

Dr. Martin Luther's Complete Writings,

published by

Dr. Joh. Georg Walch

Twentieth volume.

Reformation writings.

Disputes with the Sacramentarians and other Enthusiasts.

New revised stereotype edition.

St. Louis, Mo.

Concordia Lutheran Publishing House (M. C. Barthel, Agent).

1890.

Dr. Martin Luther's Reformation Writings.

Second part.

Dogmatic-polemical writings.

B. Against the Sacramentarians and other fanatics, as well as against the Jews
and the Turks.

Newly published on behalf of the Ministry of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod
of Missouri, Ohio and other States.

St. Louis, Mo.

Concordia Lutheran Publishing House (M. C. Barthel, Agent).

1890.

Foreword.

This twentieth volume, now completed with God's help, forms the conclusion of Luther's dogmatic-polemical writings and offers the controversial writings against the deniers of the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Communion (Sacramentirer), against other enthusiasts, as well as against the Jews and Turks; all carefully improved to the best of their ability. The main writings of Luther in this volume: "Against the Heavenly Prophets", his "Sermon of the Sacrament against the Spirits of the Swarm", his writing, "That these words, that is my body, still stand firm against the spirits of the swarm", his great and small "Confession of the Lord's Supper", "Daß JEsus Christus ein geborner Jude sei," "Wider die Sabbather," "Von den Juden und ihren Lügen," "Vom Schern Hamphoras und vom Geschlecht Christi," have all been compared exactly with the two oldest editions, the Wittenberg and the Jena; in five of them, no. 19. 20. 48a. 50 and 51, the Latin translation could also be used to correct the readings. When the first

four sermons, which Luther delivered in Wittenberg after his return from the Wartburg (No. 1a), were printed, the seventh volume of the Latin Wittenberg edition, which contains the translation of the same, was not yet in our hands; however, the comparison, which we have subsequently made, has shown that the readings, which have been recommended by us as the better ones (e.g. Col. 10: "rich"; Col. 15: "peak"; Col. 34: "heathen" and "hard") are confirmed by the Latin as the correct ones. Col. 10: "rich"; Col. 15: "top"; Col. 34: "heathen" and "hard") are confirmed by the Latin as the correct ones. Only Col. 25 is "commandment" (*mandatum*) to be put in the text instead of: "word". Newly translated from the Latin are the scriptures: No. 8. 14. (the *Syngramma Suevicum*, which is reproduced in the old edition in an exceedingly poor translation) 29. 31. (the theses of Agricola and other antinomians and Luther's six disputations against them) 48c and, in the appendix, No. 5. From the original in Förstemann's New Book of Documents, "Luther's Report of Eisleben's False Doctrine" etc. has been improved. Inserted

is the postscript to No. 45 from Burkhardt's correspondence, and Luther's judgment on Schwenkfeld, which belongs closely together with the letter to Schwenkfeld's messenger. Omitted are: "Luther's admonition against the Jews" (No. 61 of the old edition), because it is already included in the 12th volume of our edition (Col. 1264 ff.); furthermore, "Etlliche Propositiones Melanchthons wider die Lehre der Wiedertäufer" (No. 44 of the old edition). 44 of the old edition), because this writing is only another redaction of No. 40 in this volume, and finally the last six sermons of the second redaction of Luther's sermons after his return from the Wartburg, about which an account is given in the note to the superscription of No. 1a. We have added to this volume a small register of rare and obsolete words in Luther's writings, which, although it makes no claim to completeness, will be a welcome addition for many readers (because the list appended to the first edition of the Erlangen edition, vol. 26, gives an explanation of very few words that really need explanation; then also because Dietz's dictionary of Luther's writings has unfortunately only been published in a small part).

Also some historical events, which were still in the dark, could be put into brighter light. Every sincere Luther lover will certainly be heartily pleased with us that by establishing the fact that Luther had defeated his worst enemy, Carlstadt,

The fact that Luther kept him hidden in his house for months and thus saved him from the danger of death (compare the introduction, p. 24) is again a delicious testimony to his detractors that Luther not only brought the Gospel to light and taught it again, but also lived it before others as a shining example and collected burning coals on his head. For "Luther's Report" (No. 32), we think we have provided evidence that it should not be placed in April 1540, as has been assumed so far, but in the first half of June. Often, and in this case undoubtedly, the correct understanding of a writing depends on the correct determination of the time. In addition, quite a number of incorrect time determinations have been corrected in this volume as well.

Since the procedure we use for the reduction of the data is, as far as we know, not known elsewhere, but it serves us excellently in our work (because it is easy and safe), we want to communicate it here for the common good: The chronological cycles (sun and moon circles, Sunday letters, etc., thus also the occurrence of Easter) repeat themselves 340 years after the Reformation time, therefore one can easily read the data of the Reformation time from the corresponding calendars of the nineteenth century. For the years 1517 to 1546 the calendars from 1857 to 1886 give

Information. *) One obtains these calendars, which is still easy to do now; with the help of them, everyone is able to resolve the data. (Cf. Seidemann, Erläuterungen, p. IV: "that is truly not everybody's business.") This shall now be demonstrated with some dates of the antinomian disputes by 1) citing a wrong date, 2) improving it with the help of the calendar, 3) proving from correctly resolved dates in De Wette that the change is really a correction.

Wrong: Kawerau, Agricola, p. 153: "Sonntag nach Galli den 18. October" [1533]. - Correct: Calendar of 1873: Sunday after Galli is the 19th of October. - Proof: De Wette, Vol. IV, p.488: October 22, 1533 is Wednesday after 11000 virgins (October 19), thus October 19 is a Sunday.

Wrong: Köstlin, Martin Luther (3rd edition), Vol. II, p.466: "18. p. Trin. 1537, den 2. October." - Correct: Calendar of 1877: 18. p. is September 30. - Proof: De Wette, vol. V, p. 77: Thursday after Moritz (September 22) 1537 is September 27, so September 30 is a Sunday.

Wrong: Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 332: *Sabbath. dominica cantate et fo. n* (should read: *et fe. II* [Monday]) *sequente* 1540 is April 20, 1540. - Correct: Kalender

*) An exception to this is the year 1539, in which Easter fell one week earlier than in 1879. -

of 1880: Cantate is April 25; thus the writing is to be set on April 24 and 26. - Proof: De Wette, vol. V, p. 278 f.: Wednesday after Misericordias Domini is April 14, 1540; thus Sunday 9 April 25 is Cantate. Kawerau has improved this error.

In Förstemann I. c. p. 291, Count Albrecht von Mansfeld says: "Thursday, December 20, 1536" and p. 294: "Saturday, December 10, 1536". Both are wrong. - Correct: Calendar of 1876: Thursday the 21st of December and Saturday the 9th of December. - Proof: De Wette, Vol. V, p. 37 f.: Wednesday in Christmas is December 27, 1536, which proves the two dates given to be correct. - The letter in De Wette, vol. V, p. 34 ff" which should have served as proof for the latter date has the wrong resolution: Sunday after Nicolai, December 9, 1536. - According to the calendar of 1876, Sunday after Nicolai (December 6) is December 10. The wrong date of De Wette has already been corrected by Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 271.

Wrong: Köstlin I. c. Vol. II, p.470: "for a disputation to be held on February 9, 1539". - According to the calendar of 1879, February 9 is a Sunday on which no disputation was held. - Correctur: Tischreden, cap. 37, § 55, Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XXII, 1044: "The other day [after the last of January, i.e., Saturday, February 1, 1539] was the disputation." - Proof: De Wette, vol. V, p. 158 f.: on the day

On the occasion of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, February 2, 1539, Luther sent Eisleben's Disputation to Melanchthon. Kawerau I. c. p. 200 has the correct date.

Wrongly resolved in Förstemann I. c. Correct: Calendar of 1880: Friday after the Exaltation of the Cross (September 14) is September 17. - Proof: De Wette, vol. V, p. 307: "Montag nach Mariä Geburt, den 13. September 1540." If Monday was the 13th, Friday must be September 17. Kawerau I. c. p. 212 has corrected this error.

The correction of other errors in the determination of time in the antinomian controversy and elsewhere has arisen in another way. In passing here only

still notes that in Förstemann I. c. p. 348 the letter of the Electoral Councils to Agricola is dated "Sonnabends Galli", that is, October 16, 1540; however, the same letter is thought there p. 352a, in No. 35 as written on "Saturday after Galli". If the latter is correct, then the letter would have to be set to October 23, 1540.

Now may the merciful God grant that this volume, in which His salvific teaching for salvation in Christ our Lord is again abundantly presented to us, may also be diligently used by us, so that His gracious promise may also be fulfilled to us: "My word shall not return to me void, but do that which pleases me, and it shall prosper when I send it."

St. Louis, on the birthday of Martin Luther. 1890.

A. F. Hoppe.

Introduction

into the

Luther's writings against the Sacramentarians and other Enthusiasts, as well as against the Jews and Turks.

First section.

Luther's writings against the Sacramentarians, or those who denied the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion.

I. Controversial Writings Against the Error of the Sacrament First Introduced by Carlstadt ¹⁾.

In the two previous volumes, the most important of Luther's writings against the papists have been included. But unfortunately, the papists were not the only opponents of Luther and the Protestant doctrine and practice, but also from the former friends of Luther and alleged lovers of the truth, adversaries arose, against whom he had to fight in order to maintain the right doctrine and holy life. The first one against whom Luther had to turn of necessity was his college Carlstadt.

Andreas Rudolphi ²⁾ (or Rudolphus) Bodenstein (usually called after his birthplace Carlstadt) was a native of

Carlstadt in Lower Franconia, in the former diocese of Würzburg. Very little is known of his youth; all that is known is that he was a few years older than Luther and had spent time at several non-German universities for the sake of his education. When he was appointed to the philosophical faculty of the new University of Wittenberg in 1504, he was already Baccalaureus of the Holy Scriptures. He attained the dignity of a Sententiarius ³⁾ in 1508 and two years later he was awarded a doctorate in theology. As the current dean of the theological faculty, he conferred the doctorate on Luther in 1512. As long as he was sententiarius, he drew his income from the lower canonry of the All Saints' Collegiate; but as soon as he became doctor and was assigned the theological professorship, which had been taken care of by the departure of Jodocus Trutvetter, he received the dignity of archidiaconus at the collegiate church associated with this professorship and drew his income from the parish in Orlamünde, ⁴⁾ which he was assigned by a vicar (at his request).

1) In this presentation we have used Jäger's monograph: "Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt", Stuttgart, 1856.

2) In the letter of Veit Kornmesser from Stuttgart to Carlstadt of July 10, 1507, which precedes Carlstadt's writing *ve intztzionilms*, *ldpsiu* 1507, he is addressed as *N^Zister Andreas UudolpUus*, *vuIM* *Lodenstkin Oarlstudius*, and in Eck's letter to the Elector of Nov. 8, 1519, Wittenberg edition, vol. IX, p. 76, he is called "D. Andre Rodolphi von Carlstad."

3) For "Sententiarius," see Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XVIII, Introduction, p. 3, Note I.

4) This later provided him with the opportunity to enlist as a pastor in Orlamünde.

costs) had to administer. His earliest writings belong to the scholastic philosophy, are without special significance and show only a scholastic of ordinary stroke. The most important thing about him was, also according to his friends, the Thomist. In the time of his transition from scholastic philosophy to theological scholasticism falls the first original idea that suited him, namely to combine theology and jurisprudence with each other, a fixed idea that still shows itself in his later disputations of the year 1518¹ and caused him to make an ignominious journey to Rome. Because this trip gives us a deep insight into his character, we describe it here in more detail.

In a lawsuit, where the castle owner Anton Niemeck of Wittenberg had sued him for an overdue house rent of twelve florins at the collegiate court, Carlstadt refused to comply with the court's decision against him and "appealed to papal holiness". This appeal, however, was declared inadmissible by the chapter, and the Elector gave him a sharp reprimand for the same?) reminded him of the rights and privileges of the collegiate court and gave him to understand that he would assist the court. So he had to let the appeal stand, but through it he was brought to the idea of going to Rome to study law at the university there. Therefore he addressed a petition to the chapter, in which he asked for leave, so that he could undertake a pilgrimage to Rome, which he had vowed to do five years ago, when he was attacked by robbers. The Chapter brought this matter to the University, which, through its Rector Wolfgang, Count Palatine on the Rhine, declared that Carlstadt's request could not be denied "if what he wrote were otherwise true. It was added, however, that it had been learned that he wanted to study law in Rome; this was not possible according to the spirit.

The law forbids the clerics to do so. Therefore, he was to be expressly forbidden to do so and to be promised that after four months he would return home and in his absence would provide for a deputy "who would administer his prebend and dignity *onera*". The Elector confirmed this declaration on Wednesday after Corpus Christi (June 13) 1515. As his official administrator Carlstadt proposed a quite inept "white monk", who had to be rejected, especially since he himself did not want to accept because of the obligations he had towards his order. Carlstadt rode to Torgau to the Elector, who rejected him and wanted the matter to be settled by the Chapter and the University. Nevertheless, Carlstadt claimed that he had received a longer leave from the Elector, and the Chapter remained silent out of respect for the will of the Elector. Carlstadt now rode around the country for several weeks, probably to collect mild contributions for his pilgrimage). For a long time it was not known where Carlstadt was, until it was finally learned from Rome that he was there "in a Copistery Substitute". He had not taken care of the administration of his office, and, as the chapter indicated, it was also difficult for him to get someone: "because no one wants to have to send him gladly, for his sake". At the same time, however, he was constantly striving "to obtain the income of his prebends and dignity to follow him to Rome and to study law". Instead of four months, he stayed away for almost a full year. When his income was withheld after the expiration of his leave, he wrote an impudent letter from Rome to the Elector on November 13, 1515, in which he frankly admits that he is in Rome "in order to study," asks that "the fruits of my archidiaconate, which are rightfully due to me," be given and followed, and promises to order "the burdens of the church" which are incumbent upon him after he has received an answer from the Elector. On January 16, 1516, after receiving a report from the chapter, the Elector issued the following order to Carlstadt

1) Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 595, Thess 37.

2) Here, in Jäger l. e. p. 4, there is probably an error in the time determination: "Beginning of April (8. Vineaentii) 1515", because Vincentius is January 22.

3) It was a common custom to beg for the money needed for a pilgrimage.

to return immediately, but he did not obey. Only when the Elector threatened him in a second letter of February 23, 1516, that his offices would be regarded as done and that he would be reassigned if he did not dispose of his "residence" "between here and Sanct Johannis Baptistä Tag," did Carlstadt set out on his journey. At the beginning of June he appeared at the court in Torgau and began his defense with a lying accusation against the chapter. The Elector sent (on June 4, 1516) Carlstadt's slanderous writing to the Chapter, but the Chapter decided to ignore the matter. On June 16, Carlstadt again served as dean of the theological faculty at Wittenberg.

While Carlstadt was hanging around in Rome, a great change had taken place in Wittenberg. 1) Luther had come to the fore among the docents there. As Staupitzen's deputy in the vicariate of the order, he had become one of the most influential personalities. In the pulpit and on the chair he had often sharply attacked the prevailing scholasticism 2) and was therefore also exposed to many attacks on his part. Shortly after Carlstadt's return to Wittenberg, the controversy erupted with the Luther-inspired "Theses on Man's Fortune and Will without Grace," 3) defended by M. Bartholomäus Bernhardi from Feldkirch. Amsdorf, who was initially alienated by the wording of these theses, was converted, but Carlstadt and Peter Lupinus 4) were "fiercely hostile" to Luther. In the course of the disputation, Luther declared the writing *De Vera et falsa poenitentia*, attributed to Augustin, to be spurious; 5) but this very writing was the main authority

for the penitential theory of the Middle Ages; Carlstadt took serious offense at this. But already in the spring of 1517 he came out in favor of the Augustimsms and the nice direction. On the Sunday of Misericordias Domini (April 26) 1517, he proposed 152 theses on the opposition of nature and grace. Luther was delighted with them and wrote to Scheurl on May 6: "Praise be to God, who again commands that His light shine forth from darkness." Still in the late year of 1517, Carlstadt edited Augustine's writing *De spiritu et litera*, which Luther mentions with praise in a letter to Spalatin 6) of January 18, 1518.

Carlstadt was also slow to catch up with Luther in matters of indulgences. Still on February 15, 1518, Luther wrote to Spalatin, 7) that Carlstadt did not share his opinion that indulgences were of no use at all, except for those who were sleepy and lazy in the way of Christ, even though Luther knew that Carlstadt did not consider them [indulgences] to be anything. About the same time, Carlstadt comments against Spalatin in a letter dated February 5, 1518 8): "But how our university at Wittenberg could be established and ordered, so that it could be a model for others, I want to talk to you about this orally." But it almost seems as if he had mainly sought his own benefit with the intended reform of the university. For already on February 6, 1518, he speculates, allegedly in the interest of the university, in a letter to Spalatin 9) on the position of a terminally ill canonicus. Another letter of April 11, 1518 10) reveals even stronger things in the same direction. Carlstadt had secretly encouraged the students that they, together with some magisters, should bring a petition to the Elector, in which it should be demanded that the Elector give Carlstadt an ecclesiastical prebend and dispense him from the church services connected with it, so that he could now,

1) Misled by the wrong dating of the letter to Joh. Lang (it is from Feb. 8, 1517; Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XVIII, 16 ff.), Jäger I. e. p. 6 also transfers Luther's attack on the Aristotelian system to the year 1516.

2) Cf. Weimar edition, vol. I, 142; Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XVIII, introduction p. 3, col. 1.

3) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, col. 3 ff.

4) Cf. Tischreden, Cap. 37, Z 7. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1014.

5) Cf. Luther's letter to Joh. Lang of September or October 1516. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 554, K 3. - Because of Amsdorf's idid-, Col. 555, Z 5 to end.

6) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 1978 f., 8 4.

7) Walch, old edition, vol. X V, appendix, no.4, tz.4.

8) Erlanger Ausgabe, Briefwechsel, Vol. I, p. 147, toward the end of the letter.

9) Oerdkii Misoell. Oron. VII, x. 307.

10) Ibid, x. 303 "M-

where the university, which is threatened at the moment by terrible enemies, needs expedite defenders, is not inhibited. He himself knows and says that the pretext of imminent danger is untrue, but excuses it with the fact that it is only a matter of asserting an occasion (occasio) "of which a secret suspicion (ssecretus mensus), which usually foresees the future, either fears or hopes that it will occur. Spalatin was supposed to write this petition for him under the name of his audience (in rsm M6LM sub auctororum persona). The students, however, did not want to hand over this writing themselves, so Carlstadt was forced to send it to Pfeffinger. But on May 21, the matter was not yet settled, for in a letter of that day, Carlstadt still urgently asks Spalatin for his endorsement.

A desirable opportunity to enter the literary arena and to win honor there, 1) Carlstadt found, or rather, he brought it about, by turning the private dispute 2) between Eck and Luther, which had only been conducted in writing, but not through published books, into a public one by publishing at least a part of his 405 theses (402 by Carlstadt; with the addition of three theses by Luther 405. Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XVIII, 590 ff, and the introduction *ibid.*, pp. 23 ff.), which he had printed during Luther's absence 3) without his knowledge and will, made a public one. Both, Eck as well as Luther, wanted the dispute between them to end with Luther's only handwritten reply (his "Asterisks", which Luther had not had printed for Luther's sake) to Eck's "Obelisks"; this, however, was prevented by Carlstadt's unauthorized premature intervention; and the dispute continued, as such in the 18th volume of our edition.

is set out in detail, so we must pass over it here.

At the Leipzig disputation, Carlstadt's inferiority against Luther had become apparent, and this was pointed out to him in some writings of friend and foe. 4) From this arose a jealousy against Luther, and he became inaccessible to his counsel. Therefore, Luther had to turn to Spalatin with the request that he give Carlstadt the advice that he should either not revile in the same way again or not answer at all to Eck's unprecedentedly impudent and impure book 5) published against him. In the first heat, Carlstadt had started to answer Eck's writing and had given his reply the title: "Wider den ganz unvernünftigen Esel und angeblichen Doctor" (Wider the completely unreasonable ass and alleged doctor). 6) Spalatin's council was accepted by Carlstadt; he worked the writing [^]Im and published the same (but still sufficiently coarse) at the end of February 1520 under the title: Oovkutatio Xvārsas Earolostaāu sāita aāvorsns āksksnsivam spistolam 3ok. Rekii 6to.

Also Luther's judgment on the Epistle of Jacob, which he had expressed for the first time in his "Erläuterungen über seine zu Leipzig disputirten Thesen" in August 1519, 7) must have aroused Carlstadt's anger already at that time, because in the writing Do sripturis oavoviois, whose elaboration he began in the late year 1519, 8) he made coarse, malicious attacks on Luther because of this view. "If on any point," says Jäger ("Carlstadt," p. 68),

4) Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 68.

5) The title of the same is: kontra Martini l'au-cicier odtusum propuAnatorerri ^nārearn Unāolpki Loāenstein. Oarlstāāiui etc... Dpistolackekensivu. Wiedemann, "Eck", p. 512. In the way we have indicated, Luther characterizes Eck's book against Carlstadt in a distant letter to Spalatin of February 8, 1520. Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. 55.

6) Luther's letter to Spalatin of February 5 (8 ^xatdae; not February 9) 1520. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 670. - Wiedemann, "Eck," p. 149, seeks to create the impression as if Carlstadt's writing had really appeared under its first intended title, and completely ignores the reworking that occurred.

7) In the explanation of the 7th thesis. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XVIII, 858.

8) The dedication of this writing is dated August 18, 1520, so it must have gone out in August.

1) In the Tischreden, Cap. 37, 8 4, Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1012, Luther says: "Everything that Carlstadt also began, he began for the sake of vain honor."

2) This is how Luther describes it in a letter to Scheurl of June 15, 1518. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 596.

3) Luther was in Heidelberg at that time for the meeting of the General Chapter. Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, Introduction, p. 3 f.

"Eck has had a brilliant success with his suspicions, so it is just this, that he caused the beginning of the discord between Carlstadt and Luther." How far Carlstadt's suspicion against Luther went, we can see from several statements of Carlstadt in the above-mentioned writing, in which he states that Luther, out of grudge and resentment against him, suspected the Letter of Jacob, which he (Carlstadt) was explaining, 1) among the students and caused them not to attend his lectures. Still in the same year (the dedication is dated November 4, 1520) Carlstadt published a German reworking of the same writing under the title: "Welche Bucher biblisch seint", which is quite different from the Latin one. The polemic in it was mainly directed against the papacy and the theology of the monks, but was considerably more moderate against Luther. Carlstadt's attacks were completely ignored by Luther, his polemics were not answered anywhere, although Luther repeated his judgment on the Epistle of Jacob in the writing "Von der babylonischen Gefangenschaft der Kirche" ("On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church") at the beginning of October 1520, 2) in the "Vorrede zum Neuen Testament" ("Preface to the New Testament") 3) from 1522 and elsewhere quite decisively. Luther's silence may have moved Carlstadt to this moderation.

In the meantime Eck had returned from Rome with the bull directed against Luther, in which Eck had also inserted Carlstadt's name. This forced Carlstadt, who had initially refrained from any direct public attack on the deeply rooted ecclesiastical abuses, 4) to take a firm stand against the papacy. He had no choice: either he had to recant his teachings or expect the papal ban. This was not without a severe inner struggle, for his mother and his numerous relatives urged him to submit to the pope. Just here is probably the most appealing trait in the entire

Life of Carlstadt. He had to fight down great fear and despondency, but through the view of the suffering and resurrection of Christ, a great martyr's enthusiasm was ignited in him, of which his "Missive von der allerhöchsten Tugend der Gelassenheit" (Missive of the Highest Virtue of Serenity), addressed to his mother and relatives on October 11, 1520, 5) bears beautiful witness and at the same time reveals to us the inner motives of his open break with the papal hierarchy. Already on October 3, Luther wrote to Spalatin 6): "The book of the captivity of the church will go out Saturday. Carlstadt, too, has made his decision and is attacking the Roman pope." In an unbelievably rapid succession, various writings by Carlstadt against the pope and his followers went out: on October 15, 1520, his "Answer, consecrated water, against a brother, Johann Fritzhaus called, Holzschuher Order"; before October 16, 7) his "Condition"; on October 17, the relatively large pamphlet "Von päbstlicher Heiligkeit"; on October 19, his "Appeal to a Papal Holiness". On November 4, the Blick vom Canon (vo scripturis eanoniois), which was reworked into a pamphlet directed against Rom; then still in 1520, but not before the end of November, a lost pamphlet against the theologians of Louvain, who had burned Luther's and Carlstadt's writings; in addition, a series of disputations in which Carlstadt attacked the pope. This polemical activity continued into 1521. He also directed his attacks against the colibate and monastic vows, against the mass and images.

By the end of 1520, Carlstadt's connection with Luther and Melancthon had loosened considerably, and this relationship remained unchanged at the beginning of the following year. Therefore, in the spring of 1521, Carlstadt accepted with great willingness an appointment offered by King Christian II of Denmark to

1) In the spring of 1520, Carlstadt explained the Epistle of Jacob in his lectures. The poor attendance at these very lectures must have annoyed him, who liked to boast of the large number of his listeners. Cf. Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 11.

2) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XIX, 119 f.

3) Walch, old edition, vol. XIV, 105.

4) Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 70.

5) An extensive excerpt from this paper is given by Jäger l.c., p. 131 ff.

6) Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. 40.

7) i.e. before the papal bull became known in Wittenberg (Jäger l.c., p. 142); on October 16, the text of the bull became known there. (Jäger l. c., p. 145 and p. 162.)

in which he was given the task of initiating and carrying out the Reformation in Copenhagen under the immediate protection of the king. Carlstadt arrived in Copenhagen in May. But already on June 21 we find him back in Wittenberg, where he opened the attack on the celibacy of priests and monks with a disputation (of 7 theses, which he had had posted on June 20 1). The reason that Carlstadt had to return home so soon was that the Danish king, as a result of the serious crimes he had committed, was no longer free enough to enforce his reform plans, and therefore had to enter into negotiations with Rome. During the time that Carlstadt was in Denmark, namely on May 26, 1521, a general new code had been completed there, which, as one must conclude from several strange reform ideas contained therein, must have been passed with Carlstadt's assistance. In it, intercourse with the Curia and its jurisdiction are inhibited, and a royal court is established for ecclesiastical matters as well. The 17th article states: "No prelate, priest or clergyman is allowed to buy land if he does not want to follow St. Paul's teaching, 1 Tim. 3, take a wife and live in holy matrimony like his old forefathers. Thus, celibacy was punished with loss of the right to acquire landed property, though not outright forbidden. Furthermore, it is determined that "in the future, no nun may be clothed before the age of 25; that begging is forbidden to all monks who "lightly belong to the actual mendicant orders", and so on. He had not been able to bring these ideas to life in Denmark, but in Wittenberg (Luther was absent at Wartburg Castle) he was now able to take the first step, to move from theory to practice, and to take a reformatory stand. Scholl, in the first week after his return to Wittenberg, began the most violent attack against celibacy and monastic vows, so that it can be assumed that the events in Denmark

1) Jäger I. c. p. 176 has erroneously June 19. Odrvasins is June 19, thus Aewlrssr the June 20.

had a determining influence on him. 2) The second thesis of the above-mentioned disputation: "Those who have not become married should not be called to the so-called holy orders," almost coincides with the 17th article of the Danish Code, except that this thesis goes even further and amounts to a prohibition of celibacy. The 5th thesis reads: "Religious, if they are in violent heat, may marry; but they sin because they have broken the first faith; however, he who does not abstain and sins in heat admits a greater evil than he who marries." The 6th thesis allows priests to marry "without sin" because they have promised chastity only "as far as human frailty allows." Within a very short time, two important writings on the same subject followed; on June 24, 1521, his larger writing: "Von Gelübden Unterrichtung. Interpretation of the 30th chapter of Numbers, which speaks of vows. This booklet concludes by holy scripture that priests, monks and nuns with good conscience and divine will may marry and enter into matrimony, unsought Roman dispensation, which is also quite unnecessary - and gives counsel that the above-mentioned persons throw off their gleißnerisch life together caps and balls 3 and enter into right Christian life." 4) Five days later, June 29, 1521, he wrote the explanations of his seven theses under the title: Do eoslibatu, nionaebatu et vickuitate, which were shortly followed by a larger edition enriched with additions under the title: 8upor ooolib., monaeb. ot viäuit. ^xiomata psrpsonsa WittsmberZae ote. As we see from Luther's letters to Melanchthon, the latter writing arrived on August 3, 5) 1521 in Luther's

2) Thus Jäger I. c. S. 175.

3) More often: "Gugel" - hood.

4) Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 177.

5) This letter is in Latin in Aurifaber (Vol. I, 346) and in German in Walch (old edition, Vol. XV, appendix, No. 100) from the year 1521, without a more exact time determination. De Wette (Vol. II, p. 37) gives as a guess "about August 6, 1521". In Kolde's *^nalecta lmtderarm*, p. 33 ff., where the wrong readings are corrected from the original and the missing pieces are included, the time determinationpw- is found at the end of the letter.

1521, which Kolde has erroneously resolved with "26. Dec. 1521". Necessarily fit the day rwve-rtr Ktxedani, that is the 3rd August, to understand. That

Hands, and he is particularly critical of Carlstadt's use of scriptural passages that do not belong to the matter. The opponents would make fun of his distortion of Scripture. On August 6, 1521, he expresses the wish against Spalatin 1) "that Carlstadt's writings be more luminous" (plus lueis linderem), and is surprised that one goes so far in Wittenberg "that even the monks should be given wives". From this latter remark we see that Carlstadt, who had always lagged behind Luther in his doctrinal development and often followed him only with some reluctance, now that he had a free hand due to Luther's absence in Wittenberg, preceded him in his action against the Roman Church. In the same time with the two aforementioned writings falls his writing dated June 24: Von den Empfahern, Zeichen und Zusage des heiligen Sacraments des Fleisches und Blutes Christi (No. I in the appendix of this volume). Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 203, says of it that it forms the transition to his cult reforms.

Already at that time Luther expressed his concern that Carlstadt would put his attacks into action and would not let himself be admonished by any warning. In a letter to Spalatin 2) of August 15, 1521, Luther says: "It is an excellent thing that he has undertaken, and a very good endeavor, but I also wish,

that it is done in an excellent, right and skillful way. For you see how great clarity and evidential power (evsrZiue) the adversaries demand of us, so that they slander even that which is completely obvious and entirely suitable. So much the greater care must we take, who are a spectacle to the world, that our word may be blameless, as Paul teaches. I may care for strange things, but they are not strange things if his presumption has continuance. For what is more dangerous than to invite such a large group of unmarried people (euelibum) to marriage with such unreliable and uncertain passages of Scripture, so that afterwards they are tormented by constant anguish of conscience, and worse than now? I, too, desire that the celibate state be abolished (eaelibutum librum Leri), as the Gospel requires; but how I am to prove this firmly I do not yet know sufficiently. But I remind this in vain; perhaps he does not want his course to be hindered, therefore it must be let." From these words of Luther we see that he did not take offense both at Carlstadt's results and at the way in which he substantiated his doctrine, and at the impetuous haste with which Carlstadt urged the people to act without first having fortified their consciences by clear irrefutable Scriptural proofs. Carlstadt let himself think that it was enough if one had the truth; then one could immediately put it into action. Luther, on the other hand, demanded that consciences also be secured against all doubts and challenges by a firm conviction of the truth from God's Word before they were prompted to act. As long as the conscience could not be bound by a compelling proof from God's word, practice had to be delayed. In order to advise consciences in such a way, Luther sent his "Theses on the Vows and Spiritual Life of the Monasteries" 3) to Wittenberg in September 1521, the first of which reads: "Everything that does not come from faith, that is sin." In the letter that Luther wrote on September 9, 1521, at the same time as the just-

this letter is not to be placed in December, but in August, the following circumstances prove: The loei tlieoloLiei (Netkoaeus) Melanchthon were still under the press: Netioäus triaxrelus (Kolde I. e. p. 34); but already on September 9, 1521, in his letter to Melanchthon (Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XIX, appendix, no. 18), Luther retracts his favorable judgment of this writing. Luther expresses (Kolde I. 6. p. 34) his astonishment that his "Magnificat", which he had sent to Spalatin on June 10, 1521, was not yet finished. On August 6, 1521, he also writes to Spalatin (De Wette, vol. II, p. 41), "I ask you, is my Magnificat not yet finished?" On July 31, 1521, Luther gives Spalatin a negative answer (De Wette, vol. II, p. 33) to the request that he give an expert opinion on the proper establishment of a Christian Gymnasium, and reports the same matter to Melanchthon in our letter (Kolde I. c. p. 35). More could be mentioned, but we refrain from it, because Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 803 aā p. 497, has anticipated us in the correct determination of time.

1) Walch, old edition, - Vol. XXI, 759.

2) Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. 73.
Luther's Works. Vol. XX.

3) Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XIX, No. 172. b

When he sent the theses mentioned above to Amsdorf 1), The agitation in Wittenberg increased. The prior of the he remarked: "I am saddened about Carlstadt; although he Augustinians, Conrad Helt, repeatedly complained about could easily be resisted, our opponents would be given an the innovators to the Elector. On October 30, he opportunity to boast about our internal discord, to the great complained that the worst agitators among his monks were annoyance of the weak.

Melanchthon was significantly influenced by Carlstadt. two, guests who had no authority in the monastery. He On Michaelmas 1521, he took communion with his asked the Elector not to make the monastery pay for the students in the parish church of Wittenberg under both excesses that had occurred; he expected the vicar of the forms. 2) In October, the mass service in the Augustinian order to take appropriate measures to restore the old monastery was completely stopped as a result of the order. The Elector replied that the settlement of the matter sermons which Carlstadt's zealous follower, the had already been entrusted to the Academy and the Augustinian monk Gabriel Didymus (Zwilling), had given. Chapter. A few days later, on November 12, Helt wrote to He outdid his master and taught not only that malt should him: things were worse than before. No one is doing not adore the Sacrament, 3) that one alone could not anything to stop it, and exciting sermons of the innovators celebrate Mass without sin, but rather that all who were are repeated again and again, especially in the monastery present at Mass should partake of the Sacrament, 2c., but church. In these sermons, the people are incited to hatred, also that (in order to make the celebration of the Lord's even to acts of violence against the monks and destruction Supper similar to the first celebration of the Lord's Supper) of the monasteries. Thirteen monks had left, were prowling always twelve should partake of the Sacrament under both around the city and inciting citizens and students against forms with the one who celebrates Mass. On October 17, him, the prior and his faithful monks who had stayed Carlstadt held a disputation on the celebration of the masses, behind, so that they were not safe for an hour in their 4) from which it emerges that Carlstadt was initially almost monastery. He therefore asks the Elector for his completely averse to the reform plans of the Augustinians protection, and that the council admit the runaway monks at Wittenberg, that he only denied the elevation, the back into the monastery, or, if he does not want this, that sacrificial idea and the communion under one form, but they be expelled from the city, especially one of them who that he considered the worship of the elements, even the is about to marry and has applied to the council for celebration of the mass by an individual, permissible, if he citizenship. only enjoyed both forms in faith. Still in November, Soon after, Spalatin had to report to the Elector that the Carlstadt published two writings concerning this matter, Rector of the University had declared that they could not one on November 1, 1521: "On Worship and Reverence agree on the matter and that therefore a settlement of the of the Signs of the New Testament"; the other, whose matter could no longer be hoped for by the University and epistle is dated November 11: "On Both Forms of the Holy and the Committee. Until then, the movement had been limited Mass" 2c. to the Augustinian monastery, but now, at the beginning of

1) Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. 97, § 3.

2) Cf. the introduction to the 19th volume of the St. Louis edition, sub Xo. IX, a. of the second section, p. 50.

3) Zwilling, however, did not want this to be understood in absolute terms, but explained that he had only "rejected the worship of the sacrament outside of the use and action of the Communion. Seckendorf, Nist, butb., 11b. I, x>. 216, e.

4) Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 220 ff.

December, it also took hold of the municipality and the university. On December 3, the Senate wrote to the Elector that "some of our high school and also some laymen of our fellow citizens took it upon themselves this Tuesday morning not to permit the priests in the parish church to celebrate mass in the manner that had previously been the custom.

According to credible reports, the students involved had bare knives under their skirts, the priest, when he stepped in front of the altar, carried away the missals and drove all the priests from the altars; the priests, who had gone very early to sing the tides of our dear women, were thrown stones 2c. The answer of the Elector was, as before, that the University and the Chapter should unite in common steps. On December 4, the riots were repeated. Threatening letters were posted at the Barefoot Monastery, the monks were taunted by a mob of students (about forty) and prevented from holding mass. The monastery had to be guarded during the night against an attack threatened by the students. On December 6, Baier reported to the Elector that the committee appointed to settle the matter had made the definite statement that it could not decide on a unanimous answer because the views of the members were too different, but that the troublemakers, some Erfurt students, should be punished. Violent preaching against the mass continued, and only in the castle in the All Saints' Church did the old cult remain in progress, because one shied away from the wrath of the Elector; only some canons and priests had their windows broken. These events prompted Luther, immediately after his return from his secret visit to Wittenberg (early December 1521), to write: "A faithful admonition to all Christians to guard against sedition and outrage" (St. Louis edition, vol. X, 360, and introduction, col. 50). He sent it to Spalatin with the meaning that it should be printed as soon as possible. It appeared on January 19, 1522, in which he teaches that the Pabst's kingdom cannot be destroyed by fist, but only by God's word. Impetuous interventions and acts of violence on the part of those who boast of the Gospel would give the enemies of the right doctrine desirable cause for blasphemy, and also anger and repel the weak. But also among some members of the chapter the mass had come into such contempt that the two deans of the chapter had already on

October 9, 1521 to the Elector, 1) there was a lack of priests who were willing to hold the masses newly founded by the Elector.

In the meantime, the part of the university members favorable to the abolition of the mass, among them Carlstadt and Melanchthon, had drafted a declaration to the Elector, in which they stated that the abolition of the annoying abuse of the mass was quite harmless, and if some Pharisees were annoyed by it, one should let it go and keep to Christ's commandment [Apost. 5, 29.]: "One must obey God more than men. Since several members of the Senate and the Chapter refused to accept this declaration, it went out on December 12, 1521, signed by the Rector of the University, Carlstadt, the two Schurf, D. Wild, Melanchthon, Amsdorf and Bockenhein, to which D. Baier submitted an additional report. Jonas and Feldkirch also joined them. The adherents of the old rite, mostly members of the chapter, also turned to the Elector and demanded protection for the old rite in churches and monasteries. The Elector, however, ordered on December 19 through D. Baier to the university members that they should refrain from any reorganization of a new rite of mass and not allow anything of the kind to their own. However, they were to "take the matter into further and greater consideration, and also to discuss, write, read, and preach about it," and in doing so to keep to the reasonable measure, "so that nothing other than the honor of Christ is sought therein.

Carlstadt had not said mass for a long time. When it came his turn, the other canons celebrated for him. But when he preached vehemently against the mass, they refused to stand up for him any longer. In response, Carlstadt declared in a sermon on December 22 that if they forced him to say Mass in this way, he would say a "Protestant Mass" on the next New Year's Day, as Christ had said and instituted it. This reported

1) Compare the introduction to the second section of the 19th volume of the St. Louis edition sub No. IX, b, p. 51.

the canons to the Elector, 1) whereupon he sent a ban against such innovation. But Carlstadt, who had stopped preaching for some time, now appeared again three times in a row with polemical sermons and took the decisive step on Christmas Day, which he had previously intended to do only on New Year's Day. On this day he first preached a sermon from the pulpit "on the reception of the holy sacrament". Then he went immediately to the altar, read the Mass canon up to the Gospel, but omitted all ceremonies of "shielding and fencing with the crosses", the whole sacrificial service and the elevation. Then, without previous confession, he distributed bread and wine to the people with the words of distribution used by Christ at the institution. Carlstadt also seems to have touched other innocent customs already at that time, because the councilors wrote to Baier (Corp. Ref., I, 512) that they heard that Carlstadt should not be willing to put on chasuble, alb 2) or surplice to the [Protestant] mass. From now on, the people stayed away from all other masses.

Already the next day, on St. Stephen's Day, Carlstadt took a second decisive step. In the presence of Jonas, Melanchthon and many other university teachers, he got engaged to Anna von Mochau, the daughter of a poor nobleman, and on this occasion he married a priest with his cook. In order to make the affair quite conspicuous, Carlstadt intended a particularly grand wedding celebration, to which he also wanted to invite the entire university and the council, yes, he even sent an invitation to the Elector on January 6, 1522. On January 5, 3) he had a "Sendbrief D[es] W[ürdigen] Andren Boden meldende seiner Wirthschaft. Neue Geschichte 4) von Pfaffen und München zu Wittenberg" in which he harshly criticizes the priests "who keep cooks in such a form and do not want to take women",

1) This is probably meant by "the duke" in Jäger I. e. p. 254.

2) This is probably meant by the word "Almen" in Jäger I. c. p. 257.

3) This time is given by Jäger I. e. p. 257.

4) "Geschicht" is after Burkhardt, p. 44, set instead of "Gezeit" in Jäger.

praises the marriage state highly and calls on the priests to marry. He now announces that he is engaged and that the wedding has been set for St. Sebastian's Eve 5), and he now invites to his wedding.

The next day, on St. John's Day (27 Dec.) 1521, the Zwickau prophets appeared in Wittenberg, namely the cloth weaver Nicolaus Storch, another cloth weaver and Marcus Thomä Stübner, who had previously studied in Wittenberg and had therefore become friends with Melanchthon; Melanchthon accommodated the latter in his house. These people pretended to be called to teach by a clear direct voice of God, to have confidential conversations with God, to see the future, yes, to be new prophets and apostles. 6) In particular, they challenged infant baptism on the grounds that only those who believed could be baptized. They made a great impression on Melanchthon, especially their argument about infant baptism he could not resist. Amsdorf, later the strictest guardian of the pure faith against all false teachers and enthusiasts, thought it best at that time not to see or hear the new prophets at all, because he was still too much of a novice in the Holy Scriptures. In the whole of Wittenberg they caused a great stir; people talked almost exclusively about them. On the very day of their arrival, Melanchthon wrote to the Elector 7): he had strong reasons not to despise them: the matter moved him more than he could express; one had to let Luther judge the effects of the Spirit in them. He urgently wanted Luther to return to Wittenberg, because the enthusiasts had appealed to him; but this was not a sufficient reason for Luther to come out of hiding. In a letter to Melanchthon dated January 13, 1522, Luther gives the latter detailed instruction on how to test such spirits according to the Scriptures.

5) Since St. Sebastian is the 20th of January, not this day but the 19th of January will have to be assumed. Hunter I. c. S. 258 has the 20th of January. Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 516 has the correct date; likewise Kolde, Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 34.

6) Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 520.

7) Oorp. Not. I, p. 513 8Y. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2366.

8) Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. 103.

have. He asks him to investigate whether they can prove their divine calling. If they claim that they were called by direct (nuda) revelation, they should not be accepted, for God never sent anyone whom He did not either call through men or confirm by miraculous signs, not even His Son. With regard to infant baptism, he states that infants, brought in by foreign faith, receive their own faith in baptism. Luther disapproves of Melancthon's shyness toward the prophets and already at the end of this letter holds out the prospect of his return soon, "because the translation [of the Bible] will require him to return." For a longer time these enthusiasts had their being in and around Wittenberg and recruited followers. Among others, a studied theologian, Martin Cellarius (Vorrhaus, a native of Stuttgart), fell in with them and became particularly persistent. Only some time after Luther's return from the Wartburg, after Luther had had a personal meeting with some of them in the beginning of April 1522 1), did they turn away to Kemberg.

We are not told that these prophets participated in the cult reforms in Wittenberg, but they gained a significant influence on their kindred spirit Carlstadt and his followers. Meanwhile, the innovations continued. Before New Year's Day 1522, the congregation of Wittenberg sent six articles to the city council, which they insisted on accepting and carrying out, declaring that they were determined "to stay with it, to leave their possessions, life and limb above it. The content of these articles has recently been as follows: 1.

Allow everyone to preach the Word of God freely. 2. all forced masses are to be stopped. 3. all masses in which Christ's body and blood are not eaten and drunk, such as requiems, funerals, vigils, fraternity masses, wedding masses, votive masses, shall be stopped. 4 No one shall be forbidden or deprived of either form. 5. and 6. the drinking and whorehouses shall be abolished. The council immediately sent these articles to the Elector, who, however, said that they should wait "until he proposed an order. The congregation was not content with this, but already on New Year's Day more than a thousand people received the sacrament under both forms, just as many on the Sunday after (January 5), and likewise on Three Kings' Day. Carlstadt preached twice every Friday, and almost "all the people in town" attended; many who had not come to a sermon in the past now missed none. Even before January 20, they proceeded to establish daily German morning and evening services instead of early Mass and vespers; the early service with reading of a section of the Old Testament was to be provided by Jonas, the vesper service with reading of the New Testament by Carlstadt. Immediately after his marriage, Carlstadt set out to fortify the reforms and ensure their further development through a congregational ordinance. On January 24, the city council and the university agreed to the same. In this document, in addition to provisions for an orderly care of the poor, were these two laws: 1. that to avoid idolatry, images and altars should be removed from the churches, and only three altars, without images, should be left as sufficient; 2. that the mass should be held strictly according to the institution of Christ. The entire *Canon major* and *minor* were to be omitted as not in accordance with Scripture, and immediately after the Consecration, which was to be recited publicly and in German to the people, the Communion was to follow, whereby the communicant was to take the host and the chalice into his own hands. - Only the abolition of images was postponed; according to Baier's report of January 25, there were disputations on this question, with Carlstadt and his followers mainly relying on the

1) Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 776, § 4. - According to this, the information of the Cordatus "1521" is to be corrected. Tischreden, cap. 37, § 1. Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XXII, 1010. - Cf. also § 2 therein. - In September 1522, "the prophet prince Claus Stork" was with Luther. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 106. St. Louis edition, vol. XXII, appendix II, no. 125. - On April 12, 1522, Luther wrote to Joh. Lang: "The prophet Marcus together with the Zwickau prophets were punished and reminded by me; unwillingly they went away. One of them got into such a rage that I have never seen a more furious person." Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 105.

Decalogue and at the same time vividly attacked the service of the saints.

In the aforementioned community order, the iconoclasm had already been prepared, but Carlstadt found it necessary to justify this enterprise together with his newly ordered care of the poor in a special writing "On the abolition of images and that no beggar should be among Christians". The letter to Count Wolf Schlick of Passau is dated January 27, 1522, in which the fight against images is confused and mixed with the fight against the service of images, which in turn is confused with the fight against the service of saints. He also complains about the timidity with which the execution of these resolutions is delayed in Wittenberg; he has done his part and must leave it to God, who guides the hearts to good.

Around this time, namely in the last days of January, the morning and evening services had really come to life; Carlstadt preached daily in the evenings. In this activity he was supported by the Augustinian monk Gabriel Zwilling, who on New Year's Day 1522 in Eilenburg had already given the sacrament to about 200 people without prior secret confession, only on a general confession 1) under both forms, whereby he gave them the hosts in his hand and had the chalice passed from hand to hand and officiated in a long black student's skirt. These two stormed and agitated incessantly in the pulpits against the Mass, confession, priests, images and the like, and called upon the congregations to act and change on their own authority. That it really came to tumults as a result of this, we can see from the report of the Electoral Plenipotentiary, Haugold von Einsiedel, to the Elector of February 14, 1522: "that the riot that has taken place comes from no other than D. Carlstadt's and M. Gabriel's sermon"; and from other passages it appears that this riot consisted mainly in violent destruction of the images. The Augustinian monks not only removed the altars from their church except for one, but also burned the

holy images in the church. 2) Already on February 3, Einsiedel had admonished Carlstadt in a letter to be more careful, not to do anything that would annoy the common man and not improve him, and also to refrain from preaching the word where he was not especially called to do so, so that it would not seem as if he had "more desire to promote his own fame than to seek the salvation and fruit of men through the word of God. To this Carlstadt gave an impudent reply the following day, February 4. Among other things, he says: "Therefore I remain firmly grounded in the divine Word and do not allow myself to err in what others teach; I also know that I can annoy no one but unbelievers." It behooves him to preach in the castle, even though, without a formal profession, "he also acknowledges himself guilty of preaching God's word in other ways. If I am an unworthy doctor, why should I not preach? At the same time, Einsiedel had asked Melancthon (also on February 3) to admonish Magister Gabriel, about whom it was said that he sometimes "spoke inflammatory words, with instructions on how this and that should be changed by the congregation, ... from which sedition can cause discord and outrage," from his pernicious actions. In Gabriel's case, Melancthon's ideas seem to have been successful, for he left Wittenberg shortly thereafter 3) and was proposed by Luther to the city of Altenburg as a preacher on April 17, 1522. But still

2) Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, 516. - Should not perhaps be read "images of saints"? although Duke Georg in his letter to the Elector of March 21, 1522 (Seckendorf, nist. Imtksr., Ub. I, p. 218, y.) mentions that "the images of God and the saints are miserably broken or disgraced"; because also the last expression seems to indicate that not all images were destroyed. Compare the conclusion of note No. 1 on page 13 of this introduction. Although it cannot be denied that according to Carlstadt's doctrine all images, including the crucifixes, were to be destroyed (cf. Köstlin, I. 6. p. 805 aâ p. 540), it is not proven that this was actually done.

3) On February 14, Einsiedel wrote to the Elector that "Mag. Gabriel has turned away from Wittenberg, perhaps in response to the letter that I sent next to Philippo.

4) Cf. Luther's letter to the council of the city of Altenburg. Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, 2411.

1) Seidemann, Erläuterungen, p. 43: [He has] "vne alone die offene schuld't vorgespochen".

On February 5, Melanchthon wrote in his answer to the above-mentioned letter from Einsiedel: "He has often spoken such opinions with Gabriel, and has also asked D. Carlstadt to moderate himself; but I cannot hold my breath. In any case, through his inciting sermons, he also helped cause the iconoclasm in the parish church. The reason by which Carlstadt and Zwilling persuaded "the common man" to intervene with a stormy hand was: "that the common people might well have power to do something in negligence of the authorities, out of a compassion and love". Now (about February 6) it was publicly announced on which day the pictures should be taken out of the parish church. This day will probably be February 7.

1) We are moved to this very probable time determination by the following circumstances. In the aforementioned letter to Einsiedel of February 5, Melanchthon does not mention anything about these events; likewise in the letter to Spalatin of February 6 (Jäger, I. o. p. 280). On the other hand, we find the electoral commissioners gathered in Eilenburg on February 8 to discuss how to prevent further innovations and put an end to the rebellious activity. They agreed to issue a "reproach" to the chapter and the university, in which they were to be told what a stir the innovations had caused throughout the empire and how these innovations were not so essential that such danger should be dared on their account. In particular, however, it is to be noted with regard to the images: "if they had not been taken away so suddenly, cut up and burned, and if those to whom it was due had been willing to remove the image out of a good concern: nevertheless, it should not have been publicly proclaimed on what day the work should have been done, and has served nothing else than to incite the common man to a riot or a heated mind. "Nor would it have been unskilful if one had not so nearly hurried with things that were not so important. . not so nearly hurried." It seems to us from these words undoubtedly that at this time, on February 8, the iconoclasm in the parish church was already accomplished. Jäger <1. a. p. 281> understands it of something then still future, "what Carlstadt and his followers intended and openly demanded". Köstlin seems to have overlooked this passage, for he says (Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 518): "We know nothing more about the form of that storm against the images." But it seems as if neither in the church of the Augustinians nor in the parish church all the pictures had been removed, since the commissars agreed (on February 8) "to work toward the removal of the pictures in the churches (i.e., not only in the collegiate church, in which they had remained untouched, cf. Seckendorf, Hist. I, utd., 111"). I, p. 218, H.) remain until further notice." (Jäger I. 6. p. 282.)

have been. The images were "suddenly taken away, cut up and burned". Already on February 8, Carlstadt had been named by the chapter before the electoral commissioners assembled at Eilenburg as the author of the innovation, and at the negotiations of the commissioners, which took place on February 13, he himself had to admit that he had caused the tumult in Wittenberg. Carlstadt had to promise "to refrain from such preaching in the future, and if it did not happen, he would willingly suffer punishment for it. Amsdorf took over the office of preacher and offered to instruct the people in order from the pulpit. The university declared to the commissioners that it agreed with the provisions of the new municipal regulations concerning the images, but that only the authorities and those appointed by them had the right to lay their hands on the images, and that they wanted the matter to proceed decently, "but the fact that some have handled it clumsily is through no fault of our own, and the violators have been punished in part by the council, and some have escaped. 2)

But still other evils had arisen from the activities of Carlstadt, as we hear from the report of Fröschel, an eyewitness: when Luther had come again to Wittenberg, the second Diaconus had to stand with the sexton next to the altar in the chair and sing the Introit, the Kyrie eleison 2c. during the service, "because there were no pupils in the boys' school who helped to sing". "The situation of this boys' school was such that no more students went there, for it had fallen apart and had been turned into a bread house or bread bank, and the boys' school had been torn apart and caused to be torn apart by three men who would also have liked to tear down the laudable university here, where Philippus Melanchthon and D. Hieronymus Schurff had not gnawed so fiercely and stood and rebelled against them with all their might." These men, namely D. Carlstadt in his lectures, Frater Gabriel in his

2) Jäger, I. o. p. 283. In Köstlin, Vol. I, p. 517 towards the end, is a somewhat inaccurate account, in that this is attributed to the "Rathe" what was stated by the university.

Sermons in the pulpit and M. Georg Mohr, 1) the boys' schoolmaster, with his sermons in the school and out of the school in the churchyard - "all of these have pretended that one should not study, nor keep a school, neither a special school for the youth, nor a university for the others, nor should anyone receive a doctorate, neither baccalaureate nor master's degree nor *doctorate in all* faculties, for Christ himself would have forbidden such Matth. 23,10. 2) The schoolmaster also preached from the school in the churchyard and admonished the citizens and burgesses and asked them to take their children out of school, which was also done most vehemently in the pulpit by Frater Gabriel and D. Carlstadt in his lectures. So that at the same time many of his ingenues left, when I saw and spoke to some of them who passed through Leipzig and said that they wanted to go home and learn a trade, that they were no longer allowed to study. It was not until 1523 that Bugenhagen reestablished the boys' school. Carlstadt also went to the citizens in the Hällser and asked them "how they understood this or that saying in this or that prophet?" When the citizens wondered: "You should tell us!", Carlstadt answered that God had hidden such things from the scholars (Matth. 11. and Luc. 10.), that the disciples of the Lord had been much more learned and had understood and interpreted the prophets and the Scriptures much better than the scholars of that time. Also "they [Carlstadt, Zwilling and Mohr] pretended that no learned man should be accepted as preachers, as priests in the church, nor suffer, but only laymen and craftsmen, who alone could read".

As a result, the university was in danger of becoming deserted. Many students moved away from the university, others were called away by their sovereigns. 3) The preachers of the old

1) The latter also soon resigned, as did Zwilling, and continued to be a faithful pastor for many years. He is still mentioned in Luther's letters in 1545.

2) Cf. Tischreden, cap. 9, § 2 and cap. 67, § 9. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XXII, 358 and 1529.

3) We learn this from the instruction of the Elector to the bailliff Johann Oswald at Eisenach of

and the new cult reviled each other in the pulpits "with the expression of their names. Although the council of Wittenberg had originally wanted to preserve the old rite of mass, Carlstadt changed it on his own initiative, first in the monastery, then in the parish church, "whereupon in the parish one was held in a sust, the other in such a way, without order and chasuble. Then, on the advice of the university, the council adopted the new congregational order in order to ward off the boundless arbitrariness and to establish a uniform "manner and form". The movement and confusion also spread to the neighboring areas. The young theologians were almost all infected by Carlstadt's doctrine and his addiction to changing the outward customs, and continued to spread it in all directions. As early as March 1522, Luther and Melancthon were prompted to oppose such aberrations in Silesia by letter. Unrest and confusion of a similar nature also occurred in Erfurt, 4) so that Luther found himself moved to travel there in October 1522 and preach there.

The Imperial Regiment in Nuremberg, which was responsible for the government during the absence of the Emperor, had repeatedly received complaints about the events in Wittenberg, especially from Duke George of Saxony, who had been a member of the Imperial Regiment since the end of 1521. What he had to complain about, we can see from his letter to his cousin, the Elector, 5) of March 21, 1522. March 1522: in Wittenberg and other cities of the Elector, communion was taking place in both forms, the laity were touching the sacrament with their hands, it was being confirmed [consecrated] with German words, the blood of Christ was also being consecrated in common cups, the monks were throwing off their holy garments and using worldly clothing, the priests were taking women, the altars were being destroyed, the images of God and of the saints were being miserably broken or disgraced, the widows were being given the sacraments, and the saints were being given the sacraments.

March 3, 1522. Oorp. Recorm. I, p. 559, Xo. 201. Excerpted in Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2376 f.

4) Cf. Luther's letters to Joh. Lang of April 12, 1522 and to the Erfurters of July 10, 1522. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 105 and Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XIX, 962 ff.

5) Seckendorf, Hist. IJutli., Ud. I, x. 218, y.

In Eilenburg, they stormed the pastor's house, and one of them rode into the church on a donkey. And the Elector let all this happen with impunity, while he could easily prevent it. For, although the images had been taken away from the parish church, they had remained in the cathedral [the collegiate church], because he, the Elector, had ordered it that way, although the most distinguished canons 2) had been the authors of the fact that the images had been taken away from the parish church. Whoever does not prevent such an outrage, where he can and must do it, is equally guilty with the one who commits it. On January 20, 1522, the imperial regiment issued an order to all bishops to take all violators of the old ecclesiastical order into sharp interrogation and to punish the guilty, and called upon the Elector to report on the innovations and to prohibit them with severe punishment. The Bishop of Meissen indicated to the Elector that he would send virtuous preachers 3) for the upcoming festive season to proclaim anew the old orders of the church and to make known the order of the imperial regiment. Shortly thereafter, the Bishop of Merseburg also reported that he would comply with this decree. Both therefore asked the Elector for his protection and assistance in his territories. About this matter, the Elector now sought Luther's advice and had an instruction drawn up for Johann Oswald, 4) bailiff in Eisenach (on March 3, 1522), 5) in order to negotiate with him about it, and also to urge Luther that he should

Luther did not want to return to Wittenberg, because otherwise the pope and the emperor would demand that Luther be handed over to them. Luther announced his intention to come to Wittenberg in a letter to the Elector 6) in the last days of February. In this letter he consoles the Elector about the events in Wittenberg. He should not hesitate; "it is not yet there that Satan wants." "It must also be fulfilled in us 2 Cor. 6, [4. 5.]: "Charge us prove [as the servants of GOD] in riots," 2c. "E. F. G. has now had long years of applying for sanctuary in all lands; 7) but now God has made E. F. G.'s desire and sent home, without all cost and effort, a whole cross with nails, spears and scourges. I say again grace and happiness from God to the new sanctuary." The Elector should not be frightened, but let the nails go in deep, thank God and be happy: "so it must and shall go whoever wants to have God's word." In response, the Elector, in order to keep Luther from returning, hurriedly sent a "gracious concern," 8) which still came into Luther's hands on the evening of February 28, but the Instruction of March 3 did not reach him, 9) for on March 1 Luther set out on his journey.

On the way, on March 5, 1522, Luther wrote his famous heroic letter to the Elector 10) at the escort in Borna, so that he would not be "distressed by the hearing of his future" and the Elector would "think that I have much higher protection than the Elector.

Luther arrived in Wittenberg on Thursday, March 6, 1522. With his friends, namely Melanchthon, Jonas and Amsdorf, he made more detailed inquiries about the events and conditions in Wittenberg.

6) This letter is in Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 32 and an excerpt from the same vol. XV, 2375 f. - The university and the congregation in Wittenberg had also asked Luther to come. Ibidem, vol. X V, 2389, § 4.

7) Cf. the introduction to the 2nd section of the 19th volume of the S't. Louis edition, No. XI, d, p. 50.

8) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2378, § 1. We share Köstlin's opinion, vol. II, 805, that this "concern" is not identical with the instruction to Oswald.

9) Seckendorf, Hist. I, utk., Ub. I, 217, 1.

10) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2378.

1) oräinÄtionztrQ, This probably refers to the new "Municipal Code".

2) Ounonioi priniurii. With this, Duke George will aim at D. Carlstadt and the provost Jonas; but the latter had nothing to do with the iconoclasm.

3) One of these preachers, who accompanied the bishop on his visitation journey in April 1522, was Luther's bitter enemy, D. Dungersheim (cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 462 and Introduction, p. 21), who preached twice at Herzberg on April 2. Förstemann, neues Urkundenbuch, p. 19.

4) Erlanger Ausg. Briefwechsel, vol. 3, 292. In excerpt, Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2376,

5) Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 44. Cf. De Wette, vol. VI, p. 579, note 7.

On Friday, March 7, Luther wrote a statement to the Elector explaining why he had returned to Wittenberg against the will of the Elector. 1) The following Sunday, Invocavit, Luther again ascended the pulpit in his parish church and then, in eight successive days from March 9-16, delivered Eight Sermons against D. Carlstadt's Innovations in Wittenberg (**No. 1a** in this volume), in which he does not attack Carlstadt's teaching, indeed, he does not even mention his name, but reminds the Wittenbergers of their lack of love, which they have displayed in their wild goings-on. The mass is not to be done away with by violent intervention, but by the word, lest the good-willed weak be vexed and lost by the guilt of those who give the offence; "for faith wants to be willing and undemanding, and to be accepted without compulsion." Similarly, he speaks of other things, such as: the taking of the Sacrament with the hands; the receiving of the Sacrament in both forms, that no one should be forced to do so; the images and the confession that the Wittenbergers had made. However, after introducing the reader to the circumstances under which Luther preached these sermons, we refrain from further communication and refer to the sermons themselves. The success that these sermons had is surprising. Peace was completely restored, and no one dared to speak publicly against Luther. The form in which these sermons have been preserved does not come from Luther himself. The first two sermons are in the Latin Wittenberg Ansgabe, Tom. VII, col. 273 and 274b with the wrong year 1521. The first sermon has the strange superscription: *Luth. sermo*,

mira brevitate, quid Christiano praestandum sit, expediens. 1521. Walch and the Erlangen edition bring "Vorstehende Sermonen in einem anderen Abdruck" (in this volume **no. 1b**) next to the previous redaction. Because they are incomplete, full of errors, and several times meaningless, we have not printed all of them, but only the first two, so that the reader can judge for himself that the omission of the remaining six is justified. A short Summarium (we consider it a third redaction) of the first five sermons (2) is in all editions, but under different titles and with different time determinations. This writing has passed from the Jena edition to the others. We would like to assume that (because the Jena edition went out under Amsdorf's auspices) it originated from Amsdorf's pen, not from Luther's. For on March 1, Luther writes a letter to Luther. For on March 7, Luther writes to the Elector: 3) "The other [cause] is that in Wittenberg, through my absence, Satan has fallen into my hurdles and, as all the world is now crying out and is also true, has brought about several things that I cannot satisfy with any writing. 4) but must act there with my own person and living mouth and ears." After these words, it seems quite unbelievable to us that Luther, a few days before his departure from the Wartburg, had set out to dampen the unrest by this written address to the Wittenbergers. Whoever will take the trouble to compare this writing with the Sermons will hardly be able to doubt the identity of both. What is still noteworthy in this matter has already been stated in the first note to No. 1a; as a supplement, we only want to add that the title in the Leipzig edition reads: "D. Mart. Luthers Schrift wider die bei seiner Abwesenheit durch D. Carlstadt zu Wittenberg angeichtete Neuerung" (Luther's writing against the innovation caused by D. Carlstadt at Wittenberg during his absence), without any time determination; however

2) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2370.

3) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2390, § 6.

4) In the first redaction of this letter, the words are instead: "But if I had been able to help the cause with letters, as before, it would not have been necessary to call me. This is changed, however, so that it is not revealed that the Wittenbergers knew about Luther's whereabouts.

1) The declaration to the Elector is found in Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2388; moderated and changed, same Col. 2396. The letter to Spalatin of March 7, 1522, Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 14, and De Wette, vol. II, p. 145, is, as De Wette has already suspected, *une ch t*. This letter is a translation of the largest part of a letter to Hausmann, which is found in De Wette, Vol. II, p. 151, and in Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, 2404, from § 2 on. Erlanger Ausgabe, Vol. 53, p. 112 ff.

this writing is attached to those of 1522.

Luther was anxious to make known in wider circles what he had preached in these sermons. Therefore, around the middle of April 1522, he sent out a booklet with the title: "Von beider Gestalt des Sacraments zu nehmen und anderer Neuerung, D. M. Luthers Meinung" (No. 2. in this volume), which, as he wrote to Spalatin 1), he had in progress on March 30. On April 12, he reported to Johann Lang, 2) that it was under press. In the first days of May, it had already been submitted to the Imperial Regiment in Nuremberg. 3) According to the words in his letter to Duke Johann Friedrich 4) of March 18, 1522: "I have directed my letter of both forms and with hands to attack" 2c., one would almost think that he was already talking about this writing at that time, especially since the contents of this letter can be seen as a summarium of it. From this writing we also see how little Luther allowed to remain of the innovations made in his absence, 5) at least for a time, until the common man would be better informed by the gospel. With respect to this, Luther advised the following: Mass [Communion] should again be held in Latin according to the old custom, with consecrated garments, with singing and all the usual ceremonies, because such is an external thing, without danger to the conscience. The priests, however, should avoid all words in the Canon and in the Collect that refer to the sacrifice. This could also be done, because it is in Latin, without the annoyance of the common man. In the pre

The words of institution of Holy Communion should be well practiced, because the words (that they are well taken to heart) are more important than the forms. In taking one or both forms, one should follow the custom of a place and not do anything special; if one is asked, one should confess that taking one form is not evangelical, but not erect both forms again with the act or ordinance. This is justified even more strongly by Luther. Furthermore, no mass should be held where communicants are not present. The corner masses are to be rightly abolished, but one should not tear the priests from the altar who want to hold them. They must be preached against and the people must be told that there is nothing to it; then they will fall of their own accord. Confession is not to be commanded, but much less to be resisted; Luther advises that before going to the sacrament, one should confess with pleasure, for the sake of absolution. Having images is not wrong, but worshipping images is forbidden by God. Images can be used rightly and well. We cannot prove that it is right to burn, desecrate and destroy them for the sake of possible abuse. The devil has forbidden the marriage of priests and established the monastic state. They should confess that marriage is free for them, and they may leave the order, even if it annoys whoever wants to. Fasting and the choice of food are not commanded by God, but one should not use one's freedom in these things to the annoyance of the weak, nor should one want to prove oneself as your Christian by eating meat on Friday and the like.

After Luther's return, Carlstadt remained quiet for a few weeks, but in offended pride he resented the fact that he had been so shamefully disgraced with his innovations. Secretly, therefore, he sought to take revenge on Luther. He secretly wrote against Emser, in which he also casually attacked Luther. The latter may well have heard about Carlstadt's intentions, so he privately exhorted him in a friendly manner not to publish anything against him; but Carlstadt almost sacredly prayed (paene

1) Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. 83.

2) Ibidem No. 105.

3) On May 14, Hans von der Planitz wrote from Nuremberg to the Elector that Duke Georg had sued Luthern because of this booklet at the Imperial Regiment and had also sent the booklet. The Duke's messenger had to wait about 10 days for an answer, but received no other reply than that because Archduke Ferdinand had arrived, he was "burdened with great impecuniosity". "However, one wanted to look at it and then decide what was fair in it. Kolde, Friedrich der Weise, p. 63.

4) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. X, 2226.

5) See in this paper § 46 ff.

sanots) that he would not write anything against Luther. However, already on the same day, April 21, 1522, 1) the book, which had been printed in a seventh edition, had fallen into the hands of the rector and other members of the university and had been condemned by them to be destroyed, completely without Luther's consent. Luther compensated the poor printer for the damage caused by the confiscation by giving him his own new book to print and sell. 2)

Now Carlstadt abstained from all literary activity for almost a whole year; that he had not changed his mind, however, we can see from several statements by Luther that fall into this period, although they are very gentle. In a letter of September 21, 1522, to Baron Johann von Schwarzenberg, 3) episcopal court master at Bamberg, he says: "Of sacramental worship and having images, E. G. has met my opinion. But whether Doct. Andreas or anyone else holds, I let them have their way." Towards the end of the year 1522, a certain Christoph Hofmann 4) (later pastor in Jena) had turned to Carlstadt with questions about the (personal) certainty (scientia) of election, about the fall and resurrection of the righteous, about foreign faith, about infant baptism, about the persistence of the Spirit in the saints 2c. At the request of several of Hofmann's friends, Luther also answered him and warned him against these new teachings, which came from the prophets of Zwickau, who spoke from their own without any basis in Scripture. "These even Mr. Carlstadt does not yet bravely resist, either out of guilelessness or good-naturedness" (sive pro suo candore sive bono animo. As a turning point in Carlstadt's life, Luther states that at a doctoral graduation 5) he had said in a public speech: "I knowingly act ungodly, that I doctor for the sake of two guilders." To this Luther says: 6) "Since the

Carlstadt also fell and fell into various errors and remained in them. Henceforth, he no longer wanted to be called a doctor, but also called himself "a new Lay" on the titles of the writings (mostly ascetic and mystical content), which he sent out in March 1523 and later in large numbers. 7) In order to live as a true simple Christian, he bought a farm in the village of Segren, not far from Wittenberg, "and was a peasant and held fellowship with the peasants; and what the least of them had to do, he also did and had to do, as when they drank the common beer, he had to stand in front of the table, because he was the youngest farmer, and serve and pour beer, and the other farmers only called him neighbor Endres, and also called him that way when he should fetch and pour beer". 8) He maintained his office and income at the university and the collegiate church, but did not quite fulfill his duties, about which the Elector complained bitterly in a letter to Schurf 9) dated 7 August 1523. His stay in the country also served him to maintain a secret correspondence with Thomas Münzer, without this becoming apparent to the Wittenbergers. Yes, Carlstadt had even invited him to a secret meeting in December 1522, 10) in order to discuss with him such things that could not be entrusted to letters.

During his life as a farmer, Carlstadt had still returned to Wittenberg from time to time and had still carried out his official work somewhat, albeit intermittently and carelessly. But in September 1523, he left Wittenberg completely, went to Orlamünde 11) and had the congregation there make him their regular pastor. This succeeded all the more easily because the congregation

1) Cf. Luther's letter to Spalatin. Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. III, § 2.

2) Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 298. 6orp. Rot. I, r>, 570.

3) Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 27, § 3.

4) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 114.

5) Not in 1522 (Jäger I. o. p. 299), but on February 3, 1523. Cf. Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XIX, appendix, no. 7.

6) Tischreden, Cap. 9, § 2. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 358.

7) Jäger I. o. p. 300 f. lists nine such writings from the year 1523.

8) Fröschel's report in the "Innocent News" of 1731, p. 694.

9) Oorp. Üsk. I, p. 599.

10) Seidemann, Thomas Münzer, p. 128, supplement 20.

11) About the relationship of the parish in Orlamünde to the Archidiaconus at the collegiate church, compare p. 1 of this introduction.

with its previous clergyman, the vicar Conrad Glück, had fallen apart. Neither Carlstadt nor the congregation objected to the express provision that the parish in Orlamünde was to be served by permanent vicars, who were to be appointed by the academic senate and presented to the Elector. They invoked a higher divine right. Carlstadt continued to receive the income from his Wittenberg office, although he now set it aside completely. 1) indeed, it became apparent later that he had already unsuited himself to income that was not yet due. In Orlamünde, he began to reform in the same way as he had done in Wittenberg, with altar abbeys, iconoclasm and other innovations in the cult. In this reform activity Münzer supported him from Allstädt and Martin Reinhard his old comrade in the Danish attempt at reformation, from Jena, where the latter was a preacher and had helped Carlstadt to set up an angular printing press 2) so that his books would not have to suffer the censorship of the Wittenberg University. In the spring of 1524, he came forward with the writing "Ob man gemach fahren und des Aergernisses der Schwachen verschonen soll in Sachen so GOttes Willen angehen" ("Whether one should drive safely and spare the aggravation of the weak in matters concerning God's will"), in which he attacks in a wild, fanatical manner those who had set him up in Wittenberg. One must look to God's word, he says, and not wait for the other to follow. God had commanded to remove the images, therefore one should not wait for the unintelligent and weak; otherwise one would just as well continue with blasphemy, murder, stealing, adultery, until all boys become pious. "Let every community, whether small or great, see to itself that it does right and well, and wait for no one." 3) We are "all here (in Orlamünde) neither with the doctrine nor with the deed to hold still.

gewest to accomplish God's commandments, until our neighbors and the slavers at Wittenberg followed suit." "God wants so little that we wait for others until they come after and become pious, that he has commanded that one should punish the ungodly as one punishes other vices (Deut. 13. and 17, 2. ff.), and in addition kill and devastate whole cities that wait for their idolatry and do not want to wander in the right path." "It almost amazes me at our scribes and regents that they . . . want to cast down spiritual adultery with their breath and wind 4)." These last words show that Carlstadt preaches quite Münzerian; it is only to be wondered at that he, together with the Orlamünders, gave Münzer (in June 1524) quite inconsistently the answer to his request to join him in battle against the ungodly, that Christians should arm themselves not with knives but with the armor of faith. 5) In a letter of July 19, he completely renounced Muenzer; likewise his congregation. 6)

Before mid-March, the news of Carlstadt's tumultuous trial in Orlamünde had come to Wittenberg through Spalatin. 7) Already around this time, Luther complained to Hausmann that Carlstadt was persecuting him more horribly than the papists were doing. Still in March, the university went about asking Carlstadt to return to Wittenberg from the place where he had not been called and to deliver the office of the word which was incumbent upon him there; if he would not obey, he would be sued before the Elector. Carlstadt actually presented himself in Wittenberg on April 2, 8) 1524, and on April 4, negotiations were held with him. He wanted

4) With this Carlstadt aims at Luther's teaching that heresy and idolatry must be eradicated only with the preaching of the Word of God, not with the secular sword.

5) Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. I, p. 708. - Jäger I. c. S. 445.

6) Seidemann, Thomas Münzer, p. 128, supplement 21.

7) Compare Luther's briefs of March 14, 1524 to Spalatin and Hausmann. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 116 and vol. XXI, 889.

8) This time determination results from Luther's letter to Spalatin, Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 923, which there has no closer time determination, in De Wette, vol. II, p. 507 erroneously placed in May, but in truth was written April 4 or 5. Cf. Jäger, I. 6. p. 426. De Wette, Vol. VI, 612.

1) Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I p. 704.

2) On January 7, 1524, Luther reported this to Chancellor Brück. On January 14, he reported to Spalatin that Carlstadt in Jena had already published books in his newly established printing press and that he would publish 18 more books.

3) This sentence is undoubtedly correct and divine truth; but Carlstadt misuses it most disgracefully for his wild, stormy activities.

But he did not do wrong, but returned to Orlamünde. Now On August 22, Luther preached a lukewarm sermon the Elector intervened. Although Carlstadt and the against fanaticism and the spirit of rebellion, which began Orlamünde congregation repeatedly asserted to the with iconoclasm and contempt for the sacraments and Elector their divine right to elect a pastor and called the ended with murder and violence. Carlstadt, who had also right of the academy a "papist" right, the Elector come to Jena and had heard this sermon, felt affected and nevertheless commanded Carlstadt and the Orlamünde asked Luther for an interview, which was granted to him congregation on May 16 that they should obey the the same evening. 3) He insisted that he had nothing in academy and the chapter. He did not obey a request of the common with the Allstadt spirit (Münzer's) and that the university (beginning of June) to dispose of his post in accusation of sedition did not apply to him. Then he raised Wittenberg. He nevertheless remained in Orlamünde, and the accusation against Luther that he was preaching the congregation hung on him. But a few days later he had falsely about the Sacrament. Luther demanded proof. to "hand over the parish". 1) But still on August 16, 1524, Carlstadt offered to hold a disputation in Wittenberg or the council of Orlamünde called him: "our pastor and Erfurt. Luther invited him to Wittenberg and promised him pastoral caretaker". Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2433, § 1. safe conduct. In an exchange that ensued, Carlstadt said It was thought in Wittenberg to appoint a new vicar in that he had been bound hand and foot and beaten, Orlamünde, but hesitated with it, in order not to cause new because Luther alone had preached and written against conflicts with the community, which would certainly have him; on the other hand, his books had been taken from taken place if a vicar had been sent, as long as Carlstadt the printing press 4) and he had been forbidden to write was in their midst. On the other hand, attention was also and preach, otherwise it would have been known what his drawn away from this matter by the fierce attacks that spirit had done. Luther put an end to the quarrel by giving Muenzer made on Luther around this time, and the him full freedom to write against him and presented him progress of the Muenzer movement in Saxony. Because with a gold florin as insurance. 5) of this, Luther had a missive printed in the last half of July Immediately Carlstadt began to come out publicly with 2) 1524 under the title: "A Letter to the Princes of Saxony his false doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which, by the way, on the Rebellious Spirit", in which he admonishes them to he had harbored since 1522, 6) and to write against prevent your rebellion according to the authority given to Luther. Around September 1524, the two writings "Von them by God, otherwise they would be excusable neither dem widerchristlichen Mißbrauch des HERN Brod und before God nor before the world. Kelch" (No. 3 in this volume) and "Wider die alten und neuen papistischen Messen" (No. 2 in the appendix of now tried to initiate amicable negotiations. By order of his this volume) appeared. In these, Carlstadt denies the princes, Luther traveled to Thuringia around the middle of true, essential presence of the Body and Blood of Christ August to the agitated districts. In Jena, where Martin in the Reinhard had been appointed in the spirit of Carl-

3) This conversation is described by Martin Reinhard in the so-called

1) Cf. Luther's letter to the Elector of June 18, 1524, Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 72, § 2 with the wrong date: May 16. On the date, cf. old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 17). It is found in Walch, old edition, De Wette, vol. VI, p. 579 f. June 14 in Köstlin, vol. I, p. 712 is probably vol. XV, 2422. In print, it appeared at the beginning of October 1524. just a misprint. Cf. p. 814.

(Cf. Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 455.)

4) Cf. p. 18 of this introduction.

2) Not only on August 21, as it is dated in Walch, old edition, vol. XVI, 8. Cf. Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 248 and De Wette, VI, 580. In the text, Bb. II, p. 538, De Wette also mentions August 21.

5) Cf. Luther's letter to an unnamed person [Wolfgang Stein]. De Wette, Vol. II, p. 550.

6) Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 701.

Holy Communion. He teaches that Christ gave his disciples only bread and wine to eat and drink in the words "Take and eat, take and drink," and that in the words "This is my body" he was referring to himself, so that the words "Do this in remembrance of me" should be understood to mean that Christians should eat bread and drink wine in the Lord's Supper and thereby commemorate the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross. Carlstadt had already come out with this view earlier (but not until 1524), but in such a way that he left himself open to retreat, in the writing "Ob man mit heiliger Schrift erweisen möge, dass Christus mit Leib, Blut und Seele im Sacrament sei." (Whether one may prove with sacred Scripture that Christ is in body, blood and soul in the Sacrament). He gives the explanation that in it he only wanted to indicate "what our enemies would like to answer if we wanted to prove by subsequent speeches that Christ is in the Sacrament with body, blood and soul". But the whole writing shows that Carlstadt lets these so-called enemies defend his own view; in it he also recants all views of the Sacrament and of the worship of the Sacrament asserted in the writings of 1521. 1) At the end, Carlstadt asks all those to whom his answer seems to be "unchristian" to instruct him. But he did not wait for a reply, but sought, perhaps already in August 1524, 2) to bring the doctrine contained therein to the people in his "Dialogus oder Gesprächbüchlein von dem greulichen abgöttischen Mißbrauch des hochwürdigsten Sacraments JEsu Christi" (**No. 3** in the appendix of this volume). In this discussion is a series of the most biting outbursts on Luther's view of the images, the service of the saints and the sacraments. We are not able to give an exact date for this writing. We only know that it was written by Carlstadt in Orlamünde in 1524 and that it was published without any indication of the place (it must have been printed in the Jena Winkeldruckerei). In the aforementioned writing "Von dem widerchristlichen Mißbrauch des HErren Brod und Kelch" (On the Anti-Christian Abuse of the Lord's Bread and Cup)

1) Jäger I. c. S. 441 f.

2) Compare the note to the caption of No. 3 in the appendix of this volume.

the "conversation booklet" is already mentioned (in § 6). Towards the end of the year 3) 1524, Urban Rhegius sent out his "Warnung wider den neuen Irrsal Doctor Andreas von Carlstadt des Sacraments halben" (**No. 4** in this volume), which is mainly directed against Carlstadt's two writings just mentioned (No. 3, and No. 3 in the appendix), and completely puts them down. It is probably this writing that Luther asked Spalatin 4) to send him on December 29, 1524, and which he sent back to him on January 13, 1525. In the meantime, Luther had also begun to write against Carlstadt, who had been banished from Saxony by order of the Elector of September 17, 1524, and Duke John of October 2. On December 15, 1524, Luther wrote a letter to the people of Strasbourg, warning them against Carlstadt's heresy. 5) It was necessary to oppose Carlstadt's direction, for which he constantly recruited followers during his unethical travels, in wider circles as well. We hear of his presence in Rothenburg an der Tauber, in Strasbourg, in Heidelberg, in Basel, in Zurich, in Nördlingen. During this time he published one book after another, especially on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper; on November 7 in Strasbourg his "Interpretation of these words of Christ: This is my body"; in Basel (according to Erasmus) six writings on the Holy Supper. In Basel, the printers who had published his books were punished with imprisonment; 6) but Oecolampad and Pellicanus in Basel, Zwingli and Leo Jude in Zurich had fallen in with Carlstadt's opinion on the Holy Communion, even though they took the emptying of the words of institution, the reinterpretation of "is" into "means" in a different way than he did; indeed, Zwingli disapproved of the procedure of the council in Basel, and publicly demanded that Carlstadt be punished for his "is" and "means."

3) Kolde, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 158, says: "Already in November 1524."

4) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 119 and vol. XXI, 945. The former letter with the wrong year 1525.

5) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2444.

6) Luther's letter to Spalatin of January 13, 1525. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 945.

Luther was not interested in reading Carlstadt's writings. Therefore, Luther refuted the whole direction of Carlstadt in his great writing "Wider die himmlischen Propheten, von den Bildern und Sacrament" (No. 5 in this volume), the first part of which appeared towards the end of the year 1524, the second part at the end of January 1525. 1) Jäger (Carlstadt, p. 455) aptly characterizes this writing with short words: "Luther fights the whole direction of the new revolutionary mystics with biting mockery and strikingly proves the inner connection of the same with the Münzerian spirit of revolt. For the rest, we refer the reader to the scripture itself. 2)

1) About the second one, Luther wrote to Hausmann on February 2, 1525, and to Link on February 7, that it had already gone out. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 953 and 956.

2) Col. 155 in this volume we have stated in the third note that we find in this writing the proof for the assumption that the old edition of Walch also exercised an influence on the text formation of the Erlanger. Now, after this volume is completed, we are in a position to give information about how this may have happened, even in the case of the writings which the Erlanger reproduces according to an original print. Every expert knows that it would not be possible for a typesetter to work from an original edition. Therefore, either a copy of the original, or also a copy of an already existing edition, improved after the original, must be delivered to the printer; the latter was done with the Erlanger edition. The Tischreden were reprinted from a copy of the Förstemann-Bindseil edition (with some changes), which has been proven in our edition, Vol. XXII, Introduction, p. 36 ff. In the case of Luther's writings, a copy of Walch's edition was sent to the printer, after some changes had been made with it, partly improvements according to the original, but partly also restoration of such errors, which Walch had improved, e.g. Col. 1838. The indication of Walch's variants is inaccurate and incomplete, the correction of the text according to the original negligent. Therefore, a large number of Walch's errors remain in the Erlangen edition (e.g., Col. 192, cf. note 2 there, and Col. 235, note 5), hundreds of Walch's erroneous bibelleitaten are printed, and in many cases the erroneous interpretation has been retained (cf. Col. 210, Note 1 and Col. 268, Note I), also many of Walch's misprints (e.g., in § 132 of Scripture No. 5 in this volume, the Erlanger has: "im Tod" instead of: "im Brod"; § 148 ibid.: "Kolkryb" instead of: "Kielkrob"; Col. 1650: "Mäiskopf" instead of: "Meisenkopf 11) are reproduced. Even a cursory examination of this volume will lead the reader to the conclusion that it really is so, because quite often one will find the note: Thus Walch and the Erlangen edition" or: "Thus the Jena, Walch and the Erlangen edition", because Walch has often

On February 26, 1525, the second part had come into Carlstadt's hands and he immediately set about answering Luther's writing. Already on February 27, he extracted 25 articles from it, with the intention "to make a booklet on each article, one soon after the other". Already a few days later his first writing against Luther's book went out, namely about 1 Cor. 10, 16, which Luther had called in his book "a thunderbolt on Carlstadt's head and his Rotten". In the preface to this "Explanation of the 10th Chapter Corinth. 1" he gives a register of fifteen "articles" about each of which he promises to make a booklet. The tenth of these articles gives the subject for Carlstadt's "Schrift von dem neuen und alten Testament" (No. 6 in this volume), which is dated March 16.

Even during the time when Luther was busy with the publication of the first part of his writing against the heavenly prophets, and in spite of the fact that from Orlamünde, through D. Conrad Glatz, who had been sent there, terrible new information about Carlstadt's deceitful activities in Orlamünde had reached him, he made an attempt to reconcile with Carlstadt. On December 23, 1524, Luther invited him by letter to a meeting in Wittenberg or elsewhere to discuss the matter alone, without any personalities. The letter came into Carlstadt's hands late, probably due to Carlstadt's inactive life, on February 18, 1525. In his reply to Luther 3) under this date, he says: "I earnestly and faithfully desire our friendship to be reestablished according to the instruction of truth," and requests that Luther give him a free escort to the Elector and his brother. It was not until March 2 that Luther received this letter and requested on

reproduced according to the Jena edition. It is due to the unreliable nature of the Erlangen edition that even where it supposedly offers an imprint of the original (on how the reproduction of the originals in the Erlangen edition stands, compare Weimar edition, vol. II, p. 79), we have not been able to follow it unconditionally, but only with caution and selection, comparing the Wittenberg and Jena editions'.

3) Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 79.

March 4, 1) either a free escort for Carlstadt, or permission for himself to travel to another place of meeting. But this request was rejected by the Elector through Spalatin on March 20, and Luther, to whom Glatz, who in the meantime had become pastor in Orlamünde, still reported trouble, agreed. 2) In the meantime, Carlstadt had returned from the Southwest and caused similar turmoil in Rothenburg an der Tauber 3) with iconoclasm, violent prevention of mass, and the like, as earlier in Wittenberg and Orlamünde. On Easter Monday (April 17) and Wednesday after Easter, Carlstadt preached there 4) "against the Sacrament". "Tablets and images" 5) were partly thrown into the Tauber, partly broken, partly "carried home by some millers and caused great commotion". It was proclaimed "that the young priests should and may take wives [if they did so, then] one should let them follow their benefices 6) for eleven years". "On Thursday after Easter the women with halberds, forks and sticks went around in the harbor alley and made a lot of noise and said that they wanted to storm and plunder all the priests' houses. "On Friday, all the priests had to become citizens for the sake of safety, otherwise they would have been taken everything." Already since March 21, rebellious peasants had come in ever larger heaps to and around the town of Rothenburg; on April 24 7) they coveted guns; on May 15, the Rothenburgers made common cause with the peasants, "on that day Rothenburg passed from the empire to the peasants" [übergegangen]. But already on the day of Pentecost (June 4) the Rothenburgers were forced (because the peasants had been slain by the thousands, the escaped

many beheaded, some cruelly martyred, "at Kitzing 58 the eyes gouged out") to send an envoy to Margrave Casimir and ask for mercy; but the city had to surrender to mercy and disgrace. On June 29, Casimir made his entry into Rothenburg. In the time between the surrender of the city and the entry of the Margrave, the Counter-Reformation had already begun, and the search was on for those who were the main instigators of the unrest. "On the evening of St. John the Baptist (June 23), D. Johann Drechsel [Drechsler, Teutschel] was captured and imprisoned together with the blind monk [Hans Rothfuchs]. Caspar [Christian], Comthur 8) and pastor, escaped secretly with D. Andreas Carlstadt, brother Melchior, who had the blind monk's sister." The two preachers just mentioned (Drechsler and the blind monk of the Order of the Barefoot) were beheaded on July 1 in the marketplace of Rothenburg along with 23 others (same 25) 9); Carlstadt would have had the same fate if he had not escaped, especially since he had also been at the peasants' convention in Schweinfurt (June 6, 1525) and there had spoken in favor of the peasants? 10) Carlstadt was now outlawed, not safe for a moment of his life. Then, in his great distress, in order to regain a home in Saxony, he turned to the one whom he had most grievously insulted, blasphemed and reviled, to Luther. On June 12, he wrote to Luther from Frankfurt am Main, asking him to intercede for him, his wife and child with the Elector and to "bring them in again". 11) "Fear and distress surrounded us." It seems that Carlstadt's wife delivered this letter. See the postscript of the same. Already on June 24, 1525, he wrote his "Apology of the false name of sedition, so him has been imposed with injustice" and sent it to Luther with the request,

1) Cf. Seidemann, Lutherbriefe, p. 24. In Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 84 without date.

2) Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 729.

3) Cf. Luther's letter to Spalatin of April 10, 1525. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 968.

4) Report of an eyewitness in Walch, old edition, Vol. XVI, 180 ff.

5) "Panels" are painted pictures; "pictures" picture columns.

6) With Walch: "friends".

7) On "Montag Georgii" is incorrect, because in 1525 Georg (April 23) was a Sunday; we assume: Monday after Georgii.

8) In Walch: "Commenthör", i.e. Comthur of the Teutonic Order.

9) Walch, old edition, vol. XVI, 179 and 190. In the latter place Drechsler is called "D. Johann Preding", i.e. the preacher. Cf. Col. 180 *ibid.* there.

10) Köstlin, I, 753 has June 6; Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 490, June 1.

11) Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 85 f.

to have this writing printed for him. Luther complied with him and provided the writing with a preface, 1) in which he explains that he wanted to let D. Carlstadt find the service and loyalty that he had provided for him, but did not want to have Carlstadt's teaching and opinion, especially of the Sacrament, affirmed. Finally, Luther asks everyone to accept Carlstadt's apology and not to condemn him unheard, because he offered himself so highly. To remove another obstacle that stood in the way of his return to Saxony, Carlstadt wrote on July 25 a "Declaration, how Carlstadt respects and wants to have respected his doctrine of the reverend Sacrament and others" (No. 7 in this volume). In this writing, he does not revoke his teaching, but gives the explanation that he had said "that he wanted to accept Christian instruction", from which everyone could recognize that he did not want to pass off his books for "a proven divine teaching", 2) and did not want anyone to think that it was certain. Before complete, undoubted certainty had not been attained by frugal investigation of the Scriptures, "his doctrine should be regarded as nothing better than a delusion and conceit. He also sent this writing to Luther, 3) or rather, he wrote it in Luther's house 4).

1) This preface is found in Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2468.

2) Against this explanation one holds the outbursts of Carlstadt against Luther, "the new pope", whose "is the poisonous water that tries to wash away the ground of the cross of Christ". Compare in the paper No. 6 in this volume § 6 and § 69 ff.

3) Thus Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 491.

4) That Carlstadt had found an asylum in Luther's house, we have not only the testimony of "Mathesius" (Luthers Leben, St. Louis edition, p. 82 f.): "Doctor Luther, as a merciful man, believes his good words, modifies him to himself, does not keep him secretly without concern, excuses him with public writings" and so on, but also the testimony of Cordatus (Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1824, No. 129): "I have seen a frightening example of this fear in Carlstadt. At the time of his expulsion (i.e., when he was expelled from the country), he lived in my house for more than eight weeks, and no one knew anything about it," and so on. A third testimony, which so far has not been recognized as such, is Carlstadt's letter to Luther (Krafft, Briefe und Documente, p. 57), which is to be set before Sept. 12, 1525: A. B. Carlstadt an D. M. Luther. I have not forgotten you, venerable sir, from

and handed it over to him personally with the request that it, just like the previous scripture

I want to disturb your sweet sleep for your sake, so I ask you not to be unwilling. I recognize your good deed and will try as hard as I can to repay it. Moreover, as I asked thee, venerable Lord, on yesterday, so I again implore thee, and beseech thee, that thou alone for the sake of GOD, who has made thee rich in innumerable and excellent gifts, and bestowed upon thee honor before [other] men, mayest relieve this [my] banishment." Then he asks Luther to let him lament the misery and poverty of his poor wife and her unhappy child, promises to be Luther's obedient slave from now on, who will go out to him, and expresses the wish that he may be allowed to He expresses the wish that he be allowed to settle in Kemberg, because it will be easiest for him to earn his living there, since there are "fat and sandy (ureuosi) fields, then also wood and a market, hops *) and many such advantages". The signature of this letter reads: "Your honorable slave Andr. Carolostadius." From this briefs we see that Carlstadt's banishment was still in force. From this it follows that this letter is to be placed not later, but earlier than the "Instruction of the Elector for Magister Spalatin to Luther" of September 17, 1525 (Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 88 ff. Against Krafft, Briefe und Documente, p. 58). It is highly probable that Luther, prompted by this letter, addressed a request to the Elector on September 12 that he let him "stay at Kemberg or at a village nearby" (De Wette, Vol. III, p. 28); likewise, that Luther did so soon after Carlstadt's letter, because Carlstadt pleads so urgently: "Look at my misery, help, and help without delay!" Therefore, Carlstadt's letter must have been written shortly before September 12, and not from a distance, but in Luther's home; for how else could one understand the words that he had not wanted to "disturb Luther in his sleep," that he had "asked him (verbally) yesterday [he does not say: written]?" Carlstadt, without taking leave of him, left Luther's house and left this letter for him. The "Wohlthat" will have to refer to the fact that Luther hid and harbored him so long in his house. Köstlin (Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 816 p. 754) completely denies "that Carlstadt should have come to Wittenberg at that time". He rejects the testimony of Mathesius and opposes it with an untenable, purely subjective reason, which is taken from Luther's letters to Brismann, Hess and the Elector (DeWette, Vol. III, pp. 21, 18 and 28): "Carlstadt's behavior at that time does not fit at all to the unbowed stubborn spirit of the 'homo miser'" Br. 3, 21. In Köstlin's opinion, the duo is our Martin Cellarius; Vol. I, p. 754 he says: "Luther himself kept him pitifully hidden for a time." Better is Seidemann's reasoning, who (Seidemann - De Wette, vol. VI, p. 481, note 1) says: "Also, the domo unser does not seem to be Carlstadt, but Cellarius." He refers for this in his "Thomas Münzer", p. 98, note 1. to Melanchthon's letter to Brismann in August 1525 <6orx". Rst. I, 755): "Martin Cellarius from Star-

*) lupulus, what Krafft complains about, is correct, because at Kemberg there was and still is strong hop growing.

Carlstadt to go out with his preface 1), which also happened. Inspired by Carlstadt's urgent request, Luther sent a request to the Elector on September 12, 1525, 2) that Carlstadt be allowed to settle in Kemberg or a village in the vicinity. On September 17, the "Instruction of the Elector for Spalatin to Luther" was issued, 3) in which Carlstadt pardoned us for having come to us, from you to us, in our Saxony. He argues with us about his dreamed kingdom and about the New Jerusalem", etc. But also Seidemann has overlooked that Luther writes of Cellarius only in the first sentence of the immediately following passage of the letter (De Wette, Vol. III, p. 21). In the following, Luther speaks exclusively of Carlstadt. Here we have again one of the not exactly rare cases that one, misguided by false premises, charges Luther with an untidy confusion, as he should speak here in the first sentence of Cellarius, in the second of Carlstadt, in the third, without naming Cellarius, again of Cellarius. The entire passage in the letter in question, which will probably be dated July 3, 1525 (Seidemann-De Wette, vol. VI, p. 481. Instead of n866N8ioni8 [De Wette, vol. II, 22] will read vimationi8 Marias), reads as follows: "I have previously written about Martin Cellarius and set more detailed to Prince Adelbert at the same time about the establishment of the ceremonies, so I will be quite brief to you, because I am overloaded with so many writings. If Carlstadt's or Zwingli's poison of the Sacrament should come to you, see that you are vigilant. The wretched man (homo miser) has been secretly preserved with me. Now the whole world is too narrow for him; he is so inferior everywhere that he has been forced to seek protection from his enemy. I have treated the man as kindly as I could and stood by him, but he does not leave his senses, even since he has been convicted, as these kinds of spirits are wont to do. So beware of him and his teachings. I have found that in him everything is void, especially in this matter." We do not consider it necessary to understand M. Cellarius by the "wretched man". Luther warns against "Carlstadt's poison of the Sacrament" and comes back to it in the words "especially in this matter." As far as we know, Cellarius played no part in the controversy over the Sacrament; Luther refers to him everywhere only in general terms as a "raging, rebellious zealot" who has the spirit of Münzer, who wants "that all the ungodly should be exterminated and the godly should rule on earth." Therefore, we agree with Burkhardt (p. 87) and De Wette (Vol. III, p. 21) that the letter just mentioned is to be regarded as a fourth testimony to the presence of Carlstadt in Luther's house. It may have cost Luther enough effort to persuade Carlstadt himself only to issue the "Declaration". (No. 7), through which his unbowed obstinacy comes to light precisely because he does not recant his teaching in it.

1) This preface by Luther is found in Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, 2472.

2) Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 129.

3) Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 88 ff.

and that he be allowed to settle in any spot or village, with the exception of the Thuringian lands and Wittenberg, but "around Wittenberg for half a mile, a whole mile, two miles, up to the third mile," "excluding only Kemberg [which is 1-1/2 miles away]," because a busy country road leads through this town, "which is built and wandered by some and partly strange people. Thereupon Carlstadt first settled in the village of Segren near Wittenberg and "handed over" from there on October 9 "his booklet, which he had made on the orders of the Wittenberg theologians and in which he recanted. 5) Carlstadt had his son baptized at Segren in February 1526 and invited Jonas, Melancthon and Luther's wife as godparents. Luther was present at the baptism as a guest. This happened even though Carlstadt had "called the baptism a dog bath" the year before. 6) On Luther's intercession to the Elector of November 22, 1526 7) he was allowed to move to Kemberg, because he "could not stay in the villages because of the malice of the peasants". In Kemberg he supported himself meagerly through a small trade, especially with food. In Segren he had been "silent publicly" (De Wette, Vol. III, p. 137) and also behaved quietly in Kemberg for almost a year and lived according to the condition which he had set for himself and which Luther had announced to the Elector 8) "never to preach nor to write for the rest of his life, but to be eternally silent and to feed on his work. 9) But Carlstadt made himself suspect several times. In October 1527 he had left his place of residence for several weeks and it was believed that he "had traveled to his people and had a

4) Shouldn't it perhaps be "built," i.e., made into its orbit?

5) Burkhardt I. c. p. 88, note 3.

6) Cf. Luther's letter to Amsdorf in February 1526. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 999.

7) Walch, old edition, Vol. XXI, 156. - Before Carlstadt went to Kemberg, he was for a while in Berkwitz near Kemberg (Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, 754).

8) Sept. 12, 1525. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 130.

9) Almost the same words are already in Carlstadt's letter to Luther of June 12, 1525 (Burkhardt I. c. p. 86). Compare also Luther's letter to Brück of September 24, 1528. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2494, § 2.

nest for himself". 1) On November 28, Luther wrote to Brenz: 2) "So far we have nurtured Carlstadt with great love, in the good hope that he would return to the [right] path, but the wretched man 3) hardens himself more and more every day, and yet he is forced by his pusillanimity to remain silent. Even his 'Tuto' he still holds on to, although it is also rejected by his own." Luther came to this exact knowledge of the state of Carlstadt's teaching at that time in this way: Luther had offered him out of mercy, 4) "whether I could resolve his arguments and bring them to justice, which he accepted with thanks and the joy and hope of all of us; but after that he came back and did not want to do it until he had M. G. H.'s will to do it; he wants to keep the escort so clean as a cat. He asked for permission to act with Luther and obtained it. So he set up his reasons and handed them over - not to Luther, - but into the hands of Chancellor Brück at Torgau. In this way of acting of Carlstadt Luther saw, as it seems to us, rightly, an attempt of Carlstadt to pull the court to himself and to bring it to his opinion. This happened around August 1527, because on August 12, 1528, Carlstadt wrote to Brück: "After having obtained the gracious permission, I have divided my reasons into three parts; two parts E. A. gave into your own hands a year ago at Torgau, kept quiet and secret. That [it] is now carried out at Wittenberg has happened without my will, as well as that Doctor Martini's answer has been written out before, because it is in my possession." Brück, however, sent Carlstadt's writing to Luther, who replied to the erroneous reasons put forward by Carlstadt quite kindly and solely factually in a letter, which we have published under the title: *Luthers Antwort und Widerlegung etlicher*

of erroneous arguments (mainly from the *Dedit*), which Carlstadt against him gets etc., in No. 8 of this volume. This letter will not have been published in print, 5) but, as Carlstadt complains, "written out". "November 1527" is assumed by De Wette as the presumed time "because of Luther's statement that he had to travel several times to Torgau, which seems to have happened in November of this year". Luther's instruction, however, was of no avail to Carlstadt. On May 12, 1528, Luther wrote to Wenc. Link: 6) "With us, by God's grace, there is peace. But Carlstadt remains as he has been, not to say he becomes more obstinate, but he is forced to be silent." Soon it also became apparent that things were getting worse with Carlstadt. Carlstadt had already tried several times to get in touch with the enthusiasts in Silesia, Schwenkfeld and Krautwald, but had torn up again the letters already written to them because he could not get a messenger. However, on May 17, 1528, he found the opportunity to send a letter 7) to them, which Luther found out about and had the Wittenberg captain Hans Metsch tell him that he did not want to have anything more to do with him. On June 8, 1528, Luther reported to Amsdorf, 8) that Carlstadt was planning to leave, and on July 28, 1528, he expressed the wish to Gerbellius, 9) that the Strasbourg enthusiasts would like to have the viper Carlstadt, who alone is rebelling but does not dare to come forward, with them "and we would be free of him. In a letter 10) of August 12, 1528, Carlstadt complains against Brück that Luther had not given him an answer to his arguments, which Luther refutes on September 24, 11) by sending a "copy of the answer", and warns, because Carlstadt already before a

1) Luther's letter to Melancthon of October 27, 1527. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 121.

2) Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. 122.

3) Here we again encounter the expression *nonno*, which Luther uses of Carlstadt (De Wette, III, 230), as well as in the above-mentioned letter to Brismann (De Wette, III, 21).

4) Luther's letter to Brück of September 24, 1528. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2493.

5) On September 24, 1525, Luther sends a "copy of the answer" to Brück. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2494 § 4.

6) Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 2716.

7) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2476.

8) Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XIX, Appendix, No. 14.

9) Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1115, § 3.

10) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2478.

11) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2493.

Carlstadt said that he had let "a booklet without a name" go out for years, and that the Elector "should not trust him anymore". In the aforementioned letter to Schwenkfeld and Krautwald, Carlstadt himself says that he has written "a book about the disunity of the Lutherans" and that he intends to write "a booklet about the unity of all of us. In the latter writing, it was probably intended to provide proof against Luther's reproach that they give the most diverse interpretations to the words of institution, that they are all united in denying the true presence of the body and blood of Christ. Carlstadt's letter to Brück of August 12 was accompanied by a supplement to the Elector, in which, as we can see from the letter to Brück, he expresses the request: "if I ever have to leave His C. F. G. lands again [I have no doubt at all, S. C. F. G. will show me mercy, grant me time and space, and also provide me with gracious leave by letter,... so that I may look around for services with the knowledge and grace of H. C. F. G., provide for my poor children, of whom I have three, make money out of mine and bring in what I have outstanding debts. "If, however, your C. F. G. could tolerate and suffer me in this faith and confession 1) in her principality, and would favor me with a service or with quite a bit of food, I would gladly serve your C. F. G. before all princes and lords especially and faithfully and thank your C. F. G. eternally." As Brück wrote to Lutheri in the middle of September 1528 on behalf of the Elector, the Elector had sensed so much from Carlstadt's Supplication, "that Carlstadt has forgotten the fear he received from the next peasant outrage and has become somewhat bold that he might be accepted elsewhere, and will perhaps know [wyrdet], 3) for which reason he is also asking for a farewell, as you can see. Now the Elector requested Luther's counsel, which was to be done with

1) Namely, in the confession he had made in this letter to Brück, by which he retracted his earlier retraction.

2) This letter is found in Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 143 f.

3) I.e. Carlstadt may perhaps have conditions that he will be accepted elsewhere.

Carlstadt should be made. Luther replied, 4) some thought that he should be held as D. Jakob Strauß was held in Weimar, that is, that he should be imprisoned, but he said: "the man is so despondent against the seriousness that I worry that he might despair if he were to be imprisoned in this way. Therefore, he advises "to take him again into the previous silence and vow and not to let him leave the country. This advice, which Luther gave on September 24, 1528, was not carried out, but Carlstadt escaped from Saxony. We do not know the exact time of his escape; Walch says in the old edition, introduction to the 19th volume, p. 22, § 19, that Carlstadt secretly left Saxony towards the end of the year 1528. First we hear of him again from Holstein, where through Melchior Hofmann, the furrier, a strong fanatical party had been formed, which Carlstadt hurried to help. But the glory did not last long. Already on April 8, 1529, Carlstadt was gone, 5) because the party had been overthrown. As Luther wrote to Jonas 6) on April 14, 1529, the Duke of Holstein had summoned D. Bugenhagen to argue with Carlstadt. Either on May 6 or on June 15 7) we find him in Friesland, where fierce disputes were going on between the Lutherans and Zwinglians. With the latter, there were also many Anabaptist fanatical elements, which found a free place there. Although Carlstadt had called his wife to him in glorious and congratulatory letters, another letter had already arrived from Carlstadt before July 10, 1529 8) in which he (but not too humbly [*semihumilis*]) asked for the

4) Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, 2496, § 8. - About Strauß compare the introduction to No. 132 of the 19th volume of the St. Louis edition, p. 47 f.

5) Krohn, Geschichte der fanatischen Wiedertäufer, p. 147.

6) Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1158, § 2.

7) In two different letters to Jonas, what concerns Carlstadt is told in the same words. It is certainly inserted in one of these letters. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1162 and 1169. The latter letter asked Walch for the wrong date: "June 25". Cf. De Wette, vol. III, p. 470.

8) Cf. Luther's letter to Amsdorf of this date. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1173, § 2.

mercy to be allowed to return. This request was, of He fled to Zurich during the Second War with the Catholic course, refused. 1) On August 19, 1529, he wrote to the Cantons. Only in 1534 he came to rest; in this year he was Landgrave Philip of Hesse and requested admission to employed as a preacher at St. Peter's and professor of the Marburg discussion. The latter made it dependent on theology at Basel. 6) There he remained quiet and died the consent of the Wittenberg theologians, which was not there in 1541 as an ordinary Zwinglian.

forthcoming. Carlstadt became bitter about this and wrote Two Strasbourg theologians publicly spoke out about an outrageously insolent and slanderous letter against the sacramental controversy aroused by Carlstadt in such Luther to Oecolampad, 2) in which he complains about a way that they agreed with Carlstadt in the matter of the his exclusion from the Marburg discussion and recounts Lord's Supper, regarded the controversy as something his escape from Saxony, claiming, among other things, minor, and rebuked Carlstadt only because he had started that the Wittenbergers had wanted to force him to write a verbal dispute about such minor external matters. against Oecolampad and Zwingli. Oecolampad, who However, they decisively rejected his stormy approach to believed him completely, communicated the main the innovations, especially Bucer. In the late year of 1524 content of this letter to Zwingli on January 15, 1530. 7) Wolfgang Fabricius Capito (probably at Strasbourg) Luther had also learned of Carlstadt's slanderous letters sent out the writing: "What one should think and answer about the split between Martin Luther and Andreas and wrote to Cordatus on February 10, 1530: 3) Carlstadt." (No. 9 in this volume.) He was prompted to do him alive, 4) by accusing me and the rest of us so (according to § 15 of this writing) by the fact that the everywhere in diabolical (infernalibus) letters." In the people of Strasbourg were "moved and restless" because beginning of 1530 Carlstadt had to leave Friesland, of Carlstadt's coming. In the same year, dated December because he was threatened with imprisonment, because 26, 1524, Martin Bucer wrote: "Reason and Cause from Count Enno II of Friesland began to intervene against the Divine Scripture of the Innovations to the Lord's Supper, sects. 5) After a short stay in Strasbourg, he turned to so called the Mass 2c., made at Strasbourg, written in his Switzerland, where, on Bucer's recommendation, Zwingli and his colleagues' name, together with a letter to Count in particular took care of him, and arrived in Basel with Palatine Frederick" (No. 10 in this volume). Place and his wife and children around May 22. Around the middle time is not indicated in the single edition. of July he received a position in Zurich as a deacon at the hospital. Already in the summer of 1531 they tried to get rid of him there, because his Saxon dialect disturbed the Zurich people. After many vain attempts to re-home him, because of the prejudices against him everywhere, he finally succeeded in obtaining the pastorate at Altstätten in the Rhine valley, but he had to leave there already in 1532, after the end of the

II. Controversial writings of Luther and his followers against Zwingli and others who denied the true presence of Christ in Holy Communion.

a. Zwingli's dispute with Bugenhagen.

Carlstadt soon found many comrades in the fight against the doctrine of the true presence of Christ in Holy Communion.

1) Cf. Luther's letter of July 17 (not 18), 1529, to Chancellor Baier. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 289.

2) Jäger, 1. S. 501.

3) De Wette, Vol. III, p. 549.

4) These words also testify to the fact that Carlstadt found an asylum in Luther's house. Cf. p. 24 of this introduction.

5) Jäger, 1. 6. p. 502 f.

6) Compare also Luther's conversation with Wolfhard and Bucer at Gotha on March 1, 1537. Tischreden, Cap. 19, § 42. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 586 ff.

7) For this timing, see the note to the caption of No. 9.

Independently of Carlstadt, and earlier than him, the Swiss Ulrich Zwingli had come to the conviction that in the Lord's Supper only bread and wine were distributed and received, and that the Lord's Supper was only a meal which the Lord had instituted in order to commemorate his death. "Hulderich Zwingel", that is how he used to write his name, was born on January 1, 1484 in Wildhaus, a village in the Canton of St. Gallen, studied in Bern, Vienna and Basel and became a preacher in Glarus in 1506. 1) In 1516 he worked at the place of pilgrimage Maria Einsiedel and in 1519, when he began to administer his office as lieutenant priest (that is, vicar of the collegiate clergy) at the great cathedral in Zurich, he stood up in serious polemical sermons on the content of the entire Holy Scripture against the prevailing abuses in the church, especially moved to do so by the insolence of the indulgence monger Bernhardin Samson. As a result, the Zurich City Council ordered the preachers as early as 1520 to teach the Word of God purely according to the Holy Scriptures and to keep silent about all the statutes of men; indeed, after a solemn disputation held before many witnesses on January 29, 1523, 2) the Council forbade the preachers to present anything that they could not explain with Holy Scripture, under heavy penalty. But Zwingli himself did not remain within the bounds of sacred Scripture as a humble student of it, but rationalizing as he was designed to do, 3) he adjusted the teachings according to his own school of thought and then sought to force Scripture to his opinion, as in other teachings, so especially in the doctrine of Holy Communion. As he did with the holy Scriptures, so he did with the writings of his opponents, reshaping them to his own liking and then fighting their teachings as gross error. 4) Stubborn and unapproachable for instruction from the Word of God, he insisted on his preconceived opinions and defended them most stubbornly. His reformation was also not a purely ecclesiastical one,

- 1) Guericke, Kirchengeschichte (7th edition), Vol. III, p. 119 ff.
- 2) For more information, see note Col. 441 f.
- 3) Compare Luther's Table Talks, Cap. 22, § 3. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XXII, 631 f.
- 4) Cf. Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 102.

but also extended to the political sphere. In particular, he incited the war against the Catholic cantons, went to war himself, and was slain in the battle of Kappel on October 11, 1531. His body fell into the hands of the enemy, was quartered and burned. 5)

Luther will probably be right in his statement (Table Talks, Cap. 22, § 3) that Zwingli believed throughout his life that Christ in the Lord's Supper was only spiritual, for Zwingli himself says: 6) "I saw that the words 'This is my body' were spoken in a veiled way, but I did not see which word actually contained the veiling: 'This is my body,' were spoken in a foggy way, but in which word the fogging actually was, I did not see." So he was not able to find even an apparent reason for his opinion from the Scriptures. "The beautiful pearl, that this is to be explained by means of this," he found in a letter, which Cornelius van Hon, a Dutch jurist, had sent to Luther in the summer of 1522, 7) which Zwingli got to see the following winter. Therefore, he hesitated for a long time to go public with his teaching, and Carlstadt beat him to it. He fully agreed with Carlstadt's doctrine that only bread and wine were in the Holy Communion, but he did not consider its justification from the Holy Scriptures to be sufficient. Zwingli first presented his doctrine in a letter to Matthäus Alber, pastor in Reutlingen, dated November 16, 1524. 8) This letter was not intended for printing, but came with Zwingli's knowledge and will into many hands, over 500. 9) But in detail

- 5) Zwingli's writings, edited by Oualer, published in Zurich in 4, folio volumes, 1544 and 1545; further in 1581 and more recently (1t28 and following years) in 11 volumes by M. Schüller and I. Schultheß.

- 6) Col. 509, § 4 in No. 13 of this volume. See also Col. 1182, § 86.

- 7) See the note to § 4 in No. 13 of this volume, Col. 509.

- 8) This letter is found in Walch, old edition, Vol. X V, 1880 ff.

- 9) Cf. Col. 496 in this volume, § 53; also Col. 507, 8 3. From the latter passage it is evident that this letter had already been printed before October 1525. Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 75 says that the letter was already printed by Zwingli in March 1525, at the same time as his Commentary "von der wahren und falschen Religion".

he set forth his view in his *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione*, which went out in mid-March 1525, and in it he called the Lutheran doctrine "not only a coarse (rusticam), but also godless and silly (frivolam) opinion". The passages in this writing that refer to the Holy Supper, along with those from Zwingli's book *Antibulon* written against Emser, were "hurriedly brought into German" by three unnamed persons, and the resulting book was already sold in April 1525 at the fair in Frankfurt am Main under the title: 1) "Ulrich Zwingli's Meinung von dem Nachtmahl Christi, Wiedergedächtnisniß oder Danksagung" 2c. (No. 11 in this volume.) In reference to this writing, D. Johann Heß, pastor in Breslau, through D. Ambrosius Moiban, pastor there, to D. Johann Bugenhagen, that he should briefly indicate what one should say in response to the new errors that are now being raised against the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. His request was granted by Johann Bugenhagen's epistle against the new errors in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ (No. 12 in this volume), which went out about September 1525 in both Latin and German. 2) Bugenhagen says that there is no better and more certain way to answer this than with the simple text and words in Scripture, which the masters and perpetrators of such error tear apart and tear apart pitifully. This he did quite briefly and in an excellent, striking manner. On October 23, 1525, Ulrich Zwingli replied to Johann Bugenhagen's letter (No. 13 in this volume) in Latin, which was translated into German in the same year. In this letter, he complained that his teaching had been called an error, and a new one at that, because this doctrine of the Lord's Supper was not new, but Christ, the apostles, and the earliest Christians had not taught it.

1) The complete and exact indication of this title can be found in the note to the title of No. 11.

2) The Latin title is given in the note to the caption of No. 12.

held in this way. His answer against Bugenhagen is extremely powerless, because his counter-arguments are not only based on a false interpretation of clear testimonies of the holy scripture, especially the words of Paul 1 Cor. 10, 16, but also on an obvious distortion of Bugenhagen's words. 3) In von der Hardt, *Autograph*. Luther, tom. III, p. 141, another writing is mentioned, which is directed against Bugenhagen and has the title: "Answer to the highly respected D. Joh. Bugenhagen from Pomerania, shepherd at Wittenberg, to the missive, so he sent to the highly respected D. Hessium, teacher at Breslau, concerning the Sacrament, made by Conrad Reichen at Ofen."

b. Luther's dispute with Oekolampad and Zwingli.

At the same time that Bugenhagen testified against Zwingli, Johann Oekolampad publicly joined the ranks of the Sacramentarians. 4) His name was actually Hausschein and he was born in 1482 at Weinsberg in Swabia; he studied in Heilbronn, Heidelberg and Bologna and was then a preacher in his hometown for six months. He then went to Tübingen, where he became friends with Melancthon, then to Stuttgart for Reuchlin's sake, and finally back to Heidelberg, where he made contact with Brenz and Capito. Now he followed an episcopal call to Basel, where he met Erasmus, became a licentiate there on October 31, 1516, and a doctor of theology in 1518. In the same year we meet him as a preacher in Augsburg; in 1520 he entered the Brigitten Monastery Altmünster there, but left it in 1522, went to Franz von Sickingen and finally (still in 1522) settled permanently in Basel, where he was employed as a pastor in 1525 5) and died there on November 24, 1531. About the cause of his death, Luther says in his "brief confession of the holy

3) Compare the note to § 15 of No. 13 in this volume, Col. 515.

4) "Sacramentarians" was the name given to those who denied and fought against the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion.

5) Thus Guericke, *Kirchengeschichte* (7th edition), Vol. III. There is a document from the year 1526: "Bestallung Herrn D. J. Oekolampadnii zu Verkündigung des h. Evangelii in der Kirche zu St. Martin."

sacrament against the enthusiasts" (No. 47 in this volume, § 5): "Meanwhile the Zwingli was killed in the field by that part of the papists [October 11, 1531], and Oecolampad, far too weak to bear such an accident, also died of grief over it."

Initially, Oecolampad proclaimed the correct doctrine of Holy Communion, as evidenced by his Sermon on the Sacrament of the Altar (**No. 4** in the appendix of this volume), which he delivered during his stay in Augsburg in 1521; later, however, this highly gifted and very learned man turned to Zwingli's error, about which Luther was heartily grieved. 1) In the opinion that in the Lord's Supper there is only bread and wine, he was in agreement with Zwingli, but in the justification of the same he deviated from him, in that the interpretation of the "is" in "means" did not seem tenable to him; instead he explained "body" by "sign of the body. At the beginning of 1525 he began to preach his false doctrine, and in the course of the year he wrote his book *De genuina verborum Domini, Hoc est corpus meum, expositione*, 2) to which he added a letter to the Swabian preachers (**No. 5** in the appendix of this volume). He sent both to the Swabian preachers before October 1525. In the book he tries to prove from the church fathers that his doctrine is the doctrine of the old church, and to provide proof that the words of institution must be taken figuratively. In his letter, he calls the doctrine of the true presence of the body and blood a "highly dangerous superstition"; out of love for the truth, for the honor of God, he had to "hoe the field, lest the field become full of weeds. In the most urgent way he exhorts them to love and warns them not to cause discord (for the sake of the doctrine he presents). But the Swabian preachers would not and could not remain silent about Oecolampad's erroneous doctrine, even though Bucer also wrote to Brenz and other Swabian preachers.

Brenz wrote to Bucer asking him to keep peace with Oecolampad and not to write against him. Brenz wrote to Bucer on October 3, 1525: 3) "You declare war on us and forbid us the rights of war, ... the fire which you have set is burning; now you forbid that we should not run to extinguish the fire, or for that matter that we should not let ourselves think that it is a conflagration." "We, some brethren, have been assembled these (*iis*) days in [Swabian] Hall, and have discussed what we thought of the Sacrament, or the bread of the Lord's Supper. 4) We will answer Oecolampad with writings, giving an account of our faith." As we can see from this letter 5), about the end of September 1525, a number of preachers (fourteen are named) met in Schwäbisch-Hall to examine Oecolampad's book and to discuss the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Brenz was instructed by the preachers to put the result of their discussion in writing; 6) they would

3) This letter is found in Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1952.

4) Here Brenz already speaks of the meeting of the preachers in Schwäbisch-Hall as something past. If the date of the letter just mentioned (October 3) is correct, as it is also found in Pfaff: *Acta st. eripta secāskias* *^VirtsmdsrKieas*, p. 203, then Seckendorf's statement, Rist. Dtd., lid. II, p. 35s, (1): "d. 12. east." must be erroneous. This seems to us to be a misprint, arising from the date which the title of the *Syngamma* bears: "die 21. Oel." Cf. Pfaff, l. c., Appendix, eap. I, p. 3. Also in Kawerau, "Agricola," p. 87, we find, probably after Seckendorf, the indication "on October 12, 1525."

5) This letter was printed without Brenz knowing about it and appeared under the title: *Lpistola äo. Drsntii äs Verdis Domini: Dos 68t 60rpu8 IN6UIN, ornionein onorunāain äe 6uodari8tia reiellens*, without specifying place and time. In contrast, Bucer let go out in his defense: *^poloZia, Huaüdsi [nae atYN6 äoetrinas eiroa Odristi eosnam, ouam tnin ix>86, trnn slii eoelesiastas ^rA6ntoraten868 pröutentnr, rationein sim^l Leiter rsääit at^us contra äentern dspsltd, ynae inipsnin spLstoia Huaääam lo. Lrentii, 666l68ia8ta6 Halsn sis, LnssLo, nt ersditur, anotors sdita, errinnina Lntsndit. 1526* In this writing Bucer joins the deniers of the real presence of Christ and wants to know of no other than spiritual food.

6) Brenz himself reports this in his *DssoZnito dostrinss äs vsra majs8tat6 Odrisii*, which he had issued against Bullinger. In his works, lom. VIII, p. 1003. It is therefore not doubtful, as has been stated many times, but certain that Brenz is the author of the *Syngamma*.

1) Cf. Luther's letter to Hausmann of Sept. 13, 1526. Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1919.

2) This writing is found in *^cta 6t scripta puddcs, soelssias IVirtsmdsrAieas, rso. 0. M. DlaKus. dinZas 1719. dsZ. 41-150.*

send this to Oecolampad by a special messenger. Because Brenz had been Oecolampad's disciple, he would have liked to avoid this task, but he finally had to give in to their urging and composed the so-called *Syngramma Suevicum* or of the preachers assembled at Schwäbisch-Hall, Schrift wider Oecolampadius (No. 14 in this volume), which is dated October 21, 1525. It was originally written in Latin and, although it was not originally intended for publication, was first submitted to print in 1525 without the knowledge and will of the Swabian preachers. Then several editions soon followed. 1) In 1526, two different translations of the Syngramma were made. One is by an unknown author, 2) the other by M. Johann Agricola. It is probably the former that was included in Walch's old edition, because Walch says in reference to it (Introduction to the 19th volume, p. 36): "I have a German translation" 2c., but of the other: "but I also know of another, which Johann Agricola made anew". The translation of the Syngramma in Walch's old edition is the worst that we have come across. According to the external volume, it offers little more than half of the Latin original. From B. § 27 (Col. 693 of the old edition of Walch) is written in; on the other hand, in other places much is omitted, e.g. in § 32, § 35, § 47 2c., so that it is hardly recognizable that this should be a translation of the Latin. Only here and there is a single sentence torn out of the Latin and rendered quite inadequately. In the Latin, § 35 takes up three whole quarto pages; in the translation, only one column. The unfavorable remarks about the Syngramma, which one encounters here and there, are undoubtedly largely due to this wretched translation, whereas in the

1) About the different editions compare the note to the caption of No. 14.

2) Seckendorf, nist. I'utii, lid. II, p. 35a, names Bugenhagen as the translator, others (Pfaff, Leta et sorixta xudlio eoolasiasAnhang

eap. I, x. 4) the Justus Jonas. Neither of these two statements seems credible to us because of the incredibly poor quality of this translation.

Luther's verdict, 3) that it is "excellent, detailed and written in a learned manner" against Oecolampad and Zwingli, was passed on the Latin Syngramma. We do not believe that Luther read through and examined the translation; if he had done so, he would hardly have adorned it with his preface. Luther liked the Syngramma so much that he was willing to translate it himself; however, this was not done because Agricola, driven by the Mausfeld Chancellor Johann Thür, 4) had completed his translation. Luther's preface to the first German edition of the Syngramma, about the second quarter of 1526, 5) (No. 15 in this volume) precedes Agricola's translation, as Luther himself states in this preface. The words that Agricola put on the title of his edition: "von neuem durch Johannem Agricolam verdeutscht", 6) could raise doubts as to whether this edition is really the first; but this is alleviated by the fact that Luther says in the other preface, which is found before our translation in No. 14 of this volume: "I have now helped to translate the fine little book Syngramma into German for the second time. In the Syngramma itself, it is asserted how little consistent reason the opponents would be able to muster for the denial of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Communion, because none of them would agree with the others in their reasoning; Carlstadt sought to support his opinion with the "Tuto", Zwingli by reversing the "is" into "means", Oecolam-

3) In Luther's letters to Agricola of February 18, 1526. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 998 and (duplicate) Col. 1198.

4) Kawerau, Agricola, p. 87.

5) For this approximate timing, we rely on the following: On February 18, 1526, Luther brought the Syngramma to the attention of Agricola (De Wette III, 93). Around August, Oecolampad's answer to Luther's preface already appeared. Shortly before the middle of July, Agricola left with the Elector for the Imperial Diet in Speyer and remained there until the end of August (Kawerau, Agricola, pp. 80 and 88). Therefore, we must assume that Agricola completed his translation before July, and that Luther had already written the preface to it, even that it had already gone out in print.

6) How these words are actually to be understood, we do not know.

pad by explaining the word "body" as "sign of the body". In order to be able to oppose the Lutheran doctrine with some semblance, they mixed it with the papal one. The reasons they put forward are treated in detail and emphatically refuted in the Syngramma. We refrain from a further description of the contents of this writing, because we offer it in a new translation, which faithfully reproduces the original. The reproach that has been raised against the Syngramma by the Reformed side, that in it the teaching of the Reformed Church after Calvin's time is presented, deserves no refutation.

Luther was drawn into the sacramental controversy by his preface to the Syngramma. Oecolampad was very unhappy with the writing of the Swabian preachers and before the end of 1525 1) had a Latin book published against it under the title *Antisyngramma*, which Luther already mentions in his first preface to the German Syngramma. In 1526, however, Johann Oecolampad's answer to Luther's preface, together with a short answer to the Syngramma of the preachers in Swabia (No. 16 in this volume), appeared in German (around August). Stubbornly and bitterly he defends his opinion in both writings and is not afraid to say (in both writings): "The devil turns truth into a lie and makes the body out of the sign. About Luther he says (No. 16, § 56): "the right true spirit of God has left Luther at this time".

The Swabian preachers gave Oecolampad no answer to his writings, for in the meantime other men, namely Theobald Billicanus (actually Gerlach), preacher at Nördlingen, Wilibald Pirkheimer 2) at Nuremberg, and even Luther himself, had entered the battlefield to defend the right doctrine. The former gave in the

In 1525, he wrote a letter to Urban Rhegius under the title *Epistola de verbis coenae Domini et opinionum varietate*, in which he rejected and refuted the opinions of the Sacramentarians, Carlstadt, Zwingli and Oecolampad, and insisted that one must remain with the words of the institution of Christ in their simple sense. Urban Rhegius, who was then a preacher in Augsburg, replied in the same vein on December 18, 1525. Both letters 3) together were published in 1526 under the title: *De verbis coenae dominicae et opinionum varietate, Theobaldi Billicani ad Urbanum Rhegium epistola. Responsio Urbani Rhegii ad eundem. Pirkheimer, however, published at Nuremberg in 1526: Responsio de vera Christi carne et vero ejus sanguine ad Joannem Oecolampadium*, in which he reviews and refutes the same writing of Oecolampad, which had also given the Swabian preachers the occasion for their Syngramma. On the other hand, Oecolampad's responsibility against Theobald Billicanus appeared on February 1, 1526 (No. 17 in this volume), in which he endeavors to prove from the evangelists that the words of Christ's institution are to be understood in a vague way, also appeals to the analogy of the paschal lamb, and asserts that the bread in the Lord's Supper is in the same way a sign or memorial meal. Zwingli also sent out a reply against Billican and Rhegius in Zurich in 1526 under the title: *Responsio ad Theobaldi Billicani et Urbani Rhegii epistolas*.

Although Oecolampad often used the harshest expressions against his opponents in his writings, 4) "calling Luther's God the roasted and baked God and calling him together with his followers God-eaters and God-blood-drinkers", he was nevertheless of the opinion that the unity of the church should not be divided because of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In this sense, Oecolampad's two sermons on the worthiness of the Lord's Supper (No. 18 in

1) Thus Seckendorf, nist. I^{ut}U., lib. II, x. 35, (2). - Pfaff, betast serixta etc., appendix, x. 10, and after him Walch, Einleitung zum 20. Bande, p. 42, give the year 1526.

2) His writing has the title: *Liliir. LirlrUeirmsri üe vera EUristi earne et vero sjus sun^uine a<l .1. Deeolanaxaäiuna respousio. XonmU. 1526. 8.*

3) They can be found in Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1922 and 1945.

4) Pfaff, Vota et scriptn pnUl. eeel. VirtenaliierAnnex, x>. 12.

The first of these sermons seeks to prove that the celebration of Holy Communion is not so much about the real presence of the body and blood of Christ as it is about the remembrance of Christ's suffering. In the other sermon, he endeavors to defend the Swiss against the accusation that they have a Jewish nature about them and that there is less right worship in their congregations than among the Jews.

The aforementioned writing of Pirkheimer was answered by Oecolampad in his *Responsio de re eucharistiae*, Zurich 1526, in which he attacked the right doctrine of Holy Communion with harsh words. Pirkheimer countered this reply in 1527 with his *ecunda responsio ad Oecolampadium*, whereupon Oecolampad had a rebuttal printed in the same year under the title: *Ad Bilibaldum Pirkhaimerum de eucha*

Joannis Husschin [Hauschein], cui ab aequalibus a prima adolescentia Oecolampadio nomen obvenit, responsio posterior.

It is noteworthy that Erasmus was also somewhat drawn into this sacramental controversy. Conrad Pellicanus, professor of the Hebrew language in Zurich, had become acquainted with Erasmus in Basel and, when asked by his friends, said that he did not allow any other use of the body and blood than the spiritual. As soon as Erasmus learned this, he complained in several letters to Pellicanus that he was being blasted as if he were like Carlstadt and believed that only bread and wine were present in the Lord's Supper. Pellicanus based his statement on the writings of Erasmus, in which at least the spiritual use of the Lord's Supper was insisted upon. These events occurred in 1526, and shortly thereafter, still in 1526, Leo Judä, preacher at Zurich, published the following paper in German under the assumed name of Ludwig Leopold 1): "Erasmi und Mart. Lutheri Meinung vom Nachtmahl unsers HERRN JESU Christi," in which he asserted that both, before they had been

Luther did not care about this unfounded attack, but Erasmus responded vehemently in Latin: *Erasmi Roterodami detectio praestigiarum cujusdam libelli Germanicum*. Luther did not care about this unfounded attack, but Erasmus answered fiercely in a Latin writing: *Erasmi Roterodami detectio praestigiarum cujusdam libelli Germanice scripti, ficto auctoris titulo, cum hac inscriptione: Erasmi et Lutheri opiniones de coena Domini*, Basel 1526. Leo Judä defended himself against this in a rebuttal. 2)

Zwingli's efforts to gain acceptance for his doctrine in Nuremberg also form an episode in this dispute. He had written to the council to come himself, and also sent letters to Andreas Osiander and his colleagues to win them over; but in vain, for the Nuremberg preachers publicly testified against him in sermons. Upset about this, Zwingli sent a fierce letter to Osiander in May 1527, in which he says: 3) it is incomprehensible how a true Christian and theologian can still value "carnal eating"; this is a relapse into unevangelical nature, which will again lead to the "greatest godlessness". Boastfully he says: "Not three years will pass until Italy, France, Spain, Germany will take our side." Osiander had this letter printed at Nuremberg in 1527, together with his answer to it, under the title: *Epistolae duae, una Huldrichi Zuinglii ad Andream Osiandrum, qua cum eo expostulat, quod novum illud de eucharistia dogma hactenus rejecerit ac temere impugnarit. Altera Andr. Osiandri ad eundem Huldrichum Zuinglium apologetica, qua docet, quid, quam ob causam rejecerit, quodque posthac ab eo in illa causa expectandum sit*. Brenz and almost at the same time, namely in October 1525, the Strasbourg preachers Bucer, Capito and others also addressed the request to Luther that he should not disturb the peace for the sake of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper; each part should give the other its conviction.

2) Hottingers *helvetische Kirchengeschichte*, Theil III, p. 294 f.

3) Köstlin, *Martin Luther*, Vol. II, p. 102.

1) Luther mentions this Leopold in his letter to the printers Secerius and Herwagen of September 13, 1526. Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1963, § 3.

and refrain from scolding and condemning. Their principle was to inculcate in their people not what the sacraments were, but what they were for, and to keep away from them the musings and torments about the "breeding" of Christ. 1) They brought this request orally to him through Georg Casel (also Casse!, Chaselius), Lector of the Hebrew language. Luther answered in writing on November 5 and also orally through Casel: 2) he desires peace, he had not initiated the matter at first, but Zwingli and Oecolampad had worried the minds through the books published by them. Should Luther remain silent, he would also have to give up the ministry of the word and pastoral care. One should not revile, however; but if one rejects their cause or speaks against it, this is called reviling. They boast of their moderation, and yet in their books they call the Lutherans carnivores, worshippers of a gluttonous (esculsntum) and roasted God, and deniers of the redemption that took place on the cross, while they cannot bear it to be said of them that they err. Their advice (consilium) that the faithful should be diverted from the question of the presence of the body and blood and driven to the word and faith alone is not valid, because word and faith without the thing on which they are based do not exist. The words themselves also hold the doctrine that the body and the blood are there. The people could not be kept from this question (about the true presence) after so many books had been spread. They themselves should have kept silent; now it is missed, 3) and too late now one demands silence.

Soon thereafter, namely on January 4, 1526, Luther addressed a letter of exhortation to the Christians of Reutlingen, 4) in which he warns them against the error of the Sacramentarians and

urges to remain firm in the right doctrine of Holy Communion.

In the same year 1526 Justus Jonas translated Luther's writing "Vom Anbeten des Sacraments des heiligen Leichnams JEsu Christi an die Brüder in Böhmen und Mähren, Waldenses genannt" 5) into Latin. It was published in Wittenberg under the title: *Libellus D. Martini Lutheri de sacramento eucharistiae ad Waldenses fratres e Germanico translatus per Justum Jonam*. This was done, as we see from the letter to Johann Rühel, Mansseldischen Rath, in order to reject the reproach of the Zwinglians, as if Luther had been of their opinion before the outbreak of the Sacrament controversy.

According to Luther's preface to the *Syngramma der schwäbischen Prediger* (*Syngramma of the Swabian Preachers*), his first counter-writing against the sacramentists was "Luther's Sermon on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ against the Swarm Spirits", 1526 (No. 19 in this volume). In this writing, he refutes in the first part the two main reasons of the sacrament enthusiasts, namely, first: the true presence of the body and blood of Christ does not rhyme with reason, and second: the same is also not necessary. To the first he replies that many things, both in the realm of nature and in the realm of grace, are incomprehensible to reason and, according to its judgment, inconsistent; reason, however, must yield to faith and give itself up to the word of God. He rejects the other reason by accusing his opponents of wanting to master God and dictate to him how he should arrange his affairs. If this were true, one could also overthrow baptism and all means of grace. Luther summarizes this in the short words: "Only see that you pay attention to God's word and remain in it like a child in the cradle. If you let this go for a moment, then you have fallen away. And with this alone the devil deals, that he may pluck out men and bring them to measure God's will and work with reason." The second part of the scripture is about how to use the sacrament properly,

1) Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 85.

2) Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1906.

3) In the German Redaction, De Wette, Vol. III, p. 47: "verbeitet" i.e. waited too long, missed. De Wette puts as a conjecture in the margin: "spread", but erroneously, because "betten" means "wait".

4) The same is found in Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1913.

5) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XIX, 1308 ff.

in order to be assured of the forgiveness of sins; in the third part he teaches about confession. For the rest, we refer the reader to the scripture itself. This sermon was translated into Latin by Vincentius Obsopöus and published in Hagenau in 1527 under the title: *Martini Lutheri sermo elegantissimus super sacramento corporis et sanguinis Christi, in quo respondetur obiter et ejusdem sacramenti calumniatoribus*. This translation is included in the Latin Wittenberg edition, *Dom. VII, coi. 334d*.

On the other hand, Ulrich Zwingli's writing, opposed to Luther's sermon against the enthusiasts 1) (**No. 22** in this volume), which he had completed on March 30, 1527, was published.

In the meantime, the Strasbourgs, who until then had tried to take a more mediating position, had openly taken the side of the Sacramentarians. Bugenhagen had published his explanation of the Psalter, *Interpretatio in librum psalmodum, Witebergae publice lecta*, in 1524, and Bucer translated it into German in 1526 2), but in the interpretation of the 111th Psalm, instead of Bugenhagen's Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, he inserted his Zwinglian opinion. Bugenhagen gave evidence against this forgery in the same year by his writing: *Oratio Johannis Bugenagii Pomerani, quod ipsius non sit opinio illa de eucharistia, quae in psalterio, sub nomine ejus Germanice translato, legitur. Wittenbergae 1526*, which he dedicated to his two friends Spalatin and Agricola and asked them to defend him against the suspicion that he had become a sacramentarian during their stay in Speyer (where they were at that time because of the Imperial Diet). Bucer answered to this in a writing: 3) *Satisfactio de veritate psalterii ad Pomeranum*. Just as with Bugenhagen's Psalter, Bucer proceeded with Luther's church postilion, which he, as far as

The translation, which was published in Strasbourg in five parts, was entitled *Narratione* in six parts. This translation, which was published in Strasbourg in five parts, had the title: *Narratione* in six parts. He wrote a preface to the fourth part and also made comments on the text in which he expressed his Zwinglian error. Luther became very indignant about this and wrote on September 13, 1526 (not 1527, as De Wette, Vol. III, p. 201) 4) an angry letter to the printers Johann Secerius in Basel and (unchanged from the same letter) Herwagen in Strasbourg, in which he complains that the poison of the Sacramentarians has been mixed into his writings, testifies that the heretical Sacramentarians mock Christ, and demands that, if the fourth volume should be printed again, this letter of his be included in it, as a testimony that he does not hold with the Sacramentarians, and as an antidote to Bucer's preface. Bucer also answered for this letter in a special writing: 5) *Epistola M. Lutheri ad Joann. Hervagium, superiora, [namely Bucer's preface printed together with it, etc.] criminans: Responsio ad hanc M. Buceri*, which is dated "March 29, 1527".

In quick succession, Zwingli issued a number of writings in which he sought to preserve his opinion of the Lord's Supper and to refute the teachings of Luther, whom he referred to by name. In 1526, the following was published in Zurich: "A Clear Instruction on the Supper of Christ, by Huldreich Zwingli, in German, as never before, for the sake of the simple, so that they may not be deceived by anyone's sophistry. b) Likewise: *Responsio brevis ad epistolam satis longam amici cujusdam haud vulgaris, in qua de eucharistia quaestio tractatur*; 7) furthermore a German "letter to the city of Esslingen", by which he tried to win the city for himself. In this letter he describes his opponents

1) The exact title of this paper is given in the note to the superscription of No. 22.

2) This translation appeared, as Seckendorf, *Hist. D-utk.*, iid. II, p. 82, (3), at Basel.

3) The same is German in the old edition of Walch, Vol. XVI I, 1994 ff. In Col. 2007 only the date "der 25. Martii" is given, but the year 1527 is omitted.

4) Walch, vol. XVII, 1962, has the correct date. Herwagen received the original. Cf. Walch, *ibid*, Col. 1984 f., § 34.

5) German by Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1967, 6) *Huinclii Opera*, Dorn. II, 272.

7) *IdM.*, Dorn. II, 319.

as furious people who wanted to be all alone and were worse than the pope. Zwingli's main writing, however, appeared in Zurich in March of 1527, 1) namely: *Amica exegesis, id est, expositio eucharistiae negotii ad Martinum Lutherum*, 1) in which he endeavored to destroy in one fell swoop everything that Luther and his followers had published in the sacramental matter. This writing is directed against Luther's letters to Secerius and Herwagen, to the Strassburgers and to the Reutlingers; against Luther's writings against the heavenly prophets, and of the worship of the Sacrament to the Waldenses; against Luther's sermon on the Sacrament against the enthusiasts and the syngamma of the Swabian preachers; after that, however, he seeks to prove that the words of institution must be explained figuratively.

Almost at the same time as Zwingli's book mentioned above, around April 1527, 3) Luther's writing appeared: *Daß diese Worte Christi, "das ist mein Leib" u. s. w., noch fest stehen gegen die Schwärmgeister* (No. 20 in this volume), on which he had worked from January to the end of March. In the face of his opponents' rationalities, he asserts that the Holy Scripture must be and remain empress, and that one should hold fast to the dry, bright words that stand there: "Eat, this is my body," and scourges his adversaries with righteous derision because of their wanton denial and wicked blasphemy, which they commit because they punish the Holy Spirit in his words. "One part," says Luther, "must be the devil's enemy and God's enemy. There is no remedy." "He who punishes and blasphemes God in one word, or says that it is a small thing that he is blasphemed and blasphemed, blasphemes the whole of God, and despises all blasphemy against God." If it should be valid in such a way to take away the simple mind of Christ's saying, and to

By changing the word "is" into "dentet", as Zwingli writes, and by interpreting the word "my body" into "meius Leibes Zeichen", as Oecolampad writes, the one who denied that God created heaven and earth, and claimed that the world was eternal, would make use of the same knotting against the text: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth" and "make the text thus: 'GOD,' which should mean as much as 'cuckoo'; 'created,' however, as much as 'ate'; 'heaven and earth' as much as 'the warbler with feathers and with everything.'" "Who ever read in Scripture that 'body' should mean as much as 'body's sign,' and 'is' should mean as much as 'interprets'? Yes, what language in all the world has ever spoken so? It is only the arrogance and idle malice of the wretched devil, who mocks us by such enthusiasts in this great matter, that he pretends to be instructed by Scripture, so far as to put Scripture out of the way beforehand, or to make his conceit of it." For the rest, we refer the reader to this scripture itself.

Attached to this writing is an appendix: *Writing Georg Norarii to the Christian reader*, in which he indicates that some of Wittenberg with untruth ascribe to him, that he omitted a necessary piece and so on. This protest first appeared in the first printing of the third volume of the Jena edition of 1556, of which Rörer was then the editor. The omitted piece (Col. 888-891) is marked by us and in the second note Col. 888 the necessary is noted. The same piece is also missing in the Latin translation of this writing in the 7th volume of the Latin Wittenberg edition (1558), *toi. 417*.

1) The letter to Luther is dated February 28; on April 1, Zwingli sent a copy to Luther.

2) *Zwingli Opera*, Dom. II, 324.

3) About the time determination compare the note to the superscription of No. 20. Zwingli says in his rebuttal (No. 21 in this volume, Col. 1126) that Luther's writing went out simultaneously with his lines *oxozosis*.

4) In reference to this execution of Luther, Köstlin, *Martin Luther*, Vol. II, p. 89, says: "This is one of the strongest examples of how his (Luther's) polemics between really sharp logical remarks or between deep, even bold theological thoughts, often break loose into outbursts, in which one can only see clumsy discharges of his bitterness. Shouldn't a Lutheran rather agree with our judgment: that even the way Luther polemicalizes here and the expression he gives to his indignation about the shameful distortion of Scripture by his opponents is completely appropriate?"

Against Luther's writing Zwingli's answer appeared that these words: This is my corpse, eternally the old unified sense will have (No. 23 in this volume), which is provided with a letter to Prince John of June 20, 1527, in which he bitterly complains about Luther that the same "not only hurts over the string of Christian spirit and love, but also the Scripture seems to penetrate with his name shine in an improper sense". Also Oecolampad published against the same in 1527 at Basel a writing in German language under the title: "Daß der Mißverstand D. Martin Luther's misunderstanding of the eternal, constant words: This is my body, cannot stand. The Other Cheap Answer of Johannis Oecolampadii." 2)

In March 1528, Luther published his Confession of the Lord's Supper (No. 21 in this volume), which is usually called "Luther's Great Confession of the Lord's Supper" in distinction from the "Small Confession" of 1544 3). When Luther sent it to his friend Wenceslaus Link, he wrote to him 4) on March 28, 1528: "I have given Johann Hofmann copies (of the writing) against the Sacramentarians, which are to be distributed among you; may the Lord grant that they bear fruit among many. For I have decided to let these useless babblers go, and I want to have put an end to the writing against them, because I see that there is such a great ignorance in logic among them that it is impossible that they, even if they were wrong in natural things (naturaliter), could be instructed or made to stick to the piece that should be refuted (ad metam confutationis adigi). For neither teaching nor disputing can be done without the dialectic, at least the naturaliter.

Zwingli is so doltish (ruäis) that he could be compared to a donkey. This extensive and detailed writing has three parts. In the first, Luther treats the objections of the opponents and refutes them; in the second, he provides proof from the Holy Scriptures and "conquers" it that there is no trope in the words of institution of the Holy Communion, nor can there be, that therefore Luther's "understanding is right and that of the enthusiasts is erroneous and wrong"; in the third part, he makes his confession both in regard to the Lord's Supper and about other doctrines of faith. Among other things he says: "I confess the sacrament of the altar, that there the body and blood in bread and wine are eaten and drunk orally, whether the priests who administer it or those who receive it do not believe or otherwise abuse it. For it is not on man's faith or unbelief, but on God's word and order."

On the other hand, Zwingli's answer to Luther's Confession of the Lord's Supper (No. 24 in this volume) appeared at the beginning of September 1528 5) (for this writing was begun on July 1, completed at the end of August), provided with a dedication to the Elector John of Saxony and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, 6) in which he endeavors to disparage Luther and make him look contemptible. In this letter there is the strange, hopeful statement by Zwingli that he does not give the princes their titles because "transparency is proper to the stained glass windows", which Luther remembers in his Table Talks 7). To this reply Zwingli added Oecolampad's answer to Martin Luther's Confession of the Lord's Supper (Col. 1378 ff. in this volume), which (Col. 1375) is preceded by a Bnef to Zwingli. Both Zwingli and Oecolampad insist on their opinion in these extensive writings; however, Luther did not consider it necessary to answer them.

Luther's. great confession made Bucer the

1) The complete title is found in the note to the superscription of No. 23. -This writing came into Bucer's hands only on July 8, 1527, to Wittenberg not before August 21. (Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 643 sã p. 103.)

2) Von der Hardt, *ŮtUstr., Iour. II,* p. 141.

3) No. 47 in this volume.

4) Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1098.

5) For this timing, see the note to the caption of No. 24.

6) Seckendorf, nist. LutU., Ud. II, p. 118, § 41, (1) erroneously: "an den Churfürsten und dessen Sohn".

7) Tischreden, Cap. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 676.

He was so impressed by the Lord's Supper that, after reading it, he thought about how unity could be established and promoted. We can see this from two letters, 1) which he later wrote to Johann Comander and to Johann Lasko (the latter in 1541).

Around the same time that Luther's "Great Confession" went out, Bugenhagen also published a paper on Holy Communion: *Publica de sacramento corporis et sanguinis Christi, ex Christi institutidne, confessio, qua suae fidei de coena Domini reddit rationem et dicit vale iis, qui audire nolunt*. Wittenberg 1528. 8; in which, among other things, he also treats the doctrine of consecration. Brenz, too, refuted anew the truth of Zwingli and Oecolampad in his explanation of John the Evangelist in the interpretation of the sixth chapter.

Soon after the beginning of the Sacrament controversy, books were banned in the margraviate of Baden in which the error of the Sacramentists was taught. Nevertheless, at the market in Baden "a newly published booklet" by Zwingli 2) was offered for sale, which came into the hands of a preacher there, D. Jakob Strauß 3). This prompted him to send out in June 1526 his writing "Wider den unmilden Irrthum Meister Ulrich Zwingli's, so er verneint die wahrhaftige Gegenwärtigkeit des allerheiligsten Leibes und Blutes Christi im Sacrament (No. 25 in diesem Bande). On the other hand, in the same year Ulrich

Zwingli's answer about D. Strauß' book, written against him, concerning Christ's supper (No. 26 in this volume), in which he imposes his earlier transgressions on him right at the beginning of the writing (§ 5): "he [Jakob Strauß] has been unknown to me in all ways up to now, unless he is [the one] who some years ago let the very stirring final speeches full of temporal good and sign go out at Isennach Eisenach". It was, however, the same D. Jakob Strauß, 5) whom we met earlier in great aberrations, but who, after he had been called to Baden "to teach God's word in a Christian and peaceful way", faithfully carried out such a calling and here, as a witness of truth, countered the error of the Sacramentans in a suitable and effective way.

c. Zwingli's Augsburg Confession.

When the Lutherans presented their confession of faith "the Augsburg Confession" to the emperor at the Imperial Diet in Augsburg in 1530, Zwingli also set about making a confession of his faith and had it sent to Augsburg without being asked to do so. It is found in No. 27 of this volume under the title: Ulrich Zwingli's Confession of Faith, which he had presented to the Roman Emperor at the Imperial Diet held in Augsburg in 1530. The Swiss had waited in vain for the confession of their faith to be demanded of them as well. When this did not happen, Zwingli sent an "unknown person" (as Eck calls him in his rebuttal) with this confession to Augsburg; the latter, however, could not find anyone who would have dared to hand it over publicly to the emperor. This confession was completed on July 3, 1530, and a printed copy, as we can see from Melancthon's letter to Luther 6), was already available before the

1) These letters are found in *Lsultstus, svanAel. renovut.*, p. 132 sq.

2) This book, as we see from Zwingli's rebuttal § 9, is written against the papists Eck and Faber, and Zwingli complains that it is unreasonable that Strauss directs his attack precisely against this book, which was written in great haste.

3) On Strauss, compare the introduction to the 19th volume of the St. Louis edition, p. 47 f.; likewise Vol. X, Introduction, Col. 47 f.; also Kolde, Martin Luther, Vol. II.

4) About this time determination compare the note to the superscription of no. 26. Also Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 84 says that Zwingli's answer took place immediately, while Walch puts it in his introduction p. 58 into the year 1527, but in a note also mentions an edition of 1526.

5) Strauß must have been quite well known to Zwingli, because he writes in § 71 of this writing that the same had formerly been "a preacher-monk".

6) A regest of this letter in Burkbardt, Luthers Briefwechsel, p. 180.

July 14, 1530 in Augsburg. Melancthon says about it: "Zwingli sent a printed Confession here. One would almost like to say that he is crazy. On original sin, on the use of the sacraments, he publicly brings up the old errors. He speaks of the ceremonies in a very Swiss way, that is, in a completely barbaric way (*barbarissime*): he wants all ceremonies to be abolished. He pushes his cause of the Lord's Supper very hard. He wants all bishops to be exterminated. 1) I will send a copy as soon as I get it, because the one I had is going around among the princes." What Melancthon writes here is completely justified, for Zwingli's Confession is full of the grossest errors: Of original sin he teaches that it is only an infirmity, not actually sin; baptism is only an "outward accession" to the church; the sacraments do not confer grace, indeed, they do not even administer it or withhold it, but are given to the person only for the sake that they are a public testimony of grace, which was already present in that person before; Christ is not omnipresent after humanity, and the like. Against this confession of Zwingli's, Eck published a refutation still during the Imperial Diet (perhaps by order of the Emperor): *Repulsio articulorum Zuinglii, Caesareae Majestati oblaturum, Jo. Eckio auctore, 1530 in Julio, sub reverendissimi patris et amplissimi principis, D[omin]i Erhardi cardinalis ac Leodiensis episcopi patrocinio, against which Zwingli sought to defend himself in his Epistola ad illustrissimos Germaniae principes etc.* 2). Zwingli's confession did not appeal to the reformers either, for it is neither included in the collection of reformed confessions of faith published in Geneva in 1581, which bears the title: *Harmonia confessionum fidei orthodoxarum et reformatarum ecclesiarum*, nor in the later edition published there in 1612 and 1654: *Corpus et syntagma confessionum fidei, quae in diversis regnis et rationibus ecclesiarum fuerunt authentice editae*.

d. About the confession of the four cities.

Among the cities represented at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 were four that otherwise agreed in all respects with the "Augsburg Confession" of the Lutherans, but did not want to accept the tenth article of the same Confession on the Lord's Supper outright, because they were inclined to the opinion of the Swiss, namely the cities of Strasbourg, Constance, Memmingen and Lindau. Strasbourg, as the most important of these cities, therefore had its own confession drawn up (probably by Bucer and Capito), which the other three cities joined, and presented it on July 11, 1530 in Latin and German by Caspar Hedio 3) to the emperor in the name of all of them. This "Confession of the four cities, Strasbourg, Constance, Memmingen and Lindau, in which they declared their faith to the Emperor's Majesty at the Imperial Diet in Augsburg", 4) is reported in No. 28 of this volume. The eighteenth chapter of the same, which deals with Holy Communion, is, in order not to spoil it with anyone, so ambiguously worded that it can be interpreted both to the Lutheran doctrine and to the opinion of the Swiss, hence there has been much dispute back and forth as to whether the confession is to be considered a Lutheran or a Reformed one; however, it has been included in the previously mentioned *SaCorpus et Syntagma*⁵) etc., while the cities themselves dropped their confession and later joined the Augsburg Confession. The emperor accepted this confession, because it was written at his command, but the cities could not obtain it from him to be read out publicly. On the other hand, he commissioned Faber and Eck to refute this confession of the four cities (it is also called the "Swabian" and the "Strasbourg Confession"), which they carried out in such a way that

3) Seckendorf, *Ulk. ImtU.*, lid. II, x. 199, (6).

4) The titles under which this confession appeared can be found in the note to the superscription of No. 28.

5) The confession of the four cities, *Oonkessio tetra-. xolitaau*, is found there in the second part, p. 215.

1) Cf. no. 27 of this volume, § 49 at the end.

2) Cf. the note to the heading of No. 27.

The emperor had this rebuttal read out to them, reproaching them for harboring damned errors about the Holy Communion, for storming the images in the churches, and for abolishing the mass. The emperor had this rebuttal read to the cities, reproaching them for harboring damned error about Holy Communion, for having stormed the images in the churches, for having abolished the mass, for having disturbed the monasteries, for having harbored sects, and for having refused due obedience. The deputies of the cities complained about the sharpness and injustice of the rebuttal and asked for a copy of it, but they were refused. Nevertheless, they wrote an apologia against the papal refutation and had it printed in Latin and German.

e. Luther's writings concerning the leftover bread and wine in Holy Communion.

In Luther's hometown of Eisleben, a dispute had broken out between two preachers, M. Simon Wolferinus and Friedrich Rauber, about the duration of the act of Holy Communion and about the question of what to do with the bread and wine left over from the celebration, which was conducted in a very angry and bitter manner. Therefore, on July 4 and 20, 1543, Luther sent two letters to M. Simon Wolferinus (No. 29 in this volume), in which he rebuked Wolferinus for his unchristian behavior in this dispute and gave him the necessary instruction.

Second Section.

Luther's Writings Against Other Fanatics.

I. Controversial writings against the antinomians. 1)

The beginner of the antinomian disputes was M. Johann Agricola from Eisleben. After his birthplace he is often called M. Eisleben, also we often meet the abbreviation of Agricola: Grickel. 2) His patronymic is Schneider; 3) however, he later changed this name to Schnitter 4) and translated it into Latin Agricola. He was born on April 20, 1494. 5) He probably received his school education in Brunswick and then in the winter semester of 1509, in his sixteenth year, he moved to the University of Leipzig, where he was enrolled as Johannes Schnyder de Eyssleben. He earned there (when? we do not know) the degree of baccalaureus artium,

1) In this section we have used Kawerau's monograph "Johann Agricola", Berlin 1881, also Köstlin's account, II, 464 sf.

2) He called himself by this name in his family. Kawerau, Agricola, p. 4.

3) His father was also a tailor of his trade. Bindseil, Oollo'nia, vol. II, p. 254.

4) In a marriage certificate of Luther from 1524, he is called "Magister Johannes Schnitter von Eisleben". De Wette, Vol. VI, p. 501.

5) Thus Kawerau 1. o. p. 5. Others assume the year 1492.

However, he left this university without earning a master's degree. In 1514 we meet him again in Braunschweig, as it seems, effective as a teacher. In the winter semester of 1515/16, Agricola went to Wittenberg to continue his studies there. His name is entered in the register of the philosophical faculty as Joannes Schneider de Yszloben, baccal. Leypsens. He was admitted to the number of *chorales* 6) (choristers) by the licentiate Christoph Blank, who was dean of the so-called small choir in the Allerheiligenstifte at Wittenberg. The salary he received for his service enabled him to continue his studies. After a short stay in Wittenberg, he became an enthusiastic follower of Luther and demonstrated this in his first literary work; namely, during Lent 1517, he copied the sermons that Luther had preached on the Lord's Prayer, added his own explanations in part, and had them published without Luther's knowledge.

6) Different from these oNorates are the *pueri symphoniaci* (De Wette, vol. V, p. 796 f.) Compare about the Allerheiligenstift at Wittenberg and its institution the introduction to the 19th volume of the St. Louis edition, p. 50 d ff.

at Leipzig. 1) He dedicated this work to his patron Christoph Blank in a preface dated Jan. 13, 1518, and signed himself as "Joannes sneider"; on the title, however, he does not use his name, but refers to himself as "his [Luther's] student one. Luther was dissatisfied with this publication, although this work of Agricola's, as the rapidly successive editions testify, found great recognition, and felt "caused to omit this paternoster (in 1519) 2) again and to explain himself further". In the preface he pronounces: I "do not know how by God's fate I come into play, that some to friendship, some also to enmity saw and drive my word". On February 11, 1518, Agricola was awarded a master's degree in the philosophical faculty. A few months later Melanchthon came to Wittenberg, with whom he soon became close friends. In June 1519, Agricola (together with Melanchthon) accompanied Luther to the disputation in Leipzig and made the necessary notes for Luther, 3) as well as M. Johann Graumann (Poliander) for Eck. Soon after their return from Leipzig, namely on September 19, 1519, Melanchthon and Agricola were awarded the theological baccalaureate (*ad biblia*), whereby both entered the theological faculty. Like Melanchthon, Agricola came more and more into friendly relations with Luther, indeed, he was drawn into his closest circle of friends. In the Table Talks (Cap. 37, § 33), Luther calls him not only "a good friend," but one of "his best friends." As early as July 22, 1520, there was a rumor that Agricola was planning to enter into matrimony.

1) Kawerau, Agricola, p. 14 f.

2) Agricola's adaptation of the Lord's Prayer can be found in Walch, old edition, vol. VII, 1024 ff, Luther's revision in Col. 1086 ff.

3) Perhaps already as a notary? For in this capacity he acted on November 17, 1520 at Luther's appeal from Pope Leo X to a Concilium. In the Latin Jena edition (1566), Dom. II, col. 258 d he calls himself *Iokannes Larotor* (*sartor* - tailor) *ao* *Lislsdsn*, *pudlicus saora axostoliea autoritato Notarius*. On the other hand, in the Latin Wittenberg edition (1550), Dom. I, col. 232 d lacks this notarial certification, which is found in the original prints. Cf. Lrl, oxx. v. a., vol. V, p. 230 f.

4) On September 10, he married Elisabeth or Else Moshauer. The woman was well known to Luther (presumably she was a Wittenberger. Cf. Kawerau, l. c. p. 27) and she was highly esteemed by him. There is a letter of Luther to her from June 10, 1527 5) and the Wittenberg theologians testify in their report to the Elector from April 5, 1540, that 6) "the Doctor always loved and supported him, his wife and child". Agricola's marriage was richly blessed with children; at the time of his move to Wittenberg (December 1536) he had "nine living children". 7) He earned his living through his activity as a private lecturer at the University of Wittenberg, lecturing partly on philosophical disciplines, e.g. on Melanchthon's "Dialectic", and partly, and predominantly, on New Testament exegesis. 8) In the spring of 1521 he was also entrusted with the office of a catechist at the parish church, 9) and received from the Wittenberg treasury 7, later 10-1/2, shocks of groschen for giving religious instruction to the youth in the parish church ("lection in the parish church"). In addition, he occasionally helped the deacons with

4) Luther's letters to Spalatin of July 22 and August 31, 1520. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 707, § 3 and 715, § 2.

5) This letter is found in the St. Louis edition, vol. X, 1808 (with the correct year. Instead of "willens", "will" should be read) and duplicate (with the wrong year 1537) *ibid.* col. 1790. Duplicate also in De Wette, vol. III, p. 182 and vol. V, p. 64; Walch, old edition, vol. X, 2100 and 2121; Erlanger, vol. 53, p. 403 and vol. 55, p. 179. Seidemann in De Wette, vol. VI, p. 450, note 5, already recognized the identity of the two letters, but did not comment on which of them had the correct date; in Burkhardt nothing is said about this duplicate. The year 1537 cannot be correct, because Agricola already left Eisleben for Wittenberg on December 19, 1536, and had his permanent residence in the latter place until he escaped from Wittenberg on August 15, 1540, and followed the call to Berlin.

6) Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 327a.

7) *Ibid.* p. 291b and p. 315 d.

8) In the Zwickauer Rathsschulbibliothek are still Collegienhefte, which were copied in Agricola's lectures in the twenties, namely on Marcus, Lucas, John, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle to the Romans, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Galatians, the twentieth chapter of the 5th book of Moses, of which most of them are preserved only in fragments. Kawerau l. c. S. 30.

9) Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, Appendix, No. 72, § 3.

Agricola was also called upon to help out with sermons. In 1524 we find Agricola among the "servants (ministri) of the church in Wittenberg" during the decision-making process on a difficult marriage case. Although his activity in the service of the church was quite significant, and he also administered the most diverse ecclesiastical offices for 45 years, he was never ordained, but remained, as he himself says, an "unordained, unanointed layman". 1) Carlstadt and his comrades were involved in the tumultuous activity. Agricola did not participate in the tumultuous activity of Carlstadt and his comrades during Luther's absence at the Wartburg, but "neither Melanchthon nor Agricola were able to exert a prudent and powerful counteraction to Carlstadt's stormy innovations. "Clarity came into the confused Wittenberg circumstances only through Luther's return full of the Wartburg. His powerful sermons 2) also made an indelible impression on Agricola's mind. He testifies: 'It is inconceivable that anyone could have treated this matter with greater eloquence, greater earnestness, or greater zeal; always equal to himself, he has here surpassed himself!'" Agricola's first major independent work as a writer, by which he acquired a respected name as an interpreter of Scripture, is his "Commentary on the Gospel of Lucas" of 1524, which grew out of the lectures given on this Gospel in 1523. Although this work is not pure in doctrine and suffers from many other deficiencies, it was well received and widely distributed. It was first printed in 1525 by Sympertus Ruff in Augsburg; in the same year a second printing appeared in Nuremberg by Petrejus. In the following year (1526), Johann Secerius published

1) Kawerau, I. c. P. 31 f. Agricola also never attained the doctorate. Several times he has been called Doctor by wrong resolution of the "D" before his name with Doctor (instead of vorninus). Kawerau I. o. p. 21, note 1.

2) These are the "eight sermons" reported in No. 1 of this volume. The addition that Kawerau makes here (Agricola, p. 34): "against the Zwickau prophets" is not quite correct. For these sermons are primarily directed against Carlstadt and Zwilling, while the Zwickau prophets did not participate in the cult reforms in Wittenberg. Cf. this introduction p. 11.

In 1529, Secerius printed the Commentary again. This book had the honor of being placed on the Index librorum prohibitorum by the papists in 1546. 3)

Agricola had friendly relations with Münzer in the first years of the Reformation and perhaps even earlier (in Leipzig and Brunswick). When Münzer served at the Church of St. Mary in Zwickau in 1520, the two were still in correspondence. 4) However, as soon as Agricola reproached him for his boastful nature, his hopeful spirit, his spiteful behavior against individual persons, his abuse of the office of preacher, as a result of which it was reported about him that he was intent on nothing but murder and bloodshed, but Münzer rejected such warnings and rebukes from above, the bonds of friendship between them loosened (in the spring of 1521) and soon ceased completely. However, Agricola observed Münzer's activities with lively interest, and his writings are rich in memories and notes about the Peasants' War and Münzer's behavior, especially in Allstädt. On April 16, 1525, he and Melanchthon accompanied Luther on his journey through the Thuringian lands at the beginning of the Peasants' Revolt. Luther was prompted to return to Wittenberg quickly by the news of the death of the Elector Frederick on May 5. On the other hand, Agricola stayed for some time in his hometown Eisleben, mainly because of the establishment of the school, which Count Albrecht of Mansfeld wanted to found there; for Luther, in whose hands the count had placed the school matter, had chosen him to be the director of this school. Before Agricola moved to Eisleben, however, he was sent by Luther to Frankfurt, 5) whose council had requested a man to establish the church there. This matter was settled in a short

3) Kawerau, I. c. S. 37.

4) Kawerau I. c. S. 45.

5) Compare Luther's letter to the council of the city of Frankfurt of May 30, 1525. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 976.

The school was happily arranged, for the council had in the meantime found two suitable church servants, Melander and Algesheimer, who were already employed on June 13, 1525, the former in the St. Bartholomew and Liebfrauen Church, the latter in St. Leonhard. In the first days of August 1525, Agricola and his family went to Eisleben and the school, the opening of which had been prevented by the turbulent times of the peasant revolt, began. According to his profession, he not only had to take over the direction of the new Latin school, but also to preach sermons in St. Nicolai's Church (without being given an actual parish office), for which he was assured an annual salary of 120 gulden. Initially, Hermann Tulich 1) was his college, but only for a short time; the procurement of suitable assistants caused continual great concern. Among the number of Agricola's assistants, Franz Brnkhard, the later vice-chancellor of Saxony, and Magister Veit Amerbach, who was later professor artium in Wittenberg, are mentioned; the former was only active in Eisleben for a short time, the latter for several years. 2)

Agricola must have been very capable as a preacher, because the Elector John took him (along with Spalatin) to the Diet of Speyer in 1526, where the Protestants for the first time exercised the right to preach the Word of God freely in public during a Diet assembly. Although they were unable to obtain the use of one of the churches there for their services, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse allowed daily public preaching in the courtyard of their inns. The attendance of the people to these sermons was tremendous, 3) "yes, on holidays (so writes Spala-

tin) many thousands of people". On this occasion, Agricola gave continuous sermons on the Epistle to the Colossians and published them the following year with a dedication to Landgrave Philip under the title: "Die Epistel an die Colosser, S. Pauls, zu Speier gepredigt auff dem reychstage, von Joann Agricola Eysleben. By D. Martinm Luther vbersehen. Wittenberg 1527. (Wittenberg by Simph'orian Reinhart.)" While he was in Speyer, Bugenhagen sent to him and Spalatin the writing in which he protests against the falsification which Bucer had made with his Psalm interpretation in the explanation of the 111th Psalm. 4) In the first half of the same year, Agricola also translated the *Synggramma Suevicum*.

Luther decorated this translation with his preface. In 1529 (in March), he again accompanied the Elector to the Diet of Speyer and this time also preached before thousands of listeners. 5) About two months before the beginning of the Imperial Diet in Augsburg, Elector John of Saxony wrote to Count Albrecht of Mansfeld (March 13): "You want to take with you Mag. Joh. Eisleben, who is to be used on such our journey as a preacher." 6) Agricola also preached at Augsburg, but only for a short time (from the beginning of May to June 15), before the emperor arrived; then, however, all preaching (including Roman preaching) was forbidden by the emperor during the Imperial Diet, and the Elector also had to comply with this prohibition, but nevertheless kept the theologians with him until he himself departed from Augsburg on September 23. Agricola enjoyed the same favor as with Elector John with his son and successor, Elector John Frederick, who took him to Vienna in 1535 when he traveled there to be feoffed with the electorship. This enfeoffment took place on November 20, 1535. Agricola later referred to the Elector for the sermons he preached during this trip.

1) Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XIX, 4. Tulich had already left Eisleben again before October 21, 1525. See Luther's letter to Agricola, De Wette, vol. III, p. 35, where DMiokii is read instead of Iuliolüi.

2) On June 27, 1526, Luther gives him a letter of recommendation to Agricola on his departure for Eisleben (De Wette, Vol. III, p. 118). On October 25, 1528, Amerbach is still there sidiü. S. 394). Later he reverted to the Pabstthum. De Wette, Vol. V, p. 629. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1569, Tischreden, Cap. 73, § 18

3) This is attested by Cochlaeus in his *Oynanaentario*, j". 147 sy.

4) Cf. this introduction, p. 36 f.

5) "On the following Sunday [March 21, 1529], about eight thousand people had been gathered at the morning and afternoon sermons." Kawerau, Agricola, p. 91.

6) Kawerau, I. o. p. 94.

as witnesses that he had preached the pure evangelical doctrine there, and the Elector gave him in a letter of 30 October 1537 1) the testimony: "we have no other recollection than that you preached the same [your teachers] on the journey to Vienna in the manner in which you recorded them. In a letter of October 30, 1537, 1) the Elector gave him the testimony: "We have no other recollection than that you preached the same [your teachers] on the journey to Vienna in the manner in which you recorded them," but also made known to him his will: "We also do not consider it inconvenient, but good and right that such unity [with Luther] should extend not only to the substance of the doctrine, but also to the words.

The first germs of Agricola's antinomian doctrine, although still quite undeveloped, can already be found in his above-mentioned Commentary on the Gospel of Lucas, published in 1525. 2) Almost everywhere he speaks only of the harm of sin, but almost nowhere of the guilt of sin and of the task of the law to reveal sin as guilt to the holy God and to bring it to consciousness. The only real use of the law is that it is good as a restraint for the raw masses, for the pagan-minded world. In this way, the message of grace of the Gospel comes to the individual, without the preparatory work of the law on the heart of the sinner being expressly and clearly emphasized. He describes the effect by which faith is evoked as a stirring of the heart, as being seized by the sweetness and kindness of God. From this emotion the new life of the Christian is dated, and it is a life of repentance. For repentance is the fruit of faith, the daily renewal of spiritual life; it does not begin with the recognition of sin, but with the grateful sensation of God's benefits. Here, therefore, we already find in the first beginnings the teaching that he later expressed in the first thesis of his "Theses Disseminated among the Brethren" 3). In addition, already in this writing we encounter several misunderstandable, even dangerous statements, 4) e.g. "Sins do not harm,

They are as great as they want", to which a practical antinomianism could easily lean, although Agricola did not intend to preach a moral libertinism; for he assumed that the Holy Spirit had planted in the born-again the drive to fulfill the law of God willingly and with pleasure. Also in the "Christian Children's Education" of 1527, a Christian teaching for the Latin school, he begins with a partly well-done interpretation of the ten commandments, and also talks about the fact that the law should serve to expose our sins and to drive us to despair of ourselves, but in the end the main meaning of it remains for him that it is the "dog's shillelagh", i.e. the reins of the wild carnal nature, "so that it does not become too horny, but a little tame". The final section of his entire doctrinal exposition is the section on repentance. In this section he does not mention the law at all, but describes repentance as an effect of justifying faith, not as a feeling and repentance of the guilt of sin, but as "a new heart and other thoughts", as "not doing evil anymore".

Until then, Agricola had not been aware of any deviation from Luther's teaching; however, when Melanchthon's *Articuli, de quibus egerunt per visitatores* went out in print in the summer of 1527, a kind of prelude to the antinomian controversy that flared up ten years later was tied to this little work, which is the preliminary work for the "Instruction of the Visitators. In these *Articuli*, Melanchthon teaches that a preacher has to preach two things: the sermon of repentance and the sermon of forgiveness of sins. No one can understand what faith is if repentance is not preached first. Preaching the law drives to repentance, therefore the Decalogue is to be interpreted diligently. Repentance is a prerequisite for faith. Diligent preaching of the law will also be a great blessing for the believers in order to kill the old man and to grow in sanctification. This is undoubtedly the right pure doctrine that must be presented at all times; however, it was necessary to place special emphasis on it at that time, when many a Protestant

1) Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 312.

2) Kawerau, I. c. p. 133 ff.

3) Cf. Col. 1624 of this volume.

4) See Kawerau, I. o. p. 136.

The "preacher of grace" preached grace in such a way that it inevitably had to become a cover for wickedness. But Agricola felt hit and joined in the cries of many that Melanchthon had fallen away and was "crowning backwards again. In contrast to these articles, he gave his doctrine a sharper form in his second catechetical work, "130 Common Questions for Young Children," the preface of which is dated Monday after Martinmas (November 18) 1527. This "catechism" was not caused by the need of the elementary school children, for whom the "Christian child education" had not proven to be useful, but by the articles of Melanchthon, which Agricola considered to be contrary to the teachings of Luther; on the other hand, he believed to be in complete agreement with Luther. The Decalogue is assigned almost the last place in this writing and it is settled with a few explanatory words. He describes the economy of the law here again, as he had already done in the Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, 1) as a failed attempt of God to influence man. He now knows only one function of the law, namely to force and compel, to punish and torment. He sees the law only as a penal code, it is, "the Jews' Sachsenspiegel", 2) and Christ has completely eliminated this single function of the law for the Christian. The whole process of the appropriation of salvation proceeds without the law being involved at any point. Therefore, it must be called a juconsequence or an accommodation to school usage, 3) that Agricola still teaches from the law at all. To the question: How does a person become a believer? the Catechism answers: "God has Christ's death and resurrection preached to the unbelieving world, namely, that it is to their benefit and that they are reconciled to God through Christ's blood. Whosoever then is moved by the blood of Christ, and whoever is well pleased with this preaching, the Father draws him to Christ, and

sprinkles him with the blood of Christ. He believes the words of the sermon, he sees and recognizes the goodness of God that is proclaimed to him. He also sees his error and infirmity, he cries out over his unbelief, that is, he repents, repents and laments and takes care with diligence not to anger the one who has forgiven him so much." The pope teaches, "First consider and confess your sins, then you will become worthy of grace. But the Gospel preaches, first, the satisfaction of Christ; secondly, it preaches how we are to repent." Here, then, the service of the law for the preparatory recognition of sin is completely eliminated, and the justified, according to Paul's word: to the just there is no law, the law is of no concern at all. Of course, even the justified sins "every moment". But these sins are only a "need", only impulses of the "inherited damage", caused by the devil and the world. Of course, the Christian should fight against them, and this very fight against them is called repentance, but there is also the consolation: "no sins hinder blessedness, for grace is called, not good works, not evil works". The norm of the new life of the justified is not "you shall be holy, for I am holy," but merely, and therefore in a superficial way, charity. Because he has put aside the law, he lacks the seriousness of the concept of guilt when considering sins and the concept of holiness when presenting the Christian life.

Here we already find a developed autinomism in Agricola and it would certainly have come to an open rupture between him and the Wittenbergers if they had harbored the slightest suspicion against Agricola and had examined his writings with a critical eye; but it seems that Luther had not yet read the Catechism at that time, although he knew of its existence. When Agricola approached Luther with misgivings about Melanchthon's "Articles" even before they appeared in print, Luther appeased him 4) and admonished him.

1) Cf. Kawerau, I. c. pp. 142 and 134.

2) Agricola also borrows the expression here from Luther, who uses it in his writing "Wider die himmlischen ProHeten" (Col. 153 in this volume). (Kawerau.)

3) Kawerau, I. c. S. 142.

4) In a letter of August 31, 1527. Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, appendix, no. 3.

to abstain from disputing about this matter, so that the visitation would not be hindered by it. Luther said against Melanchthon, 1) that it was only a dispute about words, which he did not respect very much. After the articles had been printed, Agricola turned again to Luther with certain accusations, and also made sure that his opposition to Melanchthon became generally known by distributing copies of his "Censur". With great zeal, he advocated Luther's interpretation of the passage Gal. 3:19, as opposed to Jerome's, which Melanchthon had accepted, and brought Melanchthon under suspicion of a doctrinal difference among those who judged superficially, even though he completely agreed with Luther in the doctrine of the law. In the course of the negotiations, Agricola realized that Luther was not in agreement with him, that he, the plaintiff, could easily become the defendant, and he pulled himself out of the matter by concealing the actual point of difference and, one may well say, not only made "tame and subtle turns" 2) but also used dishonest evasions. On November 26-28, 1527, the Elector summoned the disputing parties to Torgau together with Luther and Bugenhagen as arbitrators. Agricola's charge asserted that the doctrine of repentance in the *Articuli* was in conflict with Scripture and with Luther's teaching. In the prophet Jonah, Cap. 3, it says of the Ninivites first "they believed" and only then "they repented. 3) To prove that Melanchthon was in conflict with Luther, he referred to Luther's statement that repentance begins with love. In contrast, Melanchthon bravely defended the repentance that precedes justification. First the heart must have experienced the horrors of a fearful conscience, but in this process fear of punishment and love of justice are difficult to distinguish. Here Agricola, if he had been more forthright, would have had to object and freely come forward with his confession, but cowardly he evaded it, by instead of using the just-

The first thing he did was to prove that Agricola subordinated the belief that there is a God who threatens, commands and terrifies, the *fides minarum*, to the faith that completes faith and thereby formally helped his sentence: "First faith, then repentance" to triumph. Luther then easily settled the dispute by proving that Agricola had understood the word faith in a much broader sense than Melanchthon.

These events had not clouded Luther's intimate intercourse with Agricola. Luther thought that in Agricola he had a faithful follower.

We have to assume, however, that from now on Agricola stood in conscious opposition to Luther and tried to bring his false doctrine to the people at every given opportunity. On September 11, 1528, Luther wrote to Agricola, 4) that someone had recently assured him in the most definite manner that Agricola (in a sermon preached at Altenburg in the summer) had put forward a new doctrine and asserted that faith could be without works. "I earnestly warn you," says Luther, "to beware of the devil and of your flesh." Agricola answered with the excuse that he had not railed against the doing of good works, but against the opinion that blessedness could be acquired by faith and works. The doctrine of faith has "a must" (*oportet*), 5) whereas the doctrine of good works has no must, as can be seen in the case of the thief. Luther, as it seems, allowed himself to be reassured by this; and Agricola, too, did not give any particular reason for several years that would have brought him into suspicion of false teaching. But when in 1533 Count Hoyer of Mansfeld, who remained Catholic, appointed the apostate Georg Witzel as pastor of St. Andrew's in Eisleben, Agricola was prompted by this opponent to further strengthen his antinomianism and to make it more and more strident. Witzel led a poisonous and immoderately zealous fight against Luther and his followers, not only for the sake of the extremely small Catholic community, but also for the sake of the church.

1) On October 27, 1527. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 121.

2) Kawerau I. o. p. 147.

3) Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XIX, 83.

4) Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1121.

5) Cf. the Tischreden, Cap. 37,8 35. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1031. In Melanchthon's verses, Orator - ^Arioola is another translation of the name "reaper".

1) in Eisleben from falling away, but also to bring as many as possible back to the Roman church. In the same St. Andreas Church where Witzel preached in the morning, D. Caspar Güttel had to provide the service in the afternoon. Already a few days later, when Witzel had arrived in Eisleben, a clash with the Protestant preachers took place. On the Sunday after Galli, October 19, 2) 1533, Witzel stated in his sermon that through baptism a child's past sins were forgiven, but the sins it subsequently committed in its life could only be erased through its own work of repentance, namely through true repentance, conversion, prayer, almsgiving, and many other good works that followed faith 3). In the afternoon, Güttel gave him a proper answer, and the same happened in the following time, that Witzel's morning sermons, as he complained, were "drawn out by Güttel in the most hostile and murderous manner, and that with unswung, outrageous malicious words and poisonous greediness". Witzel also did not lack the most vicious outbursts against "the sect". He himself relates: "Allhie I have confidently punished the falsifiers of scripture, so fraudulent interpretation make, have they hot in their throat lie" 2c. Immediately Agricola also reported to Wittenberg how Witzel stood by them. Already on October 22, 4) Luther wrote his answer to Agricola: "All that he [Witzel] holds and teaches is nothing at all (nimis nihil), and he is everywhere not worthy that someone who is knowledgeable of our doctrine should trouble himself for his sake. He will perish of his own accord if only our doctrine is taught clearly and abundantly. For his thing is of such a nature that it can neither be taught nor easily understood, since neither he himself nor his kind understand it." The herein contained

Luther's advice not to worry about such a vain opponent was not heeded by the Eisleben preachers. Güttel continued to preach entire sermons against Witzel, and Agricola also describes the sermons he preached at that time as controversial sermons against Witzel. 5) The more the latter attributed sin-redeeming power to the Christian's fulfillment of the law, the more the latter pushed the counter-doctrine and zealously opposed the benefits of the law. Through this continued polemic, he got deeper and deeper into antinomianism, so that he finally did not hesitate to accuse Luther of false doctrine, as was done in the third sentence of his third series of theses (Col. 1627 in this volume). We have a brief epitome of what Agricola taught in the last years of his stay in Eisleben in the series of theses, 6) which are attached to the paper: D. Martin Luthers Widerlegung der falschen und verführischen Lehre der Antinomer wider das Gesetz, in sechs Disputationen verfaßt 7) (No. 31 in this volume). For this doctrine he had formed a party whose adherents called themselves Minores, Minorisch or Minorists. 8) Luther, however, knew nothing about it, nor did he want to believe it, when Count Albrecht von Mansfeld reported it to him and other theologians (Jonas, Bugenhagen, Melanchthon), yes, even to the Elector soon after Agricola's departure from Eisleben and warned him against it.

Agricola's departure from Eisleben was initiated by all kinds of annoyances he had with Count Albrecht. Politically, the two stood on different points of view regarding the question of emergency defense; in one case, the count had granted permission, where the theologian had refused it. Agricola's income, 120 florins per year, was sufficient at the beginning of his tenure, but in the course of time it became less,

1) Witzel himself describes them as a "very small crowd" and reports, "I preach here to only ten citizens, and they don't even come to worship regularly."

2) Not the "18th of October", which Kawerau l. o. p. 153 offers, because this was a Saturday in 1533.

3) For him, "faith" is only the believing acceptance of the teachings of Scripture, the keeping oneself free from heresies. Kawerau, l. e. p. 158.

4) De Wette, Vol. IV, p. 488.

5) Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 3496.

6) On April 5, 1540, the Wittenberg theologians say in their report of these theses: "Magister Eisleben's Propositiones, which were made and transcribed many years ago," Förstemann l. c. p. 326 u.

7) These disputations were held from 1537 to 1540. For more information on the timing, see No. 31.

8) Compare the note to Col. 1624.

As his family grew and finally consisted of his wife and nine children, it became increasingly inadequate. His requests and pleas for an improvement of his situation only brought him promises; the stingy count did not decide to keep these promises. After Agricola had waited in vain for eight years for an increase in his salary, and had also rejected several professions with favorable offers, he thought of obtaining employment in Wittenberg, and therefore turned to Luther, who helped him to fulfill his wish. In a letter, which Agricola addressed to Luther 1) on October 18, 1536, he deals with great pleasure with the conditions, which Luther had put to him concerning the appointment. Luther had interceded for him with the Elector, and the latter had declared that he was willing to appoint him to the university. Although it was not possible to procure a professorship for him immediately, a favorable reason was soon found to appoint him to Wittenberg. The Elector approved the necessary salary and ordered Luther and the other theologians in a letter 2) of December 11, 1536, to cite, among others, "Magister Eisleben" to Wittenberg for a preliminary consultation on the Schmalkaldic Articles. Luther discharged this order on December 15.

by a letter to Agricola, in which he requested him to come to Wittenberg during the Christmas holidays at the expense of the Elector. Immediately after receiving this letter, Agricola left for Wittenberg with his family in a hurry, without waiting for the return of Count Albrecht, who was currently absent from Eisenach, or to say goodbye to him personally, but left behind a very rough letter to the Count, written on December 18, 1536, which is included in its entirety in the answer that the Count gave Agricola on December 27, 1536. 3) About this hasty departure, the count expresses himself in his letter as follows: that he "departed unblessedly between two days without any cause and without having taken leave ... (despite the fact that we required you to appear before us on the following Thursday [Dec. 21] by writing)". The whole answer of the count is quite ungracious and full of bitter reproaches against Agricola. Albrecht sent a copy of this letter to the Elector John Frederick 4) on January 27, 1537, with a letter in which he warns against Agricola, so that by this man "almost a worse seduction than by Münzer might be caused", because he incites the subjects against the authorities, is frivolous in words, devoted to drink, and the like. Before his departure, he had not experienced as much of his affairs as is now coming to light. Also to Luther, Jonas, Pommer and Melancthon, he had

1) This letter is found in Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 268, as we believe, with the correct date: "October 18". The time determination "18 December" given by Kawerau (p. 170) does not seem to us to be permissible according to the contents of the letter. Agricola says: rs zürn Ai866iits - since the matter now takes its beginning, Luther may occasionally (aliquanco) write to Count Albrecht; meanwhile he will find out what he may answer the man, and reports from his Frau, she had said that she would like to die, if GOtt wanted her to experience that". Such speeches had not been made if the departure had been imminent. It is rather probable that Agricola did not give any written answer after December 15, because he left Eisleben with such great haste that the count did not find him there on December 21. The "18th of December" also proves to be impossible because Agricola wrote his farewell letter to the count on the 18th of December. Cf. Förstemann's Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 292a. There, p. 294d "Saturday, December 10" is an oversight by the Count. It should read "the 9th of December". 2) Burkhardt I. o. p. 271 f.

3) Förstemann I. c. p. 291 f. At the beginning of this letter is another error that the count made in giving the date "donstag den 20. tagk diß Monts", it should read "den 21.", if not, what is possible, "Dienstag den 19.". If Förstemann's interpretation (p. 294, note 5) of the words "zwischen zweien Tagen" "So it happened at night" is correct, Agricola's departure might have taken place in the night from December 18 to 19. This gets some probability from the fact that the Count says he required Agricola "to come before him on the following Thursday [21 December]". Then the Count's return would have to be set for Tuesday, December 19. But it is more likely that there was an error in the date than in the day of the week.

4) Förstemann I. c. Soon in the beginning of this letter the expression returns that the "abscheidt czwissen czweyhen tagen gescheen" had happened.

had already sent this warning. The first reason "to be disgusted [with the count]" was "that he [Agricola] had not appointed a pastor in Eisleben who was related to him and of his own kind"; with this the count justified his warning that he should not make Agricola superintendent over the pastors, for such a thing would be detrimental, that is, Agricola would seek to bring people of his ilk into office. The theologians had been informed that Agricola had founded a sect in Eisleben against Luther and his teachings, which called itself "minoric" and condemned the teachings and school of the Wittenbergers as impure. None of those to whom the count had addressed his denunciations and warnings gave them the slightest credence, but all of them, because not the slightest complaint had been made beforehand, considered them to be slanders by which the count wanted to take revenge on Agricola.

Agricola found friendly exception with his whole large family in Luther's house and remained there even after Luther's departure (end of January) to the convent in Schmalkalden for a longer time, until he found the opportunity to rent a suitable apartment. Luther later said: 1) "I have trusted this man so much that I have given him the doctrine, the church, my house, my secrets", which is to be understood from the fact that Luther made him his deputy at the university as well as in the pulpit during his absence. Agricola was indeed active in the preliminary deliberations on the Schmalkaldic Articles, but he did not go with Luther to Schmalkalden, nor did he co-sign the Schmalkaldic Articles; this erroneous statement, which has often resurfaced, is based on a confusion of Johann Agricola with Stephan Agricola of Augsburg. Immediately following the Schmalkaldic Convention, due to the agreement of the houses of Saxony, Brandenburg and Hesse, a meeting of the princes took place in Zeitz (March 11-17, 1537), for which Agricola was appointed by the Elector as court preacher, because he was (in spite of the

Count Albrecht's accusations) "in great esteem at court and almost the ver most trusted counselor". In the sermons he preached at Zeitz, "he displeased everyone. He used "new words" by insisting "that the revelation of wrath should be preached, not the law. 2) By this way of preaching he made himself suspicious.

Not long after, still in June 3) 1537, "drey Sermon und Predigen" (Three Sermons and Sermons) appeared in Wittenberg with Hans Luft, with a dedication of June 1, 1537 to Chancellor Brück. The manuscript had previously been presented to Luther for review, and the latter, probably without having examined it more closely, had said on the first holy day of Pentecost (May 20) against Agricola: "it is a good writing, that would not be wrong."

4) Simultaneously with the appearance of these sermons, however, the rumor also arose in Wittenberg that "theses written by Agricola were to be spread among brothers," 5) in which he had completely rejected the use of the law in the Christian church and had given a collection of "pure" and "impure" passages in the writings of Luther and Melanchthon. Against the latter he had said that he had been moderate up to now, but if he now saw that they wanted to suppress him, he would break loose. Now one began to read with critical eyes his published sermons, and found in them, however, the confirmation that he was lecturing antinomian doctrine. It is essentially the same that we find in his theses. This prompted Luther to testify against this doctrine as early as July 1, 1537, in a sermon on the 5th Sunday after Trinity. 6) Bugenhagen

2) Tischreden, Cap. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1042.

3) We are led to this time determination (Kawerau, p. 174, "in July") by the fact that Luther preaches against Agricola's Sermons already on July 1 (5th Sunday after Trinity). Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, 466 also assumes "June".

4) Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 1880, p. 303. (Kawerau, p. 174.)

5) These are the series of theses already mentioned in No. 31 of this volume. These are the series of theses already mentioned at the beginning of this volume.

6) Cf. Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XI, 1328, § 42 ff. This sermon is probably what Melanchthon sent to Johann Brenz on July 16, 1537. Oorx. Ref, III, 391.

1) Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 52. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1042.

started his journey to Denmark in July, and Agricola should have been his deputy in preaching and on the chair, but Bugenhagen forbade to let him on his pulpit, and Luther himself therefore stepped in as a "stopgap" for Bugenhagen. Luther's familiar intercourse with Agricola had so completely fallen away and such a complete estrangement had taken its place that the latter no longer went to Luther in person, but on September 2 sought to justify himself against him by letter because of his "three sermons. He pleaded that Luther had approved of these sermons and claimed that they contained only the doctrine that Luther himself preached. He was not aware of any false doctrine. In order to justify himself even further, he wrote a short confession of what he had always taught about the law. This "confession," however, is of such a nature that it (as Köstlin aptly remarks) "concealed his previous position more than it revealed it," for he passes over with silence the meaning of the law, to work recognition of sin and repentance. Cowardly he evaded here, as earlier in the dispute with Melancthon, 1) because he did not have the courage to fight his assertions in a sharp open battle. 2) This written declaration was sufficient for Luther in that he refrained from personal statements against Agricola. Only in a sermon on the 18th Sunday after Trinity (September 30, 1537), in contrast to what he knew of the theses that had been circulated, he fully and clearly explained his own doctrine of the meaning of the law and the relationship between law and gospel to the congregation, 3) without mentioning Agricola by name. During a visit to Wittenberg in the course of October, the Elector also learned of the antinomian disputes and had Agricola warned by Chancellor Brück, and

admonish him to compare himself with Luther. This prompted Agricola to seek reconciliation with Luther, and he must have gone so far in his explanations that the matter was for the first time "settled with given hands and promised fidelity. 4) Towards the end of October, Agricola reported on this to the Elector. The Elector repeats this report in a letter to Agricola of October 30, 1537: 5) that after our departure Luther had "kindly and amicably informed you: you had not been understood before, but now he sees that you agree with him in doctrine, and would be well pleased with you; he also wanted to call the others together, so that you would definitely compare yourselves". 2c. 6) In his answer, the Elector demands from Agricola "that such unity extend not only to the substance of the doctrine, but also to the words. The Elector is doubtful "whether it would be as Eisleben wrote to us"; therefore, in a letter of the same date, he instructed the Chancellor Brück, 7) "to speak with Doctori Martino about it at the appropriate time", but especially to inquire "because Eisleben refers to his Summaries, which he wrote about the Evangelia, whether Doctori Martino has left it to him to print them and to have them publicly published or not, and to report this to us in the future". Probably only after Brück got rid of this order, Luther received the first information that Agricola had printed his "Summaries on the Gospels", 8) however, without Luther's prior knowledge and without the permission of the university, with Hans Luft. This writing, as we see from the dedication to some of Agricola's friends and relatives in Eisleben, was completed on September 24, and by the time Luther was notified of this, the first

1) P. 47 of this introduction.

2) Cf. Luther's statement, Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 55. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1044: "If only you would publicly argue against me and not so viciously foe behind the Pöckler [shield]!"

3) Thus Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 466. Only the date "on October 2" is wrong. The sermon is found in Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XI, 1700 sf. On October 12, Melancthon already sent a printed copy of it to Veit Dietrich.

4) Cf. Agricola's complaint to the Elector of March 31, 1540. Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 319f.

5) Förstemann I. c. S. 312.

6) This statement of Agricola is cited by Kawerau I. c. p. 179. S. 179 in such a way, as if this was Luther's saying: "Luther 'showed him quite friendly and favorable'" 2c.

7) Förstemann I. o. p. 313.

8) For the full title, see Col. 1648 of this volume, note 2.

six sheets printed. Luther immediately 1) had the existing copies confiscated. Only one copy, which Luther himself used and added marginal glosses to, has survived. 2) Luther judged this writing (Col. 1652 in this volume): "With such a postilla, Eisleben wanted to lay the first stone against our doctrine and us, that our doctrine must be unjust and impure, so that he alone might be praised as a master of pure doctrine. And at last it has been the fool's desire for his own honor that the Wittenbergers should be nothing, and Eisleben everything. Now Luther decided to fight openly against Agricola and had the "Theses spread among brothers" printed on December 1, 1537. Agricola was frightened when he heard about it and did not want to accept the theses as his own at all. With respect to the last antinomian series of theses (Col. 1627 f.), we see from Luther's own marginal note that he "does not interpret them to Eisleben, as the title indicates," 3) namely the second and third theses, but to his students, but regards them as a consequence of his principles. The doctrines expressed in these two theses: "You may well murder" 2c. are the ones that Agricola, in his complaint against the Elector, 4) makes a second main point of complaint and accuses Luther of "calumnies" and "lies"; in his complaint, however, he wisely remains silent about this! Theses. Against Agricola's sentences, Luther wrote counter-theses, and still in December 1537, the first disputation against the antinomians (Col. 1628) took place, at which Agricola remained completely silent. 5) But since he continued to speak "in the corner" against Luther, the latter withdrew from him on January 6, 1538 6) the theological lectures, which had been assigned to him at Luther's request, "so that he would not be without work and [only] annoying [other people]" (*otiosus et odiosus*),

He also told the Rector that he wanted Agricola "to abstain completely from theological work (a theologia). Now Agricola sent his wife to Luther and she pleaded for reconciliation; he was ready to do everything that Luther would demand. The latter demanded a public explanation, which Agricola gave in a satisfactory manner at the second disputation 7) (Col. 1632), in which he himself was an opponent, but only "to be instructed", and a public, solemn reconciliation took place. Luther also excused Agricola to the Elector, and obtained for him on (February 3) the Elector's order (against Bugenhagen's ban) that he be readmitted to the pulpit to inquire whether he held himself in doctrine uniform with Luther. On April 23, Agricola preached a second time by order of the Elector to recant his former doctrine and remove all suspicion from himself. Agricola refers to these two sermons in February and April in his complaint: 8) "I have ... with sermons twice ... kept myself in such a way that one must see what I change and improve in my speaking of the law." What Lauterbach reports on April 27, 1538, 9) that "Luther was sad and somewhat angry these days because of Agricola's impenitence and dissimulation" and said: "I don't want his made-up doctrine", almost leads to the assumption that Luther was not well satisfied with the last sermon, but also considered it to be a cover-up. But perhaps he did not want to reveal this out of compassion for Agricola's family? 10)

Of the third and fourth disputations against the antinomians (Col. 1636 and 1639) it is not known that they were actually held; but the words of Luther on February 3, 1538: 11) "but he is well

7) How much this whole matter had gone to Luther's heart, we can see from Luther's remarks in the *Tischreden*, Cap. 37, § 34. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1030.

8) Förstemann I. c. S. 319a.

9) Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1721, No. 160.

10) Cf. *Tischreden*, Cap. 37, § 37. Walch, St. Louis ed. Vol. XXII, 1033.

11) *Tischreden*, Cap. 37, § 34. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1030.

1) This will have happened around mid-November. Kawerau >. o. p. 18t.

2) Printed in Förstemann's "Neuem Urkunden buche", p. 296 ff.

3) i.e., the superscription Luther had placed over it: "Likewise others."

4) Förstemann I. c. S. 317.

5) 6orp. Uek. III, 482.

6) Luther's letter to Agricola. De Wette, Vol. V, p. 96.

The words "hewn" give room for the assumption that these disputations may still have taken place in January 1538 after the second reconciliation.

Externally, peace remained for a while until August 1538: 1) Agricola had renewed the assertion in a letter that Luther himself had made contradictory statements in his writings: 2) This prompted Luther to publish the theses of the fifth disputation (Col. 1642), which was held on September 13, 1538, and lasted almost five hours. 3) In this disputation, Luther "most violently opposed the new teachers. The payment of his salary and also his employment with the newly established Consistory was in question if he did not clear himself of the suspicion of false teaching. So he decided, because Luther pressed him, 4) that he would have to have a public recantation printed, and he himself was concerned that "he would not want to do it in such a way that it would be sufficiently respected," to place the writing of the recantation in Luther's hands, 5) to also ask him "that Luther do it as he could, he would be well satisfied with it"; and in humble submission he swore that he would not deviate from the pure doctrine in the future. Thus a third reconciliation took place on the outside, but the hearts remained estranged from each other. This is shown by Luther's confidential speeches from that time,

But especially what Luther said on September 30, 1538, when Agricola asked Luther to write the recantation for him: 6) "I will seek the glory of Christ, not his, and describe in his own words the cowardly, proud, and godless man who would have done great harm to the church, and I will dedicate this recantation in his name to Caspar Güttel and the other preachers [at Eisleben]." Although this is already spoken in September, this recantation promised by Luther (completely in the manner pronounced by Luther) appeared only in January 1539 under the title "Wider die Antinomer" (No. 30 in this volume) in the form of a letter to D. Caspar Güttel, preacher at Eisleben. In it, Luther relentlessly reveals Agricola's previous insidious proceedings against him, that he had acted underhandedly and secretly in bringing up and spreading his false doctrine, and that he had also referred to Luther's books and boasted that Luther and Eisleben were on good terms with each other. Now, however, Agricola had humbly promised to renounce his false teachings, recant everything he had taught or written against the law, and promised to teach in conformity with the Wittenbergers, including the Augsburg Confession and the Apology. Agricola felt extremely hurt by this writing and became fiercely bitter, so that he sought to take revenge on Luther and obtain satisfaction for it. At first, he did this again "fencing meekly behind the Pöckler [shield]". 7) In the 17 theses, which he had written for a disputation to be held in the philosophical faculty on February 1, 8) 1539, he jibes at Luther in several dark theses, e.g. Jonathan, when he ate honey, had not sinned, but Saul, when he forbade him to do so, had confused Israel. Jonathan in this thesis is Agricola, who has the

1) Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 35. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1031.

2) Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 470.

3) Tischreden, Cap. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1062. Compare also Luther's statement about the antinomians at the end of his 33rd sermon on the first four chapters of John, which was preached the following day, Sept. 14, 1538. Erl. Vol. 47, p. 42.

4) Cf. Col. 1612, § 3, also Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 45. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XXII, 1038: "The same day he ordered (Sept. 3, 1538) to deal with Eisleben that he either recant publicly or be put to shame."

5) According to this the words in our edition of the table speeches (Col. 1032) are to be interpreted: "He has handed over his revocation to me" (ooillrnsQäuvit). The translation of ooiichn6n<IÄvit by "praised" in the old editions of the Table Talks is wrong. Luther himself in his writing "Wider die Antinomer" expresses it thus: "er hat mir's [to make the recantation for him] mächtiglich heimgestellt." This happened, according to the quoted passage in Hen Tischreden (Cap. 37, § 36), either on September 30, 1538, or shortly before....

6) Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 36. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1032.

7) Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 55. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1044.

8) Not "February 9", which Köstlin l. c. offers. p. 470 offers. Compare the passage of the table speeches cited in the previous note. But this is a printing error, which is corrected in Köstlin p. 676 aâ p. 475.

Luther, on the other hand, who holds on to the law and does not allow him the honey, is Saul. Luther saw through this and therefore rightly reproached him in this disputation for persisting in his old error. In addition, news of the further spread of antinomianism came from Pomerania, Lüneburg, Thuringia, the Mark of Brandenburg and Frankfurt. This caused Luther to speak and write vehemently against the antinomians in his lectures 1) as well as in the writing "von den Conciliis und Kirchen" 2) which he completed in these days, but in the latter writing without mentioning Agricola in particular; he also testified from the pulpit. Agricola referred all this to himself and later used it for his "complaint" and its justification.

Towards the end of December 1538, Agricola (in order to be employed by the Consistory) had offered everything to affirm the purity of his teaching in various letters to the Wittenberg theologians Jonas, Cruciger and Melancthon, to the Elector 3) and to Luther. On December 26, he wrote to the latter that he, as his spiritual father, wanted to accept his son, who had let himself be hurried by a mistake, again with a gentle spirit. When Chancellor Brück demanded of him a retraction, to Wendeln: Faber, pastor at Seeburg, to go out publicly, he prepared "a form of revocation" himself and brought it to Melancthon, but added the request that he also "provide a form" 4). Melancthon accommodated him by writing *De duplici legis discrimine* (1539) for him in Latin in the mildest possible form. This writing, which was only published after Luther's epistle "Against the Antinomians

(perhaps only towards the end of the year) 5) Agricola refers to it in his "Complaint" and calls it "a writing to the preachers and pastors in the land of Mansfeld". After he had thus appeased the theologians and satisfied the demands of the Elector by his recantation, he was appointed by the Elector to the Consistory on February 7, 1539, of which he remained a member until his departure from Wittenberg. In Wittenberg, he had also been able to obtain a following, so that his election as dean of the philosophical faculty on April 19 (or 21) was in prospect. 6) Luther prevented this, so that "his hopefulness, presumption and disobedience would not be strengthened by it". For a long time (since the disputation in February) they had not spoken a word to each other, when Luther wanted to go to Agricola in the last days of June 7) 1539 to talk to him personally, but he did not meet him at home. So there was no further reconciliation.

After Agricola had taken his oath, he no longer came out publicly with his false doctrine, but he also did not teach the pure doctrine clearly and distinctly, therefore Luther had good reason to complain about his dissimulation and hypocrisy over and over again: 8) "The little man has not yet set or made a few propositions in which he affirms or denies; says neither yes nor no, as is the way of the people; does not go alike, always keeps porridge in his mouth." But with his attacks on Luther, he gradually came out in public in an increasingly uncouth and bold manner. He boasted (at the beginning of July 1539), "he 9) is Abel, must suffer much

5) Kawerau 1. 6. p. 198, note 1 - In Förstemann I. c. p. 326 a states: "Which he had printed according to the doctor's writing."

6) Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 39. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1034.

7) In Bindseil, Oologuia, Dom. III, p. 321, Luther says on July 3, 1539: "he had recently been in Willen and was already on his way to reconcile with Agricola". Cf. Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 292. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1066. Mathesius, St. Louis Edition, p. 230, reports that Luther did not meet him at home.

8) Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 39. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1035.

9) "Jener," Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 92, Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1066, is Agricola, because the following only fits him.

1) In the "Interpretation on the First Book of Moses," Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. 1, 1188, § 196 ff; Col. 1208, § 4 ff; Col. 1212, § 17.

2) Walch, old edition, vol. XVI, 2741 ff, § 187-190; Col. 2782 f., § 248 f.; Col. 2778, § 243; Col. 2787, § 256. These passages, in the order given here, form the largest part of Agricola's more detailed justification for his complaint, to which Luther refers in his "Report". Compare the note to Col. 1657.

3) On December 22, 1538. This letter is found in Förstemann I. c. p. 314 f.

4) Förstemann I. c. S. 326.

and let himself be strangled." "What?" says Luther, "he will become a martyr under my hands, and I must be his executioner to make him a martyr? since he has grieved and martyred me much more than all my adversaries. No pope nor fanatic has grieved me more than he, and now I want to lay the blame at my door." How completely justified these words of Luther about Agricola are, will be seen by anyone who considers that the whole time during which Agricola was in Wittenberg was an uninterrupted chain of annoyances and cause of distress for Luther because of his false teachings and hypocritical behavior. The same can be seen in Agricola's further behavior. Already his letter to the Elector of December 22, 1538 1) contained, in addition to great praise, hidden accusations against Luther. He writes: "But because I notice and see that this whole business flows and stands from loud suspicion, how I should have something different in my heart and yet outwardly speak and act differently, so that nothing helps me anywhere, neither my humble submission and willing obedience, so that I testify that I want to die in his [Luther's] obedience, nor my manifold pleading by myself and others, nor my oath taken to confirm my faithfulness with it, in which the heathen are satisfied and content. . . Finally, not even that I offered to make known by a public writing wherein the lack of me had been." In September 1539, he sued his "spiritual father" and manifold benefactors with the Rector of the University, with Bugenhagen and with Melanchthon. 2) His points of complaint here will probably have been the same as later in the letters of complaint to the Mansfelds and to the Elector. The Rector D. Curio 3) offered to go with Agricola to Luther's home in order to bring about a settlement there, but refused Agricola's request that he cite Luther before him. Bugenhagen and Melanchthon also rejected his complaint. Zero

Agricola threatened to file a complaint with the Mansfelders, likewise with the Elector, and finally, he wanted to appeal to all scholars in Germany and Europe, because he did not want to put up with the slander, lies, and the imposition of heresies that Luther had inflicted on him. He let Luther know of his intentions, hoping that he would relent and admit that he had done him wrong; but Luther repeatedly told him that he should only sue him if he felt like it. After some time of waiting, Agricola actually sent on January 7, 1540 a letter 4) "to the pastors and preachers and the city bailiffs, citizens and all inhabitants of the city of Eisleben", in which he asks them to help him by their testimony to be exonerated from the trumped-up accusations that he was accused of. At the end of the same is an extremely venomous attack on those who take a stand against Agricola: "For it is ever true that whoever blames me for something else than I confessed in the booklet to the pastors of the Mansfeld dominion and in my disputation at Wittenberg, accuses me of being a dishonorable, disloyal, desperate villain, and will not think otherwise of him for the rest of my life; I also ask you to think of him as such, so that he can prove it to me, as is right. When Güttel sent a copy of this writing to Luther on April 7, 1540, he added in the accompanying letter: Luther would well hear from the copy "that the ungrateful man Agricola complains about E. A. W., with attached words of shame, as if he wanted to disgrace his fatherland, E. A. W., [and] all of us, [and] put us all to shame and punish us with lies, purging himself alone and cleaning up nicely, as he never stumbled and transgressed in such highly important matters, nor found himself lying." He also states that such rage of Agricola, at least in part, stems from Luther's writing "against the antinomians": "from it the wounds have been partly hewn, and the little steed has been running, and the bear has been humming".

Two months later, March 31, 1540,

1) Not 1539, which Förstemann I. c. offers. p. 314 offers. (Kawerau I. c. p. 197, note 1.)

2) Förstemann I. 6. p. 336a: "Er hat scheußlich klaget bei dem Herrn Pastor und Philippo."

3) Förstemann I. c. S. 336b.

4) The same is printed in Förstemann I. c. S. 315.

5) Förstemann I. c. S. 327 f.

Agricola sent the same writing 1) to the Elector John Frederick of Saxony (only the invective at the end was omitted). In it, mainly three "conditions" are asserted as points of complaint against Luther: Agricola is "imposed by Calumnia", 1. "he does not want to suffer any law", 2. "he teaches: You may murder, commit adultery 2c., only believe, so it does you no harm." 3. 3. "Eisleben does not want to suffer a catechism." From the third point Agricola spins 32 "lies" which Luther brings against him, and he closes "the third edition" with the words, "Leng, devil, leug!" Then he assures his innocence and says that Luther "let himself be persuaded by poisonous slanderers and envious abusers of God and people to write untruths about other people." "There is no end to the blasphemy and vituperation in the pulpit. Therefore, he asks the Elector to "have an understanding, so that he may be overridden by such Zunodtigung [rape]".

The Elector, who was in Schmalkalden at that time, answered Agricola in a letter 2) from April 7, 1540: he did not like to hear that Agricola complained about Luther in such a way. If Agricola had tried to communicate with Luther himself, such a letter to the Elector would not have been necessary. Luther had never thought of Agricola, as he himself knew, in any other way than in a good way. But the Elector wanted to find out about things and order him to act. Before the Elector sent this answer, he had the theologians present in Schmalkalden, Jonas Bugenhagen, Amsdorf and Melanchthon, report on the matter on April 5, 1540 3). Regarding Agricola's first point of complaint, they indicate that in his "Propositiones, 4) which were made and transcribed many years ago, also in his Postille, 5) which was in print at Wittenberg, it is clear,

1) Identical except for a few variants; of course with a changed address. Förstemann I. c. p. 317 with the erroneous date "March 1".

2) Förstemann I. c. p. 320 f.

3) Förstemann I. c. p. 325 ff.

4) i.e. in the series of theses at the beginning of No. 31 in this volume.

5) Cf. p. 51 f. of this introduction.

mall should not preach any law in the New Testament", therefore the first complaint is null and void. Melanchthon reports about the second complaint: "One of the city of Lüneburg wrote to me, Philippum, in many names, that he and they held that if one believed and nevertheless broke the marriage, ... it would not be sin, and punished ours for teaching that one loses grace and faith through such works." As a result, Luther "was moved to address Eisleben again and to demand a [public] revocation to put an end to such inequality in doctrine, which he offered to do. When Agricola "finally decided that the doctor should give him a form himself," he let the book go out against the antinomians. Luther's writings were indeed vehement, "but because the doctor [in this book] speaks primarily of doctrine, and not of Eisleben alone, ... it would be good that Magister Eisleben did not interpret the same book so burdensomely for himself alone and did not introduce such unnecessary, swift consequentialias 7) and consequences, as if the Doctor had accused him of having rejected the faith 2c., which the Doctor does not interpret for him; item, Eisleben has not been mentioned in the book about the church. .. Magister Eisleben has also never been mentioned in sermons." Therefore, the theologians advised the Elector to "inform Agricola that he should put the matter with Doctore Martino to rest, considering with which man he wants to deal". As we have seen, the Elector acted according to this advice.

On April 12, Count Albrecht von Mansfeld 8) sent a copy of the letter to the Elector, which Agricola had sent to the Mansfelds. The content of the letter was of course not new to the Elector, because it corresponded almost word for word with the complaint addressed to him, but "because the same Eisleben can be heard at the end of the letter ... almost heavy and difficult words", 9) so he did not understand it.

6) Förstemann I. c. p. 326 suggests "actual", which does not correspond to the circumstances. Luther says (Col. 1612, § 3): a public contradiction".

7) As a result, the third and final head of claim is dismissed as unfounded.

8) The letter of Count Albrecht can be found in Förstemann I. 6. p. 329 f.

9) Cf. p. 55 of this introduction.

he suspected that Agricola might want to avoid leaving Wittenberg, and on April 18, 1540, he instructed the chancellor Brück to 1) "take Agricola into his hand," that is, to have him take a vow that he would not leave without the will of the Elector. The Elector left it to Brück's discretion whether he wanted to do this through the bailiff Bernhard von Mila or through the rector and the university. Brück chose the latter way and Agricola "recently after the Leipzig Easter market Angelübde gethan", that is, in the first days of May 1540. 2)

Now the Elector, who at first wanted to let the matter rest until he himself would come to Wittenberg, instructed 3) a commission, consisting of Chancellor Brück, the bailiff Bernhard von Mila and D. Benedict Pauli at Wittenberg. Benedict Pauli at Wittenberg, 4) that they would like to settle the matter between Luther and Agricola. They also consulted the Wittenberg theologians. Both united, 5) the secular councils and the theologians, demanded information from Agricola as to what his complaint consisted of and what evidence he could provide for it; therefore, his more detailed "explanation" (declaratio) and justification of the complaint is also addressed to both. The inscription of this document in the Weimar archives reads: "Principal article of trade, Eisleben's doctrine". This document is dated with certainty before June 8.

1) Förstemann I, c. p. 330.

2) Förstemann I. 6. p. 348 k. The Leipzig Easter Fair ended in 1540 on May 1. According to this, it can be assumed that the order of the Elector to Bernhard von Mila, to knit Agricola (Förstemann I. o. p. 331), was not used. - It is in the Tischreden, Cap, 37, § 37 to end, Walch, St. Louiser Ausgabe, Vol. XXII, 1033 instead of "beschicken"/"bestriken" to read what Bindseil, Ooüocmia, Dom. II, p. 77 offers. From this it follows that this speech is to be set in the beginning of May 1540, whereby again some light is thrown on these events, which have not yet been set forth in full clarity. Because of the conventional wrong time determinations (especially of "Luther's Report"), no clear picture is presented to us in this part of the antinomian controversies even by Kawerau and Köstlin.

3) Förstemann I. c. S. 330 a, No. 17.

4) Ick. S. 348 a.

5) This is proven by the title: "Ewer Gestreng und Ernwidren" (cf. the beginning of letter No. 24, Förstemann I. o. p. 340), which Agricola uses in his letters to the Commissarien.

The theologians' verdict on the complaint of the same date already refers to the same 6) and they say about it: "His present declaratio: one should preach the law with or after the gospel, he did not say that before, but rather: one should take the decalogue away from the sermon on repentance. On the whole, the final verdict of the theologians (Jonas, Cruciger and Bugenhagen), their "true and consistent. Answer to Magister Eisleben's Complaint", is identical in content to that which had already been given by the theologians in Schmalkalden. Here, the three points of complaint are formulated very briefly and clearly: 7) "Eisleben primarily points out three things in which he is said to have been wronged. The first: he has not so grossly erred as he is charged with; the second, he has not therefore abrogated the law, grace, faith 2c.; the third, as often as antinomies are mentioned, he wants him to be touched with it." With respect to the first point, they judge that by Agricola's theses, in which he calls the doctrine of the Wittenbergers impure, and them perverters of the words of Christ, and by his postilion, in which he has set forth in clear words: One should not preach law in the New Testament and among Christians, it is proven "that the Lord Doctor Martinus Magister Eisleben did not do wrong". The second piece, which had been imposed on him, Eisleben had often called a big fat lie. But Luther did not put this on Agricola, but made a conclusion: "If sin is not, one does not need grace. And in this piece, the doctor does not speak of Magister Eisleben alone, but of many others.

6) Förstemann, I. c. p. 336b at the end: "seine itzige declaratio". Förstemann has given this writing the incorrect title: "Des M. Johann Agricola Vertheidigung seiner Lehre vom Gesetz gegen D. Luther" and dates it: "ungefähr am 8, Juni 1540". The wrong title comes from the assumption that "Luther's report" is to be set already in "April 1540", and it seems that Förstemann has assumed that Agricola defends himself against Luther in this writing. In contrast, this "Declaratio" is in fact the earlier one, and Luther refutes it in his report. Until now, it has been generally assumed that Luther's report, immediately after Agricola's complaint, is to be placed in April.

7) Förstemann I. c. S. 334 a, No. 21.

those who now fall into this phantasy". 1) Therefore, it is not wrong "that Luther teaches the doctrine that not only concerns Eisleben, but many others. "On the third article, that Magister Eisleben points to himself, where the Doctor Martinus calls the Autinomos, 2) the Doctor says that such an interpretation is not contrary to him. But it is true that not only Magister Eisleben had his phantasy, but many others have started to pretend such madness, as said, that grace and sin can be with each other against conscience. ... Because this doctrine is a common and necessary doctrine against all who unduly reject the law, the office of the preachers demands that they preach against such antinomies. And Magister Eisleben cannot use this for a private prosecution. From this it is clear that Doctor Martinus did him no injustice on account of this article. ... Therefore, we ask that he be held to it, so that he does not prove to the doctor that he has done him wrong. The secular commissioners agreed with this judgment of the theologians, and they presented it to the Elector as their own. 3)

. 1) That this judgment of the Wittenberg theologians is correct is shown by Luther's own marginal note to the theses Col. 1627 f. (compare the note there): "They [the 2nd and 3rd Theses] are also not interpreted to Eisleben, but to others, as, his students, as the title indicates," namely the superscription set by Luther: "Likewise others [Antinomians teach]. We have returned here to the subject already discussed in order to defend the Wittenberg theologians against the accusation raised by Kawerau (l. e. p. 205, note): "This prevarication, frequently put forward as Luther's excuse, was, according to his own testimony, a falsehood." If Kawerau, in order to prove this accusation, refers to Luther's writing against the antinomians, which "should hit Agricola in full force," he is mistaken. For the title of this writing: "Against the Antinomians" proves that it should not only hit "such game beginners and masters", but also his followers and disciples, who drew conclusions from Agricola's teaching, which he himself either did not draw, or even disapproved of and detested.

2) This passage indicates that the Commission also heard Luther about what he had to say about Eisleben's complaints. On the other hand, Luther seems to have spoken about this matter in writing only "after this interrogation" (Col. 1654), that is, after the verdict passed on June 8; therefore, and because he already had Agricola's "Declaratio" in his hands, we place his "report" after June 8.

3) The assumption of Bretschneider, Corp. III, 1035, that the secular councilors had written this concern is, as Förstemann I. o. p. 334 states, erroneous.

Brück also requested a written report from Luther on what he had to say about Eisleben's complaint and handed him the "Principalartikel" 4) for this purpose, which Agricola had handed over to the Commission before June 8. Luther sent his report full of M. Joh. Eisleben's false teachings and shameful deeds; in addition, an answer to his unfounded complaint against Luther (No. 32 in this volume) in the first half of June 5) to Chancellor Brück, who either on June 15 (or shortly before) reported to the Elector on the state of the matter. The Commission had not been able to bring about the desired settlement between Luther and Agricola, because the latter insisted on his request (at the end of his "Declaratio"): "one should not burden him with what he does not owe". 6) Therefore, on June 15, 1540, the Elector informed the Commissars that he was of the opinion "that the matters must be brought to legal execution", 7) i.e. that the matter was to be settled by legal means, and ordered them to "appoint a legal date for Agricola to sue". Until this date, Agricola should either "send himself for settlement and reconciliation [with Luther]" or "bring his suit in a legal as well as articulate manner ... clearly and differently in writings". This order was communicated to Agricola by the Commissars on June 20, 8); in his written answer of June 21, Agricola insisted "that violence and injustice be done to him," and "insisted

4) Förstemann I. 6. p. 337 ff.

5) Perhaps this "Benchtl" was already before the Commission on June 8. However, it is mentioned for the first time in the rescript of the Elector to his commissioners of June 15, 1540. Förstemann I. o. p. 339a, No. 23.

6) Förstemann I. c. S. 339 d, No. 22 at the end.

7) Ibiä. S. 339a, No. 23.

8) On June 27th, they report to the Elector that "today eight days have passed" they reported to M. Eisleben the Elector's order and that he had "soon the next day" delivered this writing, etc. What is meant is "Agricola's explanation of the Elector's order held out to him", Förstemann I. o. p. 340, No. 24. Förstemann places this "after June 21 and before June 27, 1540". From the words quoted above, however, it is certain that Agricola's "answer" must be dated June 21. That this answer is meant, proves the words repeated from the same: "he wants to bite into a sour apple".

then about the fourth day". Now the Elector decided "to take matters in hand against him and to carry them out in such a way that he and others would henceforth be afraid of such peculiar and repugnant ungodly teachings, ... to continue to follow the matters duly and to have him, that he had spoken and taught repugnantly of the articles touched upon, and thus to have him convicted of the deed, if it is possible". Therefore, in a letter 1) of July 10, 1540, he requested Count Albrecht of Mansfeld "to have his preachers and other servants and subjects inquire" what Agricola had taught in Mausfeld, "so that one could come to correct articles and further actions against him all the more effectively. The plaintiff had now become a defendant, for whose conviction testimonies were collected. Agricola himself realized that a detailed investigation would not be very favorable for him, and in the meantime he had looked around for other accommodations. Since during this time he had been asked by the councilors of the Electorate of Brandenburg, on behalf of Joachim II, whether he would not like to come to Berlin, on July 15, 1540, he first indicated this to the bailiff Bernhard von Mila with the request that he might inquire of the Elector "what he should do". When he did not receive an answer within a month, he decided to break his promise and escaped to Brandenburg on August 15, 1540.

On September 10, 1540, there was another dispute against the antinomians. The theses of this sixth disputation of Luther (Col. 1647) were defended by M. Joachim Mörlin from Wittenberg, under the chairmanship of Luther, in order to be admitted to the doctorate.

Even in Agricola's new place of residence, his existence depended on his being reconciled with the Wittenbergers and unanimous in his teaching. The Elector Joachim II himself was most eager to get the matter on track. Luther made three conditions: First, that Agricola retract his complaint; second, that he issue a public retraction of his false doctrine and address it to those at Eisleben; third, that

he would retract his scolding of Luther's writing against the antinomians. Agricola satisfied these conditions. He wrote a retraction, 2) which he sent to the Wittenbergers on December 9, 1540. After they had approved it, he had it printed and sent a copy of this "Confession and Confession of Johannis Agricola Eisleben, from the Law of God" 3) to the Elector on January 20, 1541, with a letter in which he asked for forgiveness. In the answer of the Elector 4) of February 28, 1541, he was once again reproached for his infidelity, which he had been guilty of by breaking his vow, but he received the promise that he should have security and a passport in the Electoral and Ducal Saxon lands.

Furthermore, Agricola did not present any more antinomian teachings and "Luther's Report" (No. 32) would probably never have been published in print if Agricola had not played an extremely sad role in the negotiations about the union with the Roman Church (Augsburg Interim). This is probably the reason why this work was first printed in 1549. The words of the title "and shameful deed" should express: that Agricola, the ungrateful man, sued his benefactor and preceptor Luther before the Elector. He died in 1566 as court preacher in Berlin.

II. Controversial Writings Against Schwenkfeld, Anabaptists and Other Enthusiasts.

In the sacrament controversy, besides Carlstadt, Zwingli and Oecolampad, we also encounter the names of the Silesians Valentin Krautwald and Caspar Schwenkfeld (von Ossig), who twisted the words of institution in this way: "My body, which is given for you, is this, namely spiritual food." 5) Luther complained in

2) Initially, Agricola also tried to adorn himself here by pretending that he had only presented his doctrine "disputation-wise". But he had to change this and acknowledge and revoke his earlier errors without further ado.

3) Printed in Förstemann I. c. p. 349 f.

4) Ibid. S. 352.

5) Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 128, with the wrong timing: "Wednesday after Palmarum" instead of "Tuesday" (March 27).

1) The same is found in Förstemann I. c, p. 343.

In a letter to Spalatin of March 27, 1526, he wrote that that one should insist to such people that they must prove they tormented him excessively with their books and were their profession, because no one can have a preaching ministry without command and profession.

Namely, Schwenkfeld, after Carlstadt had come out with his error, also wrote a book on the Sacrament, which he a letter to Margrave Albrecht of Brandenburg, Duke of Prussia, (**No. 36** in this volume) in response to an inquiry by the prince about the sacrament and the proper understanding of the sixth chapter of the Gospel of Saint John. He admonishes the duke not to tolerate in his country such people who cause all kinds of disagreement and red tape over the text.

Similarly, on October 9, 1532, Luther exhorted in a letter to the Counts of Schlick to keep Jáchymov clean of swarmers (**No. 37** in this volume), whereupon the Counts shortly issued a mandate against the swarmers.

When the preacher of Münster, Bernhard Rothmann, let a book "Restitutio", which was full of blasphemy and seditious teachings, go out, Melanchthon, on the other hand, in the first half of the year 1535, made several propositions against the teachings of the Anabaptists (**No. 38** in this volume). There are four pieces against which he directs his attack, namely, 1. that they teach that before the last day there will be an outward bodily kingdom of Christ on earth, in which the pious will rule and destroy all godless princes by force; 2. that they teach that the subjects of the church are to be the rulers of the world; and 3. that they teach that the rulers of the church are to be the rulers of the world. That they teach that the subjects shall resist their authorities and overthrow them; 3. That they teach that their preachers shall take up the sword and overthrow ungodly authorities; 4. That they teach that in their new church there shall be none ungodly, but all holy and pure. Another redaction of this writing, provided with Melanchthon's preface and somewhat more detailed, 4) is **No. 40** in this volume: Wider das gotteslästerliche und schändliche Buch, so zu Münster im Druck lulich ausgegangen ist, etliche Propositiones gestellt durch Philipp Melanchthon.

At the beginning of 1532, prompted by the prowling and unauthorized intrusion of the Anabaptists, Luther wrote his letter to Eberhard von der Tann on the prowlers and angle preachers (**No. 35** in this volume), in which he advises that the Anabaptists should not be allowed to take advantage of their influence,

1) Compare the last note to No. 33.

2) Kolde, Xnalketa, p. 392: "in Schwenkfelds Dpistolar. (1870) II, 701 ff."

3) This expression seems to be more appropriate than the one used by Köstlin, Martin Luther. Bd. II, p. 590: "passionately coarse".

4) Compare the note to the caption of No.40,

Now, because one of these two redactions is completely dispensable, we have omitted the former and retained only the number and title so as not to confuse the count.

A paper entitled "Neue Zeitung von den Wiedertäufern zu Münster" (No. 39 in this volume), which reports on the life and activities of the Anabaptists in Münster in the late year of 1534, was prefaced by Luther (probably at the beginning of 1535) and printed.

Even before the fall of the city of Münster, i.e. in the first half of 1535, Nicolaus Amsdorf's final speeches against the Anabaptists and Sacramentarians appeared (No. 43 in this volume); on the other hand, after the conquest of Münster (June 25, 1535), Melanchthon's publication of several unchristian articles, which the Anabaptists claimed (No. 41 in this volume). This writing is assigned by some to the year 1535, by others to the year 1536; likewise Melanchthon's teaching against the doctrine of the Anabaptists (No. 42 in this volume). In 1536, Melanchthon's concern appeared that secular authorities were obliged to defend the Anabaptists with corporal punishment (No. 44).

In Freiberg, a preacher had crept in who persuaded the people that it was not necessary for them to go to Leisnig to hear the sermon and receive the Sacrament there (because in Freiberg, which was under the control of Duke George, neither the Gospel was allowed to be preached nor the Sacrament to be administered in both forms), but that every landlord could administer the Sacrament in his house. Therefore, on February 11, 1536, Luther sent a warning to Lorenz Castner and his comrades at Freiberg to beware of angle preachers (No. 45 in this volume).

In 1544, Luther wrote a preface to Justus Menius' book on the spirit of the Anabaptists, which is included in No. 46 of this volume.

Luther learned that Schwenkfeld spread the letter, which he had addressed to his messenger (No. 34 in this volume), "to his honor and glory" and to Luther's "disgrace and shame". This caused him in 1544, at the end of September ("as I now go to the pit"), before his end, to once again issue a short confession of the Holy Sacrament against the enthusiasts (no. 47 in this volume). 47 in this volume), in order to "bring this testimony and this glory," he says, "with me before the judgment seat of my dear Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, that I have condemned and shunned with all earnestness the swarmers and enemies of the Sacrament, Carlstadt, Zwingel, Oecolampad, Steukefeld [Schwenkfeld] and their disciples at Zurich and where they are, according to his command, Tit. 3, 10. For Schwenkfeld's sake alone Luther would not have written, but word came to Luther many times "as if the enthusiasts should boast that he was one with them." In addition, in the summer of 1544, the draft of the Reformation, which Bucer and Melanchthon had written for the Archbishop of Cologne, had come into his hands. 1) Luther judged this book as follows: 2) "It [the book] has long been full of talk about the benefit, fruit, and honor of the sacrament, but it mumbles about the substance, so that one should not hear what it thinks of it, in all measure as the enthusiasts do; - nowhere does it want to come out, whether there is real body and blood, received orally". Therefore, he testifies again in this writing that he has never had anything in common with the false doctrine of the heretics, nor does he want to have anything in common with it now.

1) Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 591.

2) In the letter to Brück (July or August 1544), Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 486 f.

Third Section.

Luther's writings against the errors etc. of the Jews and Turks.**I. Against the Jews.**

In the first years of the Reformation, Luther believed that many Jews would be converted to the Gospel if it were brought to them with true Christian love and gentleness. Just as the Word of God had been obscured in the papacy by all kinds of human statutes, so it was still obscured among the Jews by the false interpretations and lies of the Talmudists. Moreover, they were not treated as human beings but as dogs, they were not allowed to do any trade, so that they were forced to proliferate. The example given to them by the false Christians could also not serve to improve the Jews. Therefore, in order to make the Jews aware of the Gospel, which was shining brightly again in all countries, and to convert some of their number, Luther wrote in 1523 the scripture that Jesus Christ was born a Jew (No. 48a in this volume). In it, he most sweetly explains that Jesus is the promised Seed of the woman, the Seed of Abraham, in whom the Gentiles were to be blessed, the King who is to sit on the throne of David forever, the Virgin Son, of whom God had proclaimed through Isaiah. Now he also proves that the Jews wait in vain for another Messiah, if they do not receive the Lord Jesus, Abraham's and David's son from the tribe of Judah, as their Savior. The time when he came was the right time, because he is the Shiloh who was to come when the scepter of Judea was stolen, to reign eternally, not as a worldly but as a spiritual king. The same is proved by the account of Daniel's seventy weeks. Attached to this writing is a very readable letter of Jonas to Andreas Rem (No. 48b), in which he speaks about the excellence of this writing, which he translated into Latin, so that it could be spread among all peoples.

The same is true of a letter from Luther to Bernhard, a converted Jew (No. 48c), together with which he sends the preceding scripture so that Bernhard may fortify himself in the Gospel and spread it among his people.

Luther's writing seems to have had a favorable influence on the external conditions of the Jews, in that he advised "that one should keep the Jews friendly," but with regard to their conversion he was completely mistaken. He expresses this on December 10, 1537, in a letter to the Jew Jesel at Roßheim (No. 49 in this volume): "My writing has served all Jewry [Judenschaft] very much," and complains that the Jews disgracefully misuse such of his ministry "and do such things that we Christians do not have to suffer from them," even using Luther's favor "for their obduracy. For this reason, he also rejects his request that Luther intercede on his behalf with the Elector. The Jews, he said, had brought about by their obstruction that he would not be able to promote their affairs with princes and lords. Nevertheless, Luther also added a glorious testimony about the promised Messiah to this letter. He reminds him that the Jews have now waited in vain for the Messiah for over fifteen hundred years in misery, while the time determined by Daniel is long over, and exhorts him to accept the crucified Jesus, "their cousin and Lord", with us Gentiles.

About the same time 1) Luther received an inquiry from a good friend, namely Count Wolf Schlick of Falkenau, 2) as to how one could protect oneself against the pretence of the Jews from the Holy Scriptures that the law of the Jews must remain eternally, the Chri-

1) As we can see from the beginning of Scripture No. 50, Luther hesitated for some time with the answer.

2) Thus Mathesius, Luther's Life, St. Louis Edition, p. 62.

The sabbaths had to let themselves be circumcised, and the like. Luther responded to this in his letter against the Sabbathers to a good friend (No. 50 in this volume), which went out in March 1538. Luther gave this answer no longer for the sake of the Jews, because they do not believe the Scriptures but their rabbis, but to strengthen the Christians. To the Jews one should bring out the old argument, which they cannot answer for: They are now 1500 years in misery. About this one should ask them: what is the sin for which God has punished them so horribly? They cannot indicate any such sin. According to God's promise, Messiah must have come 1500 years ago, when the throne of David, the principality of Judah, the priesthood of Israel, the Temple and Jerusalem were still standing. Their sin could not endure God's promise. All their kingdom, worship, etc. is destroyed, and they are scattered among all nations, because they have not accepted the Lord Jesus, the true Messiah. Their law is over, because Moses alone was to last until the Messiah, but Messiah was to establish a new and better thing for the people of Israel and the throne of David. But if the Jews refer to the ten commandments, one should answer them: "If the ten commandments should be called Moses' law, then Moses came much too slowly, [has] also taken much too few people before him, because the ten commandments did not only go before Moses, but also before Abraham and all patriarchs over the whole world. For even if Moses had never come, nor Abraham been born, the ten commandments should have ruled in all men from the beginning, as they did and still do." Seckendorf (*Hist. Luth., lib. III, p. 200, § 68*) judges this writing to be worthy of being regarded as one of the most splendid testimonies to Luther's high talent because of the power of the reasons and the excellence of the writing.

Now Luther had resolved to write nothing more either about the Jews or against the Jews; but because they did not cease to lure the Christians to themselves, Luther, "in order to resist such poisonous activity on the part of the Jews and to keep the Christians safe," had the Jews write a letter to him.

At the beginning of the year 1543, he published his work on the Jews and their lies (No. 51 in this volume) and soon after, in March 1543, his work on the Shem Hamphoras and the lineage of Christ, Matth. 1 (No. 52 in this volume). The former, an extensive work, has four parts. In the first, Luther shows that circumcision and the glory of the noble blood (because of their bodily belonging to the people of Israel) are of no use to them without faith in the true Messiah Jesus Christ. In the second part he proves, especially against the horrible lies of the rabbis, that the Messiah has already come, and that Jesus is this true Messiah. In the third part he deals with the horrible blasphemies of the Jews against Jesus, his mother and all Christians, and gives the advice that by protecting and shielding the Jews, one should not make oneself a party to the public lying, cursing and blasphemy of the Son of God, but 1) burn their synagogues, destroy their houses, take away their prayer books and Talmudists, forbid their rabbis to teach, prevent them from usury and urge them to work. In the fourth part, Luther contrasts the Messiah, as the Jews desire him in earthly riches, power and glory, and that of the Christians, who is outwardly poor, lowly and despised, but nevertheless, according to God's promise, the peaceful, salvific King, who reigns without a sword with peace in all the world, who forgives sins, who is the resurrection and the life, who saves from death and gives eternal life and bliss to all those who believe in him. - Luther had already promised the other scripture of the Shem Hamphoras in § 270 of the previous scripture. He wanted to counter the lie of the Jews, as if the Lord Jesus had been a sorcerer, who through the interpretation

1) Here Luther, although, as we see from § 315 of this writing, it is only the authorities to whom this advice is given, goes too far in his zeal for God's honor by advising to intervene in matters of religion with the fist. But we assume that this was only a shot in the dark to ward off the great insolence of the Jews; for we do not hear that such a thing was carried out, at least in Luther's time, which would certainly have happened if Luther had insisted on it with all seriousness.

of the name of God (Tetragrammaton) has done all kinds of miraculous works. In the 11th chapter of the Book of Purcheti, which he translates into German, he shows how the Jews believe and must believe even the most insincere lies of their rabbis, and take in all the filth of the devil, because they do not want to accept the right one God in Jesus Christ, His Messiah, with right faith. Especially interesting is the closer explanation of what the Shem Hamphoras actually is, through which supposedly all kinds of miracles can be performed. In the second part of this writing, Luther proves that Christ is descended from the family of David, and brings the genealogical registers of Matthew and Lucas into agreement with each other.

The last writing of this section by Walch: D. Luthers Vermahnung wider die Juden, we have omitted here, because it forms the conclusion of the last four sermons of Luther, which he held at Eisleben, and has already been communicated in the 12th volume of the St. Louis edition, Col. 1264 ff.

II. Against the Turks.

In the late year of 1528, there was a rumor that the Turk was preparing for a new campaign against Germany (in 1529, the Turks were outside Vienna); Luther was asked by his friends to write against the Turk. He complied with this request in his writing on the war against the Turks (**No. 53** in this volume), which he sent to Landgrave Philip of Hesse on October 9, 1528. The text would have been published in February 1529 or earlier, if the first sheets had not been lost through the negligence of the servants. Luther had to write it again. 1) Therefore, it did not go out until April 1529. 2) The cause for

Luther himself states: "Especially because there are some clumsy preachers among us Germans, who imagine to the people that one should not and must not wage war against the Turks, but some are also so foolish that they teach that it is not fitting for a Christian to wield the secular sword or to rule. In the Scripture itself, Luther states that the Turks have no just cause to start and wage war against the Christians. They only sought to plunder the Christians and to rob and damage other countries as the sea robbers and highwaymen. Against this, by God's command, two men shall now wage war against the Turk, Christianus and Emperor Carolus. The Christian should first of all strike the devil, the god of the Turks, and pray diligently against the Turk, the rod of God and the devil's servant, who not only destroys land and people with the sword, but also seeks to devastate Christ's kingdom. The emperor, however, as the highest authority, is obliged to protect his own and must therefore resist the Turk, in which all princes should also give him strong support, and Luther exhorts them to do the same.

After the Turks had to leave Vienna again, Luther, in order to exhort the army against the Turks (Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 2377, § 5, hence the title "Army Sermon"), let his Army Sermon against the Turks go out at the end of October 1529 (**No. 54** in this volume). Because probably (says Luther) "my dear Germans, the full swine, will again sit down according to their ways and with good courage in all security celebrate and live well and forget such great grace, shown, and think: Ha! the Turk is now gone and fled, what do we have to worry about?" etc., Luther wants to do what he can, so that God will not be provoked to let the well-deserved punishment pass over us. Therefore comforts

the title the date: "den 16. April". Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 122 places the writing in the month of March, probably due to the letter just mentioned. But as the completion of the writing, which was already in print on March 3 (De Wette, III, 426), had to be postponed already once from Judica (March 14) to circa Palmarum (March 21), so it seems that Luther had to put up with a rather long postponement until April 16.

1) Cf. Luther's letter to Hausmann of February 13, 1529. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1369. There *sexterniones* is wrongly translated by "six sheets". - "Sextern" is a sheet of six leaves.

2) On March 13, 1529, Luther wrote to Hausmann (Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1148): "The book Wider den Türken will be ready about Palmarum (March 21)." However, the first printing of the book took place on

And Luther exhorts the devout Christians through this sermon to the army. In the first part, he instructs the consciences by interpreting the seventh chapter of the prophet Daniel that they not only can and should fight against the Turks with a good conscience, but also die as martyrs if they perish in the war. In the second part, he exhorts them to put body and soul into it, to gladly give an estimate if the authorities demand it for this fight, and also to run toward their commandment with body or person, because God has commanded obedience.

On the occasion of Luther's exhortation to prayer against the Turk (No. 55 in this volume), which was published about the end of

August 1541, the necessary has already been said in the note to the superscription of No. 55. Similarly, in Brother Richard's publication of the Alkoran, written in 1300, translated by Luther, with his preface and attached warning (No. 56), which went out about the end of April 1542.

The last writing of this section, Luther's admonition to the pastors in the superintendency of Wittenberg to exhort the people to repentance and prayer against the Turk (No. 57 in this volume), was written by Luther on the orders of the Elector John Frederick. It appeared in February 1543.

Contents of the twentieth part

of

Luther's complete writings, which include Luther's controversial writings against the Sacramentarians and other zealots, as well as against the Jews and the Turks.

First Section.

Luther's Writings Against the Sacramentarians.

I. Controversial Writings against the Error First Brought on the Path by Carlstadt from the Sacrament.

Column

- 1a. Luther's Eight Sermons Against Carlstadt's Innovations, Preached at Wittenberg in Lent, 9 - 16 March 1522 4
- 1b. Above sermons in another impression (the first two) 50
2. Luther's opinion of both forms of the sacrament and other innovations. Middle April 1522 62
3. D. Andreas Carlstadt's writing about the anti-Christian abuse of the Lord's bread and Chalice. About September 1524 92
4. D. Urban Rhegius' warning against the new insanity of D. Andreas von Carlstadt, halben des Sacraments. Towards the end of 1524 110
5. Luther's writing against the heavenly prophets. End January 1525 132
6. Carlstadt's writing of the Old and New Testaments. March 16, 1525 286
7. Carlstadt's declaration of how he respects and wishes to have respected his doctrine of the reverend Sacrament and others. July 25, 1525 312
8. Luther's answer and refutation of several erroneous arguments that Carlstadt had against him 2c. November (?) 1527 324
9. Wolfgang Fabricius Capito's verdict on what to think and how to respond to the split between Luther and Carlstadt. Late 1524 340
10. Martin Bucer's Reason and Cause, from Divine Scripture, of the Innovations to the Lord's Supper 2c. made at Strasbourg. December 26, 1524 352

II. Controversial Writings Against Zwingli and Others Who Denied the Real Presence of Christ in Holy Communion.

a. Zwingli's dispute with Bugenhagen.

Column

- 11 Zwingli's opinion of the night meal of Christ. April 1525 440
- 12 John Bugenhagen's epistle Against the New Error in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. About September 1525 500
- 13 Zwingli's response to Bugenhagen's letter. October 23 1525 506

b. Luther's dispute with Oecolampad and Zwingli.

- 14 The so-called *Syngramma Suevicum*, or the preachers' writing against Oekolampad assembled at Schwäbisch-Hall, with Luther's preface. October 21 1525 520
- 15 Luther's preface to the first German edition of the *Syngramma*. About the second quarter of 1526 876
16. Oecolampad's response to Luther's preface, together with a short answer to the *Syngramma* of the preachers in Swabia. About August 1526 582
- 17 Oecolampad's responsibility against Theobald Billican. 1 February 1526 634
- 18 Oecolampad's two sermons on the worthiness of the Lord's Supper. December 21 and 24, 1525 768
- 19 Luther's Sermon on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ Against the Spirits of the Swarm. 1526 734

Column	Column
20 Luther's scripture that these words of Christ, "This is my body," etc., still stand firm against the spirits. About April 1527762 Appendix: Georg Röser's writing to the Christian reader. 1556892	26 Zwingli's answer about D. Strauss's book 2c. Second half 1526 1494
21 Luther's Confession of the Lord's Supper. March 1528894	c. of Zwingli's Augsburg Confession.
22 Zwingli's writing against Luther's sermon Wider die Schwärmer. Completed March 30, 15271104	Zwingli's Confession of Faith, which he had presented to the Emperor at the Imperial Diet in Augsburg in 1530. July 3, 1530 1546
23 Zwingli's answer that these words, that is my body, will have the old unified meaning forever. Letter of June 20, 15271122	d. of the confession of the four cities.
24 Zwingli's response to Luther's confession of the Lord's Supper. Begun July 1, completed end of August 15281228 Incorporated into this writing is: Joh. Oecolampad's Response to Luther's Confession of the Lord's Supper.1378	28. confession of the four cities of Strasbourg, Costnitz 2c. handed over at the Imperial Diet at Augsburg. July 11 1530 1570
25: D. Jakob Strauß's writing against Zwingli's error. June 15261472	e. Luther's writings concerning the leftover bread and wine in Holy Communion.
	Luther's two letters to M. Simon Wolferinus. First letter dated July 4, 1543 1604 Second letter of July 20, 1543.... 1607.

Second Section.

Luther's Writings Against Other Enthusiasts.

I. Against the antinomians.

30 Luther's writing "against the antinomians" to D. Caspar Güttel. January 15391610	38 Melanchthon's etliche Propositiones Wider die Lehre der Wiedertäufer. First half 1535 1686
31 Luther's refutation of the false teaching of the antinomians against the law, in six disputations. The first in 1537, the following four in 1538; the sixth in 15401622	39 Neue Zeitung von den Wiedertäufern zu Münster. Beginning 1535 1688
32 Luther's report [to D. Brück] of M. Joh. Eisleben's false teaching 2c. First half June 15401648	40 Melanchthon's "Against the blasphemous and shameful book [Restitutio] that went out in print at Münster," several Propositiones 2c. . First half 1535 1698

II. Wider Caspar Schwenkfeld, Wiedertäufer und andere Schwärmer.

Luther's admonition to Caspar Schwenkfeld. April 14 15261660	41 Melanchthon's displacement of several unchristian articles that the Anabaptists claim. 1535 (?). 1536 (?) 1706
Luther's verdict on Schwenkfeld and Luther's letter to Schwenkfeld's messenger. Nov. 8, 1543...1662	42 Melanchthon's Lessons Against the Doctrine of the Anabaptists. Second Half of the Year 1535 or Later 1724
35 Luther's Letter from the Lurkers and Angle Preachers. Beginning 15321664	43 Nicolaus Amsdorf's Final Speeches Against the Anabaptists, etc. First half 1535 1742
36 Luther's letter to Duke Albrecht of Prussia against a number of red-blooded spirits. Perhaps April 15321678	44 Melanchthon's concern that the secular authorities were obliged to defend the Anabaptists with corporal punishment. 1536 1752
37 Luther's letter to the Counts of Schlick to keep Jáchymov clean of ravishers. 9 October 15321686	45 Luther's warning to Loren; Castner and his journeymen at Freiberg to beware of angle preachers. February 11, 1536 1758
	46 Luther's preface to Justus Menius' book "Vom Geist der Wiedertäufer. 1544 1760
	47 Luther's short Confession of the Holy Sacrament. End of September 1544 1764 List of some writings belonging to it... 1792

Third Section.

Luther's writings against the errors etc. of the Jews and Turks.

I. Against the Jews.

48a. Luther's Scripture that JJesus Christ was a Jew by birth. 15231792	48c. Luther's letter to Bernhard, a converted Jew. 1523 1822
48b. Letter from Justus Jonas to Andreas Rem, citizen of Augsburg. 15231822	49 Luther's letter to the Jew Jesel at Roßheim. December 10, 1537 1826
	50 Luther's Letter against the Sabbathers to a Good Friend. March 1538 1828

	Column
51. Luther's writing about the Jews and their lies. Issued in 1542, issued in early 1543	1860
52. Luther's writing on the appearance of Hamphoras and the lineage of Christ. March 1543	2028
II. Against the Turk".	
53 Luther's writing about the war against the Turks. April 1529	2108
54 Luther's Army Sermon Against the Turks. Oct. 28, 1529	2154
55 Luther's Exhortation to Pray Against the Turks. About the end of August 1541	2194
56. brother Richard's transfer of the Alcoran, with Luther's. Preface and attached warning. About the end of April 1542	2218
57 Luther's exhortation to the pastors of the Superintendent of Wittenberg to exhort the people to prayer against the Turk. February 1543	2284

Appendix of some writings still belonging to the 20th volume.

	Column
1. Carlstadt's Scripture of the Receivers, Signs and Promises of the Holy Sacrament of the Flesh and Blood of Christ. June 24, 1521	2288
2. Carlstadt's writing against the old and new papist masses. Circa September 1524... ..	2306
3. Carlstadt's Dialogus or Booklet of Conversations on the Abominable Idolatrous Abuse of the Most Reverend Sacrament of Jesus Christ. Perhaps in August 1524	2312
4. John Oecolampad's Sermon on the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. 1521	2360
5 Joh. Oecolampad's letter to the Swabian preachers. Before October 1525	2380
List of some rare or obsolete words in Luther's writings	2386
Supplements and corrections	2404

The writings contained in this twentieth volume

ordered according to the time sequence.

	Column
1521.	
June 24. Carlstadt's Scripture of the Receivers, Signs, and Promises of the Holy Sacrament 2c.	2288
No date. Oecolampad's Sermon on the Holy Sacrament of the Altar	2360
1522.	
March 9-16 Luther's Eight Sermons Against Carlstadt's Innovations	4
Middle of April. Luther's opinion to take from both shape	62
1523.	
No date. Luther's Scripture, that JEsus Christ was born a Jew 1792	
Without date. Letter from Justus Jonas to Andreas Rein at Augsburg	1822
No date. Letter from Luther to Bernhard, a converted Jew	1822
1524.	
About August. Carlstadt's Conversation Booklet on the Abuse of the Sacrament	2312
About September. Carlstadt's paper Wider die alten und neuen papistischen Messen	2306
About September. Carlstadt's writing on the anti-Christian abuse of the Lord's bread and cup	92
Late year. Capito's Urtheil von der Schaltung zwischen Luther und Carlstadt	340
December 26 Bucer's Reason and Cause for the Innovations etc.	352
Towards the end of the year. Rhegius' Warning Against the Madness of Carlstadt	110

	Column
1525.	
End of January. Luther's writing Wider die himmlischen Propheten	132
March 16 Carlstadt's writing of the Old and New Testaments ..	286
April. Zwingli's Opinion of the Supper of Christ	440
July 25 Carlstadt's statement of how he respects and wants his doctrine of the Sacrament and others respected	312
About September. Bugenhagen's epistle Against the New Error, etc.	500
Before October. Oecolampad's letter to the Swabian preachers	2380
October 21 The so-called <i>Syngamma Suevicum</i>	520
October 23 Zwingli's reply to Bugenhagen's letter	506
December 21 and 24 Oecolampad's two sermons on the worthiness of the Lord's Supper... ..	708
1526.	
February 1 Oecolampad's responsibility against Billican	634
April 14 Luther's admonition to Casp. Schwenkfeld	1660
June. D. Jakob Strauß' writing Wider Zwingli's Irrthum	1472
About second quarter of the year. Luther's Preface to the First German Edition of the <i>Syngamma</i>	576
About August. Oecolampad's Response to Luther's Preface to the <i>Syngamma</i> and to the <i>Syngamma</i> Itself	582

Column	Column
Second half of the year. Zwingli's answer about Straussen's book 1494	No date. Melanchthon's Concern that Secular Authorities are Guilty of Resisting the Anabaptists with Corporal Punishment ... 1782
No date. Luther's Sermon on the Sacrament Against the Spirits of Enthusiasm 734	1537.
1527.	December. Luther's First Disputation Against the Antinomians 1628
March 30 Zwingli's writing against Luther's Sermon against the enthusiasts 1104	Dec. 10 Luther's letter to the Jew Jesel 1826
About April. Luther's writing that these words of Christ, this is my body, still stand firm Against the swarming spirits 762	1538.
June 20 Zwingli's answer that these words, that is my body, will eternally have the old unified meaning 1122	January 12 Luther's Second Disputation against the Antinomians 1632
November (?). Luther's Answer and Refutation of Some of Carlstadt's Erroneous Arguments 324	January (?). Luther's Third and Fourth Disputations Against the antinomers 1636
1528.	March. Luther's Letter Against the Sabbathers to a Good Friend 1828
March. Luther's Confession of the Lord's Supper 894	September 13 Luther's Fifth Disputation Against the Antinomians 1642
End of August. Zwingli's Response to Luther's Confession of the Lord's Supper 1228	1539.
End of August. Oeolampad's Response to Luther's Confession of the Lord's Supper 1378	January. Luther's writing "Against the Antinomians" to V. Caspar Güttel 1610
1529.	1540.
April. Luther's Sermon on the War Against the Turks 2108 October 28 Luther's Sermon on the War Against the Turks..... 2154	First half of June. Luther's Report of Eisleben's False Doctrine, etc. 1648
1530.	September 10: Luther's Sixth Disputation against the Antinomians 1647
July 3 Zwingli's Confession of Faith, of Augsburg delivered 1546	1541.
July 11 Confession of the four cities, delivered at Augsburg in . 1570.	About the end of August. Luther's Exhortation to Pray Against the Turks 2194
1532.	1542.
Beginning of the year. Luther's Letter from the Lurkers and Angle Preachers 1664	About the end of April. Brother Richard's laying of the Elder Koran, with Luther's preface. 2218
Perhaps April. Luther's appeal against some Rottengeister to Duke Albrecht of Prussia.... 1678	1543.
October 9 Luther's letter to the Counts of Schlick to keep Jáchymov clean from swarms 1686	Beginning of the year. Luther's writing about the Jews and their lies 1860
1535.	February. Luther's admonition to the pastors of the superintendency of Wittenberg to lead the people to the Prayer To admonish against the Turk 2284
Beginning of the year. Neue Zeitung von den Wiedertäufern zu Münster 1688	March. Luther's Scripture on the Shem Haniphoras and the lineage of Christ 2028
First half of the year. Melanchthon's Propositiones Wider das Buch [Restitutio], so issued at Münster in print. 1698	July 4 Schrerben to M. Simon Wolferinus. 1604
First half of the year. Amsdorf's Final Speeches Against the Anabaptists 1742	July 20 Second letter to the same 1607
Second half or later. Melanchthon's laying of some unchristian articles of the Anabaptists..... 1706	November 8 Luther's verdict on Schwenkfeld 1662
Second half or later. Melanchthon's Lessons Against the Doctrine of the Anabaptists 1724	November 8. Luther's letter to Schwenkfeld's messenger 1664
1536.	1544.
February 11 Luther's warning to Lorenz Castner and his comrades at Freiberg to beware of angle preachers 1758	End of September. Luther's Short Confession of the Holy Sacrament 1764
	Undated. Luther's Preface to Justus Menius' Book of the spirit of the Anabaptists 1760
	1556.
	Without date. M. Georg Röer's writing to the Christian reader, because of some omissions in the Wittenberg edition of Luther's writing: "That these words of Christ, that is my body, still stand firm against the raving spirits " 892

Reformation Writings.

Second part:

Dogmatic-polemical writings

B. Against the Sacramentarians and Other Weakeners,

as well as

against the Jews and Turks.

First Section.

Luther's writings against the Sacramentarians, or those who denied the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion.

I. Luther's controversial writings against the error of the sacrament, which was first brought onto the scene around Carlstadt.

1a. D. Martin Luther's Eight Sermons,

which he preached against D. Carlstadt's innovations at Wittenberg during Lent. *)

March 9-16 Anno 1522.

When the Satan of Luther's teachings, neither by the scholars, as Tetzl, Wimpina, Silvester Prierias, D. Eck, Emser, Murnar, Ochsenfurt, Latomus and others, nor by the pope and the Roman emperor and the high schools in the German lands and in France, he thought to watch Luther in another way and to do him harm by false spirits and sects, and tried to do this (according to his old ways) inwardly in the church at Wittenberg, in the place where the gospel had first come to light again, and for this he especially used D. Andreas Carlstadt, who had previously been Luther's assistant and counselor in the Leipzig disputation. The latter, because Luther was absent in his Patmo, caused havoc in Wittenberg out of a misunderstanding of Christian freedom. For after

they had learned from the gospel that a Christian life was not in outward show, images, clothing, fasting, eating or drinking 2c., 1 Tim. 4, 3. but in spirit and faith, and that eating meat, eggs 2c. He and others went to the altar, overthrew the corner mass, stormed and burned the images, destroyed the altars, abolished the auricular confession, dropped the chants and ceremonies of the church, no longer wanted to use chalices and paten, ran unheard and unacknowledged to the sacrament, wanted to prove their Christian freedom in these pieces. They did not let a sermon precede, since the Word of God had previously instructed the heart about true godliness, and the

*)The Erlangen edition lists five individual editions of this work published in Wittenberg in 1523 under the title: "Acht Sermones D. M. Lutheri von ihm gepredigt zu Wittenberg in der Fasten, darin kürzlich begriffen von den Messen, Bildnissen, beiderlei Gestalt des Sacraments, von den Speisen und heimlicher Beichte. The first four of these sermons are also found in the Latin Wittenberg edition, Dorn. VII, fol. 273 under the title: Ksrino ds rsdhs msaäis st simulasris. German in the Eisleben Collection, vol. I, p. 83; and.

They did not do it with the consent and foreknowledge of the authorities, nor did they ask that the weak be annoyed and offended by it, but did it all out of their own iniquity, presumption, and vain honor. They pretended that they were driven to it by the first commandment and Christian freedom and were full of the Holy Spirit; they condemned as heretics all those who did not agree with them. D. Carlstadt also had a book printed "on the abolition of images" in 1522, on the Monday after the conversion of St. Paul [January 27], which he attributed to Wolf Schlick, Count of Passau, 1).

When this innovation and great annoyance was brought before Luther, and he saw with a saddened mind that the devil sought to suppress doctrine, disruption, and sedition with it, he immediately rose to Wittenberg to control this evil, and preached against the undertaken

1) This name is also found in Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 263. In the Wittenberg Album, 99: "Basssun"; in Luther's letter to Seb. Schlick, De Wette, Vol. II, 231: "Passun".

The newness taught that they did not lead the right process of resisting abuses or using Christian freedom, if one therefore wanted to act by force and not first sufficiently instruct the hearts of the doctrine of faith (because this must precede), so that they would be strengthened and assured in their conscience, and not get stuck in the challenge and reproaches, why they ran to the sacrament, even attacked images from the churches, ate eggs and meat.

(3) First of all, the abominations of the Pabst concerning the sacrificial measure, images, confession, fasting, and forbidden food should be punished and condemned by the word. If, therefore, the hearts were first freed from the cords, the outward abolition would be the easier; indeed, all this would fall from him. Then, too, for the sake of the weak, patience could be exercised in the outward ordinances, and only the strong could be used for freedom; so that Christian love would nevertheless be taken into account in it, lest a poor Christian, who does not yet know about it, be annoyed.

This redaction is, as Aurifaber notes in the margin of the Eisleben edition, taken from a print that was published by Lei Antonius Otho of Nordhausen. Aurifaber has placed it in the year 1522. We only reproduce the complete redaction contained in the Eisleben edition, but only the first two sermons of the other edition, which was first published by Walch and after him also by the Erlangen edition. For we consider it sufficient that in a writing that did not flow from Luther's pen, but only from his mouth, only one and that is the best version is reproduced. We have reprinted the two sermons mentioned, however, so that the reader can convince himself by his own observation that the omission of the other six sermons is justified. For we do not consider the inclusion of such an incomplete version, teeming with errors and often meaningless, to be a desirable enrichment of Luther's works, but rather an unnecessary burden on them. There is a third, very short, redaction, which has made the rounds through all previous editions. It is first published in the Jena edition of 1555, vol. II, p. 53 b under the title: "Schrift D. M. L. wider die Neuerung zu Wittenberg, durch D. Carlstad angericht, weil D. Martinus, held after the Diet of Worms, Anno 1521 was in his pathmo. Anno MDXXII." As a marginal gloss is added: "This writing has not been entirely available, but as much of it as is available has been put in so that it does not get lost, because it was written by D. M. himself," and so on. From the Jena edition, it is transferred to the Wittenberg edition of 1557, vol. IX, p. 144b and also added to the writings of 1522, but the words "Schrift D. M. L." are missing in the title. From it printed in the Altenburger, vol. II, p. 89; and with a somewhat changed title in the Leipziger, vol. XVIII, p. 247. Walch, vol. XV, 2370 has as its heading: "Antwortschreiben an die Wittenberger, wider die bei seiner Abwesenheit zu Wittenberg angerichtete Carlstädtische Neuerung, woinnen er sie theils bestraft, theils auch unterrichtet"; without indication of the time. De Wette, Vol. II, p. 118, is the first to date this letter "An die Wittenberger. Fragment" to the year "1521 perhaps in December". The Erlanger, vol. 53, 99, reprinted from De Wette, but leaves out the "perhaps" in determining the time. This so-called letter or scripture is obviously a short summary of the first five sermons given here. Almost sentence for sentence can be traced in the sermons; even the expression "puri Purdi" (Walch, Vol. XV, 2372, § 8) is repeated in the penultimate § of the fifth sermon; not a single thought is contained therein that is not found in the sermons, only that Carlstadt's name is mentioned twice, likewise Duke George and Meissen and Leipzig. Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 291 sf, places this "sharp rebuke of the Wittenbergers" at the end of February 1522 (on what grounds, we do not know) and then gives a rather extensive excerpt. Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 527, sees in it "a written address to his Wittenbergers, which, however, did not come to the conclusion and to the dispatch, because he himself appeared with them instead of them", and transfers the same also into February. It is correctly noted that in it "the main thing he had to say to them is briefly and sharply summarized". Nevertheless, we are not able to see anything else in it than a summa of Luther's sermons, which is hardly written by Luther himself. The "gestellet" only indicates the intellectual authorship, just as Luther's "Preface" to the second volume of the Wittenberg edition, "vor seinem Abschied gestellet," was not written by him, but was compiled from several of Luther's writings. - The introduction to the eight sermons was written by Johann Aurifaber.

The first sermon.

On Sunday Invocavit.

(1) We are all called to death, and shall not die for one another: but every man in his own person must be armed and prepared to fight for himself with the devil and with death. Hebr. 9, 27. We may cry in one another's ears, comforting and exhorting them to patience, to fight and to battle, but we cannot fight or battle for him; each one must look to his own fortress and engage himself in battle with the enemy, with the devil and death, and lie alone with them. Then I will not be with you, nor you with me. Therefore, every man himself must know the main things that concern a Christian man, so that he may be prepared for this serious battle, which are those that your love has often heard from me.

2. first, we must know that we are all children of wrath, and that all our works, thoughts and senses are sinful and nothing in the sight of God, so that we may not come before God with them, however beautiful they may be. And in this we must have a bright clear saying from the Scriptures, on which we must be founded, which clearly shows us that this is so. Although there are many of these sayings in the Scriptures, I do not want to overwhelm you with many sayings, but rather hold up to you this single and short saying of St. Paul, which he writes to the Ephesians and says: "We are all by nature children of wrath" 2c., Eph. 2, 3. Let this saying be well commanded to you.

3. secondly, we must also know that God sent His only begotten Son into the world out of pure grace and goodness, that we should believe and trust in Him; thus, whoever believes in Him shall be free from sin and be a child of God, as John says in the beginning of his Gospel: "But as many as received Him, to them He gave power to become children of God, who believe in His name", Jn. 1:12. 1) In this piece

1) Erlanger: Joh. 1, 11. This wrong citation, and in this writing still three others, is from the old Walch.

we should all be well acquainted with the Bible and equipped with bright, clear sayings to hold against the devil. For if you do not have a certain, bright, clear word of God in this battle, you cannot stand. And especially remember this saying of Christ in John: "God so loved the world that He gave His only Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have eternal life. For God did not send His Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. Whoever believes in him will not be judged. But he who does not believe is already judged, for he does not believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God," John 3:16, 17, 18. Likewise, note this saying of John the Baptist: "The Father loves the Son and has given all things into His hand. He who believes in the Son has eternal life. He who does not believe in the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him," John 3:35 ff.

(4) In these two things I do not yet perceive any defect or error in you, but they are preached to you purely and correctly. And I would be heartily sorry if it had happened otherwise than rightly. Yes, I see it well, and may well say that you are more learned in this than I am: not only one, two, three, four, 2) but probably ten, twenty and more, who are all well and truly enlightened in these two main pieces, and would not have thought that in such a short time, perhaps in a year, it should have risen so high.

5) Thirdly, we must also have love and through love do to one another as God has done to us through faith; without which love faith is nothing, as St. Paul says to the Corinthians: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And if I could prophesy, and knew all mysteries, I should be a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

The first edition is reprinted in the second edition. Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 885, note 2.

2) In the Eisleben edition: "one, two, three, four. That the reading we have given is correct is evident from comparison with the other print of these sermons from 1523.

If I had all faith, so that I could move mountains, and yet had not love, I would be nothing. And if I give all my possessions to the poor, and let my body burn, and have not love, it is of no use to me. Here, dear friends, this piece is almost lacking, and I do not feel any love in any of them, and I almost realize that you have been ungrateful to God for such rightful treasures and gifts, which He has sent to you in a short time, and has given to you for nothing. Therefore let us see to it that Wittenberg does not become Capernaum, Matth. 11, 23. I see and notice that you are well able and know how to speak of the doctrine that is preached to you, as of faith and also of love; which is no wonder, although you can speak much of it. It is almost possible to teach an ass to sing; should you not learn so much that you should repeat the doctrine and the words? But, dear friends, God's kingdom does not stand in speech or in words, but in power and in deed, 1 Cor. 4, 20. For God does not want only hearers and persecutors, but followers and doers, Jac. 1, 22, who keep the word, Luc. 8, 15, who practice the faith that is strengthened by love, Gal. 5, 5. 6. For faith without love is worthless; indeed, it is not faith, but only an appearance of faith. Just as a face seen in a mirror is not a true face, but only an appearance of the face.

6 Fourth, we also need patience. For he who has faith, trusts in God and shows love toward his neighbor, and practices the same daily, cannot be without persecution, 2 Tim. 3:11, for the devil neither sleeps nor rests, but gives men enough to do. But persecution brings patience. For if I am not persecuted nor challenged, I know little to speak of patience. After that patience brings hope, Rom. 5, 4. which then freely surrenders and swings in God, and does not let itself be put to shame. And so, through many trials and persecutions, faith increases more and more, and

grows stronger day by day. Such a heart, in which faith thus increases and is endowed with such virtues, cannot rest nor abstain, but must in turn pour itself out and do good to its neighbor, as has been done and befallen it by God.

(7) Here, dear friends, not every man must do what he has a right to do, but must also forgive himself his right and see what is useful and beneficial for his brother, as St. Paul did, who wrote to the Corinthians: "I have all power, but not all profit to me," 1 Corinthians 6:12. 6:12, and then in chapter 9, vv. 19-23, he says: "Though I am free from all men, yet have I made myself the servant of all men, that I might gain much. To those who are under the law I became as under the law, that I might gain those who are under the law. To those who are without law I have become as without law (though I am not without God's law, but am in the law of Christ), that I may win those who are without law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I became all things to all men, that I might save some of all things. But these things do I for the gospel's sake, that I may be made partakers of its fellowship.

(8) In these words of Paul we are instructed how we, who have now received faith from God, are to conduct ourselves toward everyone, namely, to direct ourselves according to our neighbor's weakness. For we are not all equally strong in faith. I have a stronger faith than some of you. Some of you have stronger faith than I, and so it is a mixed thing among us. Yea, he that hath strong faith today may have it weak tomorrow; and again, he that hath weak faith today may have it strong tomorrow. Therefore we must not look to ourselves and our faith or fortune alone, but look to our neighbor, that we may conform ourselves to him, and not offend him with our liberty. So that I may tell you a gross similitude: If a man bear a sword, and be alone, he may bear the sword bare, or not bare; he may not bear it bare, but bear it alone.

1) In the other imprint of 1523 probably better: "rich".

1) or not, there is little that matters; but when he is in the crowd or with children, he must be much more careful with the knife, so that he does not harm anyone. In the same way, we must keep our freedom so that we do not give anyone cause to take offense at us and our freedom. Let us not forget how God has borne and tolerated our weakness, even our unbelief, for a long time, and thus also bear patience with our neighbor, even if he cannot follow us so soon, even if he still struggles and lacks at times. Listen to how God cries out in the prophets that he carries his people like a mother carries her child, Isa. 46, 3. He feeds them like a nurse feeds the child. How does the mother feed or nourish her child? First she gives him milk, then porridge, then eggs, and so soft food, until the child is used to harder food and can eat cheese and bread from then on. For if the mother were first to give the child cheese and bread, roasted and boiled meat to eat and wine to drink, what would become of it?

(9) In the same way we should deal with our weak brothers, be patient with them for a while and suffer their weak faith, even give them milk and soft food at first, 1 Pet 2:2. As it has happened to us, until they also become strong; not snapping at them cruelly, but acting kindly and instructing and teaching them in all gentleness, so that we may not think of going to heaven alone; but seek to bring your brother with you. Even though they are now our enemies and do not have perfect faith, they will yet become our friends and let go of unbelief. If all mothers should reject their impure, shameless, unclean children, where do you think we would be? Dear brother, when you have suckled enough, do not cut off the teats immediately, but let your brother suckle as long as you have suckled.

(10) I say all this because I see that you have been lacking in this piece, and have been grossly-

1) Otherwise, the form "störzen" also occurs, i.e. to fall, to swing.

I would not have gone as far as I did if I had been here. I would not have taken it as far as it has gone if I had been here. The thing is good in itself, but the hurry is too fast. For on that side there are also brothers and sisters who belong to us; they still have to be brought here. Faith should stand firm and steadfast, but love must and may be guided, as one can see that it wants to be according to the neighbor's need.

11) Take a similitude: The sun has two things, the shine or brilliance, and the heat. There is no king so strong and mighty as to bend or direct the brightness and rays of the sun, for it cannot be directed, but remains fixed in its places; 2) but the heat directs itself, and yet is all about the sun. So faith must always remain fixed and immovable in our hearts, and must not depart from it nor waver; but love moves and is directed, according as our neighbor may understand and follow it. There are some who can run, some who can walk, but some who can hardly crawl. Therefore we must consider not our own ability but our brother's weakness and imperfection, so that he who is weak in faith, if he would follow the strong, may not be torn asunder by the devil.

Therefore, dear friends, follow me! I have never spoiled it; I was the first one whom God put on this plan; I cannot escape God, but must remain until it pleases God, my Lord; I was also the one whom God first revealed to preach and proclaim such His word to you. I am also certain that you have the pure, unadulterated word of God. Therefore, let us do well in this, and let us be careful to act on the same divine word with fear and humility, to lie under one another's feet, to join hands, to help one another, to counsel one another, and to do good to one another in all their needs, and to take care of one another's misfortunes, fears, hardships, and distresses as if they were our own.

2) Here "örtern" means to assign to a place, to put in a place.

(13) I will do mine own part in this, and speak my mind as I ought, and mine heartily to you, as I do to my soul; but if there be any that have better, and be revealed unto him more than unto me, I will submit my mind and understanding unto him, and will not set my mind above his head, but will follow him. But if it should be found that my opinion and understanding were right, I will not suffer anyone to set his head above my mind. Let us all work together in harmony, it will nevertheless cost us enough effort, if we are to remain with the pure, loud, righteous words of God. For we are not arguing here against the pope, bishops and worldly rulers, for these are coarse heads, which one can well recognize that they are mistaken and only pretend coarse things, which one can almost understand with reason, but we are arguing against the devil, against the spirits of wickedness under heaven, not against flesh and blood, as Paul says to the Ephesians in the 6th chapter, v. 12.

14 Therefore, dear friends, do not think that Satan is asleep and quiet; indeed, he attacks us in all places and with all cunning. He has many arts; if one does not go away, he soon has another; we are far too bad and simple for him; he is an artist of a thousand. He sees the true light of the gospel shining so clearly that he is not allowed to look him straight in the eye; therefore he would like to come to his side and try his salvation there, if he could tear in beside him; he will also do it, if we do not look diligent. For I know him well, and he also knows me well; but I hope that I am his master. But if we leave him only a foot's breadth, we may see to it that we are rid of him.

(15) For this reason all those who helped and permitted the mass to be done have erred, not that it was not good, but that it was not done properly. You say: It is right from the Scriptures. I also say it, but where is the order with it? For it was done in a sacrilege without all order, with offense to the neighbor. You should have earnestly asked God for it beforehand.

If you had prayed and taken the authorities, you would have known that it was because of God. I would have started it, too, if it had been good; but it will not suffer soon to throw away all evil things so suddenly and without order. Therefore, if it were not such an evil thing about the mass, I would again establish it, in spite of those who have handled it disorderly; for I do not know how to defend or maintain that you have done well in this; I have just told you.

(16) Before the papists and before the rude heads I could well do it, for I would speak: What do you know whether it was done in a good spirit or in an evil spirit, since the work is good in itself? But before the devil I do not know how to dispute it; for if the devil will reproach those who have started this game with these sayings or the like when they die: "All plants that my heavenly Father has not planted will be cut down," Matth. 15:13, or the one from the prophet Jeremiah: "I did not send the prophets, yet they walked; I spoke nothing to them, yet they preached and prophesied," Jer. 23:21, how will they survive? They will certainly have to go to hell. But I will hold a cannon 1) in front of the devil's nose, so that even the wide world will become too narrow for him, for I know and am certain that I did not accept my preaching ministry of my own accord, nor did I intrude, but was called upon to do so, and was also chosen to preach here against my will. 2)

17 Therefore you have done wrong, that you have begun such a game without my command and consent, and have not also asked me beforehand.

(18) I have not been so far from you that you could ever have reached me with writings, for it is not the least bit;

1) In the other edition of 1523, instead of "Sprütze" it says "Spitze", which seems to us to be a better reading.

2) For several years, Luther had been entrusted with the preaching office at the parish church of the city of Wittenberg, to help the sickly Simon Heinz from Brück, brother of Chancellor Brück. He died in 1522, and only in 1523 Bugenhagen became his successor, next to whom Luther also preached frequently.

It would have been worthwhile if you had sent to me for this. If you want to sow something thoughtlessly and out of a sacrilege, and I should answer for it afterwards, that would be too difficult for me, I will not do it. All this shows that you do not have the Spirit, even though you have a high knowledge of the Scriptures. There is a great difference between these two things: "must be" and "be free." For "must be" is that which necessity demands, and must exist unsteadily, as there is faith; which I will not let be taken from me nor overthrown, but must always have in my heart and freely confess before everyone. But "to be free" is that which I have freely, and may use it or let it stand, so that my neighbor, and not I, has the benefit of it. Therefore do not make "being free" into "having to be," as you have now done, lest you should have to give account for those who are tempted by your uncharitable freedom. For if you tempt someone to eat meat on Friday, and he is challenged because of this in mortal distress, and thus thinks, "O woe is me, that I have eaten meat and cannot stand!"

(19) I would have started many things, since not a few would have followed me; but what is the use? For I know [that] those who have started such things, when it comes to the meeting, as you now see, that they cannot stand, indeed [would be] the first to resign. Dear, how would it stand if I brought the bunch on the plan, and I [who had been] the first, had stopped the others, and wanted to flee from it myself and not wait for death happily: ei, how should the poor bunch be deceived! Therefore let us also give milk to the others, as has happened to us, until they also become strong in the faith. For there are still many of them who fall to us in other things, and would gladly praise and accept these things also, but they cannot yet well understand; all of them we drive back with such impudent impetuosity. We must not forget our love for our neighbor, but always keep it in mind and judge all things by it. If we will

If we do not do this, our being will not stand. We must be patient for a while with those who are still weak in faith and not reject them. How much more should we do and leave it, if love requires it and does not harm our faith! Therefore I say and warn you faithfully: if we do not earnestly ask God and send ourselves right into the matter, then the game looks to me that all the misery, which the papists started from us, will come upon us. Therefore, I could not stay outside any longer, but I had to come and tell you this. That's enough about the mass; tomorrow we will talk a little more about it and also about the pictures.

The second sermon.

On the Monday after the Sunday Invocavit.

Dear friends! Yesterday you heard what pieces a Christian man should have in him, namely how the whole Christian life and being is "to believe" and "to love". Faith is directed toward God, but love is directed toward man and neighbor, so that we show ourselves in love toward man by doing good, by counseling, by helping, as we have received good and help from God without our merit and work, in vain, out of pure grace and mercy.

(2) Now there are two things which a Christian man should and must respect. The one that is necessary, namely that it must be done in this way and not otherwise; the other that is free and unnecessary, which may or may not be kept without danger to the faith and the souls' salvation. In these two things, love must act with one's neighbor as God has done for us, and thus walk the right road and not fall either to the left or to the right.

(3) In the things that must be or are necessary, such as believing in Christ, love nevertheless acts in such a way that it does not force, nor is it too severe. As, the mass is an evil thing and God is its enemy, in that it is done as if it were a sacrifice and meritorious work; therefore, it is not a sacrifice and meritorious work.

they must be done. Here is no questioning or doubting, as little as you should ask whether God is to be worshipped. Although we are now in complete agreement in this matter, since the special masses must and should be stopped, as I also wrote about them and wanted them to be stopped throughout the world, and only the common evangelical mass to be kept; nevertheless, love should not be strict in this matter and tear down these masses by force. Let it be preached, written, and proclaimed that the mass held in this way is sinful. But no one is to be torn away from it by the hair, but one is to give it home to God and let his word work alone, without our doing or works. Why? Because I do not have the hearts of men in my hand, as the potter has the clay, to work with them according to my pleasure, as God has the hearts of all men in his hand, to convert them or to harden them, Jer. 18:6, Rom. 9:21. I cannot go further with the word than into the ears; I cannot go into the heart. Since faith cannot be poured into the heart, no one can or should be forced or compelled to do so, for God alone does this and makes the word alive in the hearts of men when and where He wills, according to His divine knowledge and good pleasure. Therefore, let the word go freely and do not add our works to it. We have *jus verbi*, and not *executionem*, that is, we are to preach the word, but the consequence is to be placed in the service of God.

(4) If then I fall, and will forcibly put away such abuse of the masses, there are many of them that must enter into it, and yet know not how they are, whether it be right or wrong; saying then: I do not know what my position is; I have had to follow the congregation, the crowd and the congregation; they have an erroneous, restless conscience, which they can hardly get rid of. And out of the compulsory commandment alone a mirror fencing, an outward being, a monkey play and a human statute; from it then shining saints, hypocrites and gleamers come. For there is no heart, no faith, nor love. Where these three pieces

If you don't come up with a work that is as right and good as you want it to be, then nothing will come of it; I didn't want to give a pear stem to it.

5 The people's hearts must be seen for the first time, which is what happens when I preach God's word, preach the gospel, proclaim to the people their error, and say: "Dear lords, dear priests, dear papists, leave the mass; it is not right for you to keep the mass, you sin in it and anger God with it; that is what I want to have said to you. But I did not want to make a statute for them, nor did I want to insist on a common order. Whoever wanted to follow, followed; whoever did not want to, remained outside.

If one did this, the word would fall into the heart of one person today, and into the heart of another tomorrow, and would have such an effect that one would have to give himself up as a prisoner and consider himself guilty that he had erred in this, and would go and fall from the mass by himself. Thus God worked more with His word than if you and I and the whole world melted all power into one heap. For with the word God takes the heart; when the heart is taken, you have already won the man. Then the thing must at last fall from itself and cease.

(7) But when all the mind and spirit are united, and all things become one at the same time, so that there is no more weakness, then do away with that which is not right. But if all mind and heart are not yet there, then let God rule; then I beg you, for you do no good.

(8) I do not say this to restore the mass, but leave it in God's name; because it has fallen, let it fall. Only this must be respected and preached at all times, so that faith will not be trapped or bound, nor will it be constrained to any work by any order. Then follow this and no other. With such storms and violence you will not lead it out, you will see. And if ye therefore tarry, and will not be led, know that I will not stand with you; I will also beseech you. What harm can it do you, if you stay for a while with

Do you have patience with such outward things? Do you I have done all this and acted accordingly. Even if I had have pure and strong faith in God, so that this thing cannot driven into this with violence and mischief, I should harm you? Love requires that you have compassion on probably have started such a game that Germany would the weak until they also increase in faith and become have come into great bloodshed. But what would it have stronger. This is what all the apostles did. Paul, when he been? It would have been a fool's game and a ruin of came to Athens, a mighty city, found altars built in the body and soul. I sat quietly and let the word act.

temple, and went from one to another, beholding them all, (12) What do you think that the devil thinks when such and all the idolatry thereof; but he touched none of them a thing is done with rumor? He sits behind hell and thinks, with his foot, but stood in the midst of the place, and told "Oh, how the fools will make such a fine game for me! the people that it was a vain idolatrous thing. And when That is how I would have it; I will get my share from this the word had taken hold of their hearts, the idols booty; so let them continue; this is just a game for me in themselves fell away, and all idolatry was consumed from which I take pleasure. The devil is not greatly harmed by themselves, without all violence and without all tempest, such storms, but he is frightened when we do the word and let it work alone; it is all-powerful and takes hearts captive. When the heart is captured, the work must fall Apost. 17, 22-34.

(9) So it should have been done here also. If I had seen that the priests had held mass, I would have away from itself and go to ruins.
preached and admonished that it was blasphemy and that 013 There were also sects in time past among the God would be greatly angered by it. If they had complied, Jews and Gentiles concerning the law of Moses, and I would have won them over; but if not, I would not have especially concerning circumcision: some would keep the torn them away by the hair and by force, but would have law, and some would not. Then Paul came and preached let the Word act and prayed for them. For the Word that people should keep the Law of Moses or not, for created heaven and earth and all things, Genesis 1:1, there was no power in it, and they should not be forced to Psalm 33:6; the same Word must do it here, and not we keep it, but should be free to do so, and there was no poor sinners. danger in keeping it or not.

Summa Summarum: I will preach it, I will say it, I will 14 This lasted until the time of Jerome, who came and write it, but I will not force anyone, because faith wants to wanted to make it an obligation, wanted to put it into an be accepted willingly and without coercion. order and statute and force it to be done away with. Then

11 Take me as an example. I have opposed the pope, Augustine came, and was also of the same opinion as the indulgence and all papists, but with no violence, with Saint Paul, and said: one should keep it, or not keep it. no sacrilege, with no storming, but with the word of God St. Jerome was probably a hundred miles from St. Paul's alone I have driven, preached and written; otherwise opinion. There, the two Doctors ran very hard with their have done nothing at all. That same word, when I have heads together, and no one wanted to give way to the been asleep or in good spirits, has accomplished so much other. But now that Augustine had died, Jerome brought it to the point that it had to be stopped. After that came that the papacy has become so weak and powerless that the popes, who also wanted to do something about it, and no prince or emperor has ever been able to break off so made laws; then many thousands of laws grew out of the much. I have not done it; the few words preached and one law, so that they have now overwhelmed us with shouted by me laws.

(15) So it will be here also, if one wants to grasp the of the devil, through those who are liars in glibness, and thing with laws. For one law soon makes two, two make have brands in their consciences, and forbid to marry, and three, and so on, so that in the end there would be no end to shun the food which God has created, to take with to the laws. That is enough for this time. Let us only take thanksgiving the faithful, and those who know the truth." care, dear friends, that we do not confuse or deceive the (3) Now in those things which are free, which may or weak consciences with our iniquities, for which Christ also may not be done, keep thyself thus: If thou canst keep such died, as well as for our sake, as St. Paul clearly teaches things without burdening thy conscience, keep them to the Romans, Cap. 14, 1. always; but if thou canst not, let it stand, lest thou fall into greater burden. Here no common commandment need be made, but each one should be free to accept or not to accept. As if a priest, monk or nun cannot abstain, but has a desire for the conjugal life, he or they may freely become conjugal, so that the consciences may be advised, 'and no commandment or prohibition shall be made to them in this.

The third sermon.

On the Tuesday after the Sunday Invocavit.

(1) We have now heard, dear friends, the things that must be, and that are necessary, which must be done, that and no other; but that one must do away with the angular or special masses, which are against God. For I mean that all works must be done which are commanded or forbidden by God, and which the high majesty of God has thus decreed to be done. But besides this, you have also heard that no one is to be dragged to or from it by the hair, but to let the word preach and work freely, without our interference, where it should and will. For I cannot drive any man to heaven, or beat him with knuckles [there]. That, I think, is said roughly enough; I also think you have understood it well enough, and I hope you will do the same.

Now follow the things that are unnecessary and left free by God, which one may or may not keep; such as becoming married, removing images, becoming monks and nuns, monks and nuns leaving the monasteries, eating meat and not eating on Fridays, and what such things are more. These things are all free and need not be forbidden by anyone; but if they are forbidden, it is wrong, for it is against God's order. Yes, St. Paul calls it the doctrine of the devil and of the end of Christ, 1st Epistle to Timothy 4, v. 1, 2, 3, where he says: "But the Spirit clearly says that in the last times some will depart from the faith and follow false spirits and doctrines.

4 But you must see to it that you are prepared and armed, so that you can stand before God and before the world when you are challenged on this account, especially at death and in the deathbed before the devil. It is not enough that you would say: This one and that one did it; my neighbor eats meat on Friday, therefore I also ate it; everyone does so now, therefore I also do it; I followed the common crowd, and what are the more unstable, unfounded words. That you wanted to say: This or that preacher 1) has preached it; it does not apply, does not hold the sting; the devil does not turn to it either. Yes, if you are not more certain and better equipped than with such weak armor, then you have already lost. In this case, everyone must stand up for himself and be prepared in the strongest possible way to fight against the devil. You must base yourself on a bright, clear, strong saying of the Scriptures, by which you can stand. For if you do not have such a saying, it is not possible for you to stand; the devil will snatch you away as the wind snatches away a dry leaf.

1) In the other edition: "I followed the common crowd, when the provost, Doctor Carlstadt, Gabriel [Zwilling] or Michael preached to us."

(5) Therefore, whichever priests have taken wives, so soon conclude and judge: This priest has taken a wife, and whichever nuns have married, they must have for therefore all priests must take wives. Not yet! The monk, themselves a certain saying from the Scriptures, upon this nun has left the monastery, therefore they all must which they may plead against the devil and against the leave. Not yet! He has burned the images, that one has world, which will not leave such divine work broken the crucifixes, therefore we must all burn and unchallenged. And especially may they remember this break. Not yet! Again, if I were to say: The priest has no saying of St. Paul, which we have told above, that the wife, therefore no priest must have no wife, nor become devil's doctrine is to forbid marriage and to forbid food. married. Not yet! For they that cannot keep chastity take The devil will not overthrow or eat this saying; indeed, he wives; but they that can keep chastity, it is good for them will be eaten and overthrown by this saying.

-Now, if any priest, monk or nun finds himself too weak the spirit, and not in the flesh.

to keep chastity and wants to become married, let him (8) Nor shall monks and nuns dispute the vows they look at his conscience. If his heart and conscience are so have made, vowing chastity, obedience and poverty. For strengthened that it can stand, and be sure that it is not we cannot vow anything against God's word. 1) God has against God, he can become married with a good made it free to become married or not, and you fool dare conscience and a happy heart. If God wanted all monks to make a vow out of this freedom against God's order. and nuns to have this understanding, and if they all ran Therefore, let it remain a freedom and do not make it a away from the monasteries, and if all monasteries in the compulsion. Vows or not, vows or not, they are not valid whole world ceased to exist, that would be my wish and here, because they are against God's commandment and my heartfelt desire. But now they do not have the order. Such vows are as much as if I vowed to hit my understanding (because no one preaches it to them) and father in the mouth or to take someone's property. Do you from hearing that others run away from the monasteries, think God would be pleased with that? As little as I should they also go out, and because of that, that others become keep a vow to strike my father in the mouth or to take married, they also take wives and husbands, without another's, so little should I keep chastity by vow, for God reason and with an unsteady conscience, that is evil. For has decreed otherwise on both sides.

(9) Likewise, God has decreed that it is free to eat fish or meat, and there shall be no commandment or prohibition here. Therefore, all Carthusians, all monks, nuns and all those who are under the pope's laws, step away from God's order and from the freedom that God has given them. But they know nothing to say about this freedom, but stand on their human statutes and rules; they think that if they ate meat, they would be lost.

7 So this is the summa of it in short words: What God has made free, that shall remain free. But if someone bequeaths it to you, as the pope did, the end-Christ, you shall not follow him. But whoever can do or not do something without harming himself, why would he not do it? I may well wear a cap or plate for the love and service of my neighbor, if only it does me no harm to my faith. So, dear friends, it has been said clearly enough, and I think you should now understand that you should not make a commandment out of freedom, and not

1) So in the old edition of Walch. In the Eisleben edition: "Gebot", which does not fit here.

restrains. Thus it is to be understood of all things that God has left free, where there is no public commandment or prohibition; therein every man must keep himself, that he offend not his neighbor, neither act contrary to his faith and conscience.

We must also say a little of the images.

(10) As for the images, they are unnecessary; but it is left free to have them or not to have them. Although it would be better if we had none of these images at all, for the sake of the tiresome misuse and unbelief. A great dispute arose about the images between an emperor and the pope. 1) The emperor wanted that there should be no image, but the pope said that they must be; and finally this deal was broken with great bloodshed. But they both failed, in that they made a must out of that which God had left free. Dear, do not let yourself think more than the high divine majesty. If God had wanted to make a commandment or a prohibition out of it, he could have done it. Because he has left it free, why do you want to be so bold and make a commandment or prohibition against God's freedom?

11 Yes, said the same iconoclasts, in the 2nd book of Moses it is written: "You shall not make for yourself an image or any likeness, either of what is in heaven above or of what is on the earth beneath, or of what is in the water under the earth," Ex 20:4. Behold, they say, these are clear, bright words, by which the images are forbidden. I know it well, dear friends, that this is their reason, but they will not harm us with this text. For if we look at the first commandment and the whole opinion of the same text, this is the mind and opinion of Moses, that we should worship only One God, and no image, as is also clearly stated in the text that soon follows, v. 5: "Do not worship or serve them." Therefore one should say to the same iconoclasts: Worship is forbidden here,

and not the making. I may well have or make pictures, but I should not worship them.

012 And if they say, It is clearly written, Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image; say thou, It is clearly written, Thou shalt not worship them. Summa, they only deal with the fact that they make us uncertain and wavering over this text. But who will be so bold in such wavering as this, and go and break down the images? Not I. Noah, Abraham, Jacob and other patriarchs have built altars to the Lord. Moses set up a bronze serpent in the desert, Numbers 21:9, who himself forbade not to make an image. Is a snake not also an image? What do the iconoclasts have to say about this? Item, were there also two cherubim with wings made over the mercy seat in the temple, at the very place where God alone wanted to be sought and worshipped, Ex. 25, 8-20. Are these not also images? How can you be so bold as to freely conclude from this text that the images should be stormed and torn down?

(13) Therefore we must confess and conclude that we may make and have images, but not worship them. But if there be any images which we would worship, let those images be broken, and taken down; yet not with a tempest and an outrage, but let the authorities command it to be done. This is what King Ezekiel did when he broke the bronze serpent that Moses had set up. 2 Kings 18:4.

14 If the iconoclasts were so bold as to say: Yes, they also worshipped the images, therefore we are also caused, like the king Ezechias, to tear down and break the images. So they would have to answer: "Are you the man who can blame us for having worshipped the images? How can you see into our heart? How can you know whether we have worshipped them or not? Above this answer they must fall silent. That is why we have made a big mistake here and have gone too far with iconoclasm. There is another way to outline images. It should be preached that images are nothing, and that one does not serve God by them.

would do, if one aligned images. If one had done so to him, the images would have passed away and perished by themselves.

(15) So Paul did in Athens, as ye have heard. He went into the temple and looked at all their idols and images, but he did not go and break them or strike them on the mouth, but stood in the middle of the square and punished the Athenians for their superstition and idolatry. He preached against idolatry, but he did not tear down any image by force. But you want to go and tear down the altars without any preaching, demolish the images and cause much turmoil. Not yet, for you will not destroy the images; indeed, you will raise them up stronger and stronger in this way. If you storm the images right here in Wittenberg, do you think they will be overthrown all over the world? Not yet! St. Paul, as it says in the Histories of the Apostles Cap. 28, 11, once sailed in a ship with the twins Castor and Pollux, two idols, painted on a banner. He did not allow himself to be challenged, did not ask for them to be torn down, did not ask anything about them, but always continued, leaving them standing as they were.

16 From all this you should know that no outward thing can harm the faith, nor can it cause any harm; but care must be taken that the heart is not attached to outward things, nor does it dare to be attached to them. We must preach and say this and let the word (as heard) take effect. For this must first capture and enlighten the heart. We are not the ones who should or can do it; it takes another power and authority. That is why the apostles boast in their writings only of the ministry (*ministrarii*), 1) and not of the *execution* (*executionis*). Let us leave it at that and call upon God for mercy.

The fourth sermon.

On the Wednesday after the Sunday Invocavit.

These days, dear friends, we have heard of the things that are necessary and must be done, such as that the mass be celebrated for

1) The two bracketed Latin words are inserted from the other edition.

not to hold any sacrifice, and what is contrary to God's word, and is done and performed with vexation of conscience contrary to faith, that one should consider all these things to be necessary to do away with and to forbear. After this we have also spoken of some things which are unnecessary, which do not urge any necessity, but should be free, such as abstaining from married life, from monasticism and nunnery, and from images. So far we have dealt with these four things and said that love should be the captain and master in them.

(2) And especially of the images I have spoken next, that they should be removed when they are worshipped; otherwise they may well be suffered. Although I would like the images to be removed throughout the world for the sake of the grievous abuse, which no one can deny. For if someone has an image placed in the church, he soon thinks that he is doing God a service and good in it, and that he has done a good work, so that he may earn something from God, which is really idolatry. This is the greatest and most noble reason why the images should be removed. But you have not used this cause, but a much lesser one, namely, that if a man had an image, he would hold it like the image; as if a man had a crucifix, he would hold it no differently than if it were Christ, God, and man himself, and the like. These are very small causes. For I believe that there is no one here who has the gross, senseless mind to think that this crucifix is my Christ and my God, but he thinks it is only a sign that he remembers the Lord Christ and his suffering. But the world is full of the other abuse. For who would place a wooden, let alone a silver or gold image in the church, if he did not intend to do God a service by it? Do you also think that princes, bishops and other great merchants would have allowed so many more precious, silver and gold images to be placed in churches and monasteries, if they did not think that it should count for something before God? Yes, they would have let it be.

3 This cause would not be sufficient yet,

to overthrow, destroy and burn all images. For there are still many people who do not have this opinion, but can and know how to use the images well; although these people are still few. Therefore we cannot condemn it, nor should we condemn it so soon as any man may yet use it. But this would have been the right way, as it was also said next, that one would have preached that the images were nothing, God did not ask anything about them, one would also do God no service nor pleasure with them, if all corners were made full of images, of silver or of gold, and that it would be better to help poor people with such money, than to put many images according to this opinion, since God has commanded that, but not this. If princes, bishops and other people had heard such things, the images would have fallen away from themselves without any fuss or commotion and would have perished, as it had already happened in Schwang.

(4) Therefore we must be careful, for the devil seeks us through his apostles most earnestly and acutely, and must not so soon, when there is an abuse of a thing, that we want to overthrow or destroy that same thing. For if we were to reject everything that is misused, what kind of a game would we be playing? There are many people who worship the sun, the moon, and the stars; shall we therefore go and cast the stars out of heaven, and cast down the sun and the moon? Yes, we will probably leave it.

(5) Wine and women are a source of misery and heartache to many, and they make fools and mad men of many; shall we therefore pour out the wine and kill the women? Not so. Gold and silver, money and goods cause much evil among men; shall we therefore throw them all away?

No, truly. Yes, if we wanted to drive out our nearest enemy, who is most harmful to us, we would have to drive out and kill ourselves. For we have no enemy more harmful than our own heart; as the prophet Jeremiah says Cap. 17:9: "The human heart is crooked," or, as I put it, "The human heart is not good.

German, wicked and odd, which is always receding to the side. Dear, what would we do if we did that to him? We would not do anything good, but turn everything around to the bottom and the top, The devil is certainly there, but we do not see it. Someone must have good money if one wants to make the devil black, because he also wants to be beautiful when he is invited to church mass.

7) So one must roast him 1) and saw. So speak, and ask one who has many images made: Tell me, my dear, is this why you put the images in the churches, so that you think you are doing God a service and good in them? If he says yes, as he must certainly say yes, you can soon conclude from this and say that he has made idolatry out of it, has thus misused the image and done that which God has not commanded; but he has neglected God's commandment, namely, that he should have helped the poor with it, which he has not done. Yes, he says, I can still give to the poor, Marc. 14, 7. and also have pictures made; what have I lost? To this you answer: that it is impossible, if he believes it with all his heart, that he is not doing God any service or favor by his image-making, that he would let any such great expense go to it; he would rather give a poor man a florin or two than spend fifty, sixty, a hundred florins and even more on a useless thing. But with this I cannot yet sufficiently argue that therefore the images should not be, or that they should be broken and torn down. Therefore we must conclude and leave it at that, that the images are neither otherwise nor so, neither good nor evil, but let it be free to have them or not to have them, only that the belief or delusion is that we do no service nor pleasure to God with our image-making.

The devil has taken something from you here that he should not have taken from me, namely,

1) The word "beröhsten" occurs only here. Dietz in his dictionary says: "The sense is: to present captious questions." Should it not rather be: to warm someone up, to corner him?

that we must let the images be free, since we must confess that there are ever people, or can be invented, who make good use of the images. Yes, if there were only one on the whole earth who did not misuse them, the devil could say against me: "Why do you condemn that which can still be well used? He has attained defiance, and I must admit it; he would not have attained it by a long shot if I had been here. In his arrogance and defiance, he has won a great deal from us. Although it brings no harm to the word of God.

(9) You wanted to make the devil black, but you forgot the coals and took chalk for the coals. Therefore, if we want to fight with the devil, we must be careful to use the Scriptures well; that is enough.

[From dishes.]

(10) Now let us go on and say a little about the eating of meat, how one should keep oneself inside. It is true, dear friends, that we are free and masters of all food, be it meat, fish or butter, and may eat and use it as we please without distinction; no one can ever deny this, for God has given us this freedom, and it is certainly true. But we must know how to use our freedom properly, and how to behave differently toward the weak and differently toward the stubborn. Therefore, be careful how you use this freedom.

(11) First, if you cannot spare it without harming yourself, or if you are sick, you may eat what you desire, whoever is angry with it; and even if the whole world is angry with it, you do not sin against it. For God may well credit thee, considering his liberty with which he hath endowed thee, and thy need, in that thou canst not spare it without danger to thy health.

12. secondly: If anyone would urge you, as the pope has done with his foolish laws, not to eat meat on Friday, but to eat meat on Sunday.

Fish; likewise, in fasting, eat fish, and not meat, or eggs, or butter, or not eat them, and so on: thou shalt not in any way be forced from thy liberty which God has given thee, but shalt defy them and speak freely: Yes, for this very reason that you forbid me to eat meat, and you dare to make a commandment out of my freedom, I will eat it in defiance of you. And so shalt thou do in all other things that are free. Take another example: If the pope or someone else wanted to force me to wear the cap, that and no other; then I would take off the cap in defiance of him, God grant that he would laugh or look angry about it, even if he became furious and nonsensical, mad and foolish about it. For what God does not command me to do, and what I am free to do or not to do, no man, no devil, nor any angel shall make any commandment of it for me, even if it costs life and limb.

(13) Thirdly, there are some who are still weak in faith, who would be wise, and would gladly believe as we do; but their uncertainty alone hinders them. And if this had been preached to them, as it has been to us, praise God, so abundantly and clearly, they would be at one with us in these matters, and would not take offense at anything.

(14) We must behave much differently toward such kind-hearted people than toward the stiff-necked. We should be patient with them and abstain from our freedom, since it brings us no harm or danger, neither to body nor soul; indeed, it is beneficial to us and does our neighbor great good and good. But if we want to use our freedom for our neighbor's annoyance, we drive back the one who would like to come to our faith in time.

015 So did St. Paul when he circumcised Timothy. For when the Jews were angry and simple-minded, Paul said, "What harm can it do if they are angry because they are foolish? 16:3, and he also had him circumcised. But since the Antiochians

When they insisted that he should circumcise Titum, he stood up to them all, and in spite of them he did not circumcise Titum.

(16) In the same way St. Paul did again at Antioch with St. Peter, because Peter by his liberty drove an evil mind and delusion into the simple hearts, so that when he came to the Gentiles, he ate with them what they had, pork, and what was put before him, sparing nothing, using his liberty openly. But when some of the Jews came to Antioch, he withdrew and separated himself, not wanting to eat all kinds of food with the Gentiles as before. Then the Gentiles who had recently come to faith thought: We don't have to eat pork, we don't have to eat all kinds of food like the Jews, we have to keep the law with them; so they had a big conscience about a small thing. When Paul became aware that Peter had brought such distress and anger into the simple, weak hearts of the Gentiles, 1) and feared that such a deal would bring great harm to evangelical liberty, he spoke harshly to Peter, read him an old 2) lection and said to him publicly in front of everyone: "If you, who are a Jew, live a Gentile life and not a Jewish life, why do you force the Gentiles to live a Jewish life?"

(17) From this history you should learn that we should use our freedom in due and convenient time, so that nothing may be taken away from Christian freedom and no trouble may be caused to our brothers and sisters who are still weak and ignorant of this freedom. That is enough of it.

The fifth sermon.

On the Thursday after the Sunday Invocavit.

[Of Sacrament.]

(1) We have now heard of the things that are necessary, such as that the mass should not be taken as a sacrifice, because it is contrary to faith. Likewise you have heard of

1) So put by us instead of "Jews", which seems to us to be wrong.

2) Maybe "hard" ?

the things that are unnecessary and free; as when the monks and nuns run away from the monasteries; of the marriage of the priests, and of the images, how one should keep oneself in the things, so that one does not make any compulsion out of it, nor pull anyone away with the hair, but we should let God's word alone act in this. Now let us see from the reverend sacrament how one should conduct oneself in it.

(2) You have often heard me preach against the foolish laws of the pope concerning this sacrament. Among other things, he commanded that no woman should wash the cloth on which Christ's body had been placed, even if it were a pure consecrated nun, unless a priest or monk had washed it first. Even if a layman touched the body of Christ or the chalice with his bare hands, his fingers would have to be circumcised, or his skin rubbed off with a brick, and what more foolish laws there are under the papacy. The papists have made them more conscience-stricken about this than about their fornication and blasphemy, which have been so public against God and so bright in the day that even the children in the street have sung about it. I have preached enough of this, and thus revealed and made known that there were no sins in these foolish, foolish laws of the pope, and that a layman did not sin if he touched the body of Christ and the chalice even with his bare hands.

(3) Above such preaching and on account of this understanding, you should have thanked God, because you have ever come to the knowledge that many excellent, great people have not been given. So now you go on and do something as foolish as the pope, in that you think it is necessary to attack the sacrament with your hands, and you want to be good Christians in this and with this. You have grossly transgressed in this matter and have acted too freely with this precious treasure, so that it is no wonder that God would have punished you immediately. God could have tolerated everything else, but to act so freely with this piece, He cannot and will not tolerate, in that you have made a compulsion and a mean order,

that each one of you should bring and attack the Sacrament, the Body and Blood of Christ, even with his hands, so thirstily and so freely, without all shyness and fear. And if you will not desist from this piece, no emperor, nor king, nor anyone else may drive me from here; I will run myself, undriven by you. I may well and freely say that none of my enemies, although they have done me much evil, has done me so much harm as you, my friends, with this one piece. You have hit me right in this.

4 If you want to be good Christians and boast that you touch the sacrament, the body of Christ, with your hands, the Jews, Herod and Pilate would have been the best Christians; I mean, they touched the body of Christ. No, dear friends, no! This is not the way. The kingdom of God does not stand in external things that can be grasped and felt, but in faith and power.

005 Yea, sayest thou that we live, and that we should live according to the scriptures: so hath Christ appointed that we should receive it with our hands. For he hath spoken: Take ye and eat, this is my body: and the disciples took it with their hands: why should not we also take it with our hands? Answer: Although I consider it undoubted and certain that the disciples attacked the body of the Lord with their hands, admit that you also may do it without sin: but to steer and insist greatly on it, that I do not know. For if the devil, as he seeks us, shall speak: Where did you read in the Scriptures that "to take" means to attack with the hands? how will I prove and maintain it? Yes, how will I meet him when he holds up to me the contradiction from Scripture, and proves that "to take" does not only mean to receive with the hands, but to bring something to oneself in another way? as when John writes, how those who crucified the Lord gave him vinegar to drink, he says, "When Jesus had taken the vinegar," John 19:30. Here you must confess that Christ did not attack the sponge with his hands, for he was

nailed to the cross. What do I want to say against that? I have to give myself captive there and am decided, so that I have to allow, I want or do not want, that "to take" does not only mean to receive something with the hands, but also to bring it to me by other means, as it may happen.

(6) Therefore, dear friends, if we are going to do such things, or things like them, we must stand on a certain ground, that we may be able to keep ourselves from the devil's offense. I do not say that you have sinned by attacking the body of Christ with your hands, but still you have not done a good work, because the whole world is angry about this piece. For this custom is in all Christendom, that the reverend Sacrament should be received by the hands of the priest. Why then will you not serve the weak believers in this and abstain, even if you had the power and were free to take it with your hands and attack it yourself? since it brings you no piety if you do it, nor any harm if you neglect it.

(7) Therefore, we must be careful not to teach any new thing contrary to old and praiseworthy customs, unless the gospel has been thoroughly preached and taught beforehand, and unless it has been grasped and believed. Therefore, dear friends, let us act carefully and wisely in these matters, because they concern God. For God does not like to be scolded in His matters. 1) Deal with other outward things as you will: let our Lord God be content with what is His, and believe His words with simplicity. Therefore refrain from this abuse and order; this is my faithful counsel and diligent plea.

(8) Let us also say a little about both forms of the reverend Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. Although I certainly believe that it is necessary to take this sacrament in both forms, according to the institution of Christ our dear Lord, as clearly described by the three evangelists and St. Paul, nevertheless, one should as soon as possible

1) i.e. joke.

And suddenly make no compulsion of it, and put it into a common order, until every man be well instructed every where beforehand, lest the weak of faith be offended in this; but the word be practiced, exercised, and preached, and after that the consequence of the word be put in secret, and GOtte command it until his time. For if this is not done, then it becomes an outward work and a gilding. And that is what the devil wants. But if he lets the word go freely and does not bind it to any work, it touches one person today and another tomorrow; it falls into the heart and captures the hearts; then it goes on so that one does not notice how it was begun.

(9) It was written to me that some here had begun to take the sacrament under both forms. I was glad to hear that, and so you should have let it remain and continued gradually and not have brought it into any common order or compulsion. But now you are going, burdi, burdi! and want to go through with your head, want to force everyone to do it and push. There you are missing, dear friends. For if you want to be seen as good Christians, that you touch the sacrament with your hands and take it under both forms, then you are real Christians to me. By the same token, an unreasonable animal could be a Christian.

(10) Therefore, dear friends, do neatly in these high things; there is no reproach here. Let us look to the weak and to others who shall also come to us, whom we all chase back with such iniquities and storms. Dear friends, do not hurry, lest the devil lead us astray, as he has in mind. I may well say that I have never received such heartache from all my enemies as from you, my friends, with whom I should have had support and comfort (so many people in authority). Well, God will still send everything for the best, if you only want to do so and desist from this abuse and storms; as I am completely sure that you will do. That is enough for this time. Tomorrow we will deal with it further.

The sixth sermon.

On the Friday after the Sunday Invocavit.

So far we have dealt with the main things, and now we have come to the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, of which we said a little yesterday; but today we want to say a little more about how one should conduct oneself in this, and which are and belong to the reception of the sacrament.

First of all, it is necessary that your heart and conscience understand that there is a great difference between the outward reception of the sacrament and the inward or spiritual reception. The bodily and outward reception is when I receive the body of Christ and his blood outwardly with my mouth. And such a reception can happen without faith and love by all men; but this reception does not make a Christian. For this can be done by bad or good men, and it would be a bad thing to be a Christian if it were done by this.

(3) But the inward, spiritual, and right reception of the sacrament is much different. For it consists not only in the bodily reception of the body and blood of Christ, but in the exercise and fruits of this reception by faith. We Christians have no outward sign to set us apart from other peoples except this sacrament and baptism. But without faith the outward reception of these sacraments is nothing; faith must be present and make the outward reception skillful, and show us 1) before God; otherwise it is a mere mirror fencing and an outward being, in which Christianity does not stand, but in faith stands Christianity, which is not bound to any outward work, nor does it want to be bound. But faith is directed to this and stands in it, if we want to receive this sacrament worthily in any other way, that we must firmly believe that Christ is the Son of God and the only atonement for our sin, who is our sin.

1) Instead of "indicate," the other redaction is "pleasant," which seems to us to be the better reading.

and iniquity upon his own neck, and on the cross made atonement for them by his death and suffering, and paid them off to the Father, and now stand before God without ceasing, and reconcile us before the Father, be our mediator and advocate, and make us a gracious, merciful, kind Father, who will forgive us our sins, and remember them no more, through this his only Son, our Lord Jesus Christ; and that this Son has instituted this sacrament, his body and blood, to confirm and confirm our faith, and has commanded us to receive and enjoy it.

(4) He who has faith belongs to this place and is qualified to receive this sacrament, the body and blood of Christ. Neither sin nor death, neither hell nor hell itself, can harm such a person who firmly believes this and is sure of it. For God is my protection and restraint, Ps. 73, 23. ff. If I have that, in spite of all sin, in spite of death, in spite of hell, in spite of all devils, that they harm me, yes, bend any hair; for God fights for me, protects and shields me, that they cannot harm me, yes, [their attempts] must, against their will, serve them to great harm. This is the high, delicious, exuberant treasure that is given and bestowed upon us in Christ, which no man can reach with words, nor can any human heart comprehend; faith alone must grasp it.

(5) But not all men have such faith, therefore no common order should be made out of this sacrament, as the pope has done with his mad, foolish laws, when he decrees that all Christian men should go to the sacrament once a year on Easter feasts; and this should be their punishment, if one does not go, so that he is not buried in the churchyard. Isn't this a great foolish law, set up by the pope? Why? Because we are not all alike, neither have we all one faith; for one has a stronger faith than another; some leap away, others can scarcely crawl after. For this reason it is impossible that there should be

can be brought and pushed into a common order.

(6) From this you can easily conclude that throughout the whole year no greater sins are committed, nor more terrible blasphemies, than at Easter times, just because of this unchristian commandment that one wants to force and urge people to the sacrament, God grant that they are skillful or unskillful, funny or unfunny. If all robbery, murder, adultery and fornication were counted in one heap, this sin would surpass all other sins, and just when it seems most beautiful and holy.

7 But that the pope has acted foolishly and unchristianly in this is evident, for he has not known the hearts whether they have believed or not. One man cannot know another man's heart whether it believes or not. How can I know if you believe that Christ stands for you and puts all that he has for you, even his blood, and says to you: "Come up fresh, there is no need, all these enemies shall not harm you. Let the devil, death, sin, hell and all creatures stand against you; if you have me, they shall not harm you; only trust me and cling to me, and I will help you through freely? For he who stands in such faith belongs here and takes this sacrament worthily, as a safeguard and sign that he is certain of divine promise. Yes, but we do not all have such faith. Oh, God would that the tenth person had it!

(8) For this reason, it is necessary to be careful here and not to make a common order about when and how often, and also that everyone goes to this sacrament without distinction. For such unspeakably rich treasures, with which God has graced us, cannot be common to everyone, but only to those who are in temptation, persecution and adversity, whether bodily or spiritual, external or internal, whether from men or from the devil. So when the devil makes your heart weak, stupid and despondent, so that you do not know how to deal with God, he holds your sin against you and makes you fidgety and hesitant.

that you will become a partaker of this noble treasure of yours, yes, be sure that you already have it. For in such a frightened, trembling heart God wants to dwell and rest, as Isaiah Cap. 66, 2. and also David says in the Psalter, Psalm 51, 19. For who desires a shield, protection and restraint, but he who is in pain and feels resistance?

(9) Therefore, whoever does not yet feel that his sins bite him and the devil attacks him, does not yet belong to this food; for this food wants a hungry, desiring person, and gladly enters such a hungry soul, which contends daily with sins and would gladly be rid of them. But if any man does not yet feel this way, let him abstain from this sacrament for a time, for this food does not want to enter a full and satisfied heart; but if it enters, it is there with harm. If we felt such pressure of conscience and stupidity of our despondent heart, we would probably approach with all humility and reverence, would not be so insolent and run like swine to the trough, without all fear and humility. But we do not always find ourselves able; today I have the grace to do so, tomorrow not; yes, at times, hardly in half a year, a devotion comes to me that I go there.

10. From this we should finally realize that those who are best suited for this sacrament are those who are attacked by their sin, death and the devil, who are in constant battle with these enemies; it is most conveniently given to them and is also most useful to them, so that the same person may stand there and believe that these enemies cannot harm him, since he has the one standing on his side who is powerful against all these enemies and can save us from all distress, fear, adversity and tribulation.

11 Thus did Christ, when he instituted this sacrament. First of all, he greatly terrified his disciples and almost shattered their hearts by saying that he was going to leave them and that there was one among the multitude who would betray him.

This was a bitter salve to them, a terrible thing, that he should depart from them on whom they had cast all comfort; and that one of them should betray him. There their hearts will have trembled, and they will have been in great exuberant fear that they should now be the betrayer of him from whom they had received so much benefit, who had dealt with them as kindly and fatherly as any father with his children. Then each one will have thought: Oh God, will you let me fall into such a great sin? The dear disciples sat there as if they were all traitors and evil-doers against their Lord and Master. Only then, when he had made them tremble and shake, did he use this sacrament to comfort and refresh them, and so he comforted them again.

(12) From this you may well know to whom this sacrament is most convenient and useful, namely, to the afflicted, the despondent, the sorrowful, and the stupid of conscience. For this bread is a comfort to the afflicted, a medicine to the sick, a life to the dying, a food to the hungry, and a rich treasure to all who are poor and needy. That is enough said for this time about the use of the sacrament, how you should use it, and who goes there usefully. Let us leave it at that and call upon God for mercy.

The seventh sermon.

On the Saturday after the Sunday Invocavit.

Dear friends, yesterday you heard about the custom of the reverend Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, and who are rightly qualified for it, namely, those who are afraid of death, who are chased by the devil, who have a despondingly stupid conscience, and who are afraid of sin and of hell. All of these go to this food in a just and worthy manner, to strengthen their weak faith and to comfort their sorrowful conscience. This is the proper custom and practice of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; let him who does not feel himself thus skilled, let it remain until God also stirs and stirs him with His Word.

Now let us also speak of the fruit of this sacrament, which is love; namely, that we let ourselves be found like this toward our neighbor, as has happened and happened to us from God. Now we have received from God all love and good deeds. For is this not a great unspeakable love, that he sent down his only begotten Son from heaven and cast him into the flesh, that he might save and redeem us from sin, death, the devil, and hell? Is not this a great immeasurable love, that the same Son, for the Father's pleasure, gave his body and blood for our sake? Is it not a great abundant love that God should proclaim and distribute to us such treasure in His Word through the sermon, and give us all the victory and triumph of His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, against sin, death, the devil and hell, so that I can boast of the victory and triumph as if I had done it myself? For this purpose Christ is our righteousness, our satisfaction, our wisdom and our sanctification, 1 Cor. 1:30, who without fail represents us before God His Father and is our advocate 1).

This inexpressible love, which no human heart can grasp, should move us to love our neighbor in turn, to do him good, to help and advise him in whatever way we can, and he needs us. But I do not feel such love here yet, although much has been preached to you; but no one wants to go there; one often runs to other unnecessary things; here no one is at home. Christians are known by a few things when they show love for one another, as Christ said to his disciples in John: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you. In this way everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another," John 13:34, 35. And St. Paul says: "If I spoke with the tongues of men and with the tongues of angels, and if the angels had loved me, I would have loved you.

If I did not have love, I would be a sounding brass or a tinkling bell. And if I could prophesy, and knew all mysteries and all knowledge, and had all faith, so as to move mountains, and had not love, I would be nothing. And if I give all my goods to the poor, and let my body burn, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." 1 Cor. 13, 1. 2. 3. These are excellent, hard words; but you have not yet come that far.

4 Because you have great gifts of God here in Wittenberg and much of them, including the knowledge of Scripture, which is a great gift and grace, you have the gospel bright and clear, but you do not want to continue with love. You would like God to be good to you and to give you his gifts, but you do not want to give anything to others; no one wants to reach out to another, no one takes another seriously, but everyone looks to himself for what is best for him, and all seek what is ours; let go what goes; let him who is helped be helped; no one looks to the poor for help. It is to be pitied that I have preached to you so long, and in almost all my little books I have done nothing else but faith and love, and so no love at all shall be felt in you.

(5) I will tell you for certain that if you do not show love to one another, God will send a great plague upon you. For he will not have his word preached and revealed in vain; neither will he have his word dishonored or despised. You are trying GOD too hard. My friends, if this word had been preached to our forefathers some time ago, they might have behaved differently than you do. You don't even want to do it, and you don't take it seriously. You can talk about it, but you do not yet want to follow it with action. With other jugglery you go about, which is unnecessary; but what is necessary, that you leave pending. God grant that it may not only stand in words, but also break forth powerfully. Let us leave it at that.

1) In the Eisleben edition: "Fursprach". Otherwise, Luther uses the form "Fürsprech", e.g. in the first editions of the New Testament, 1 John 2:1: "So we have a fursprechen bey dem vater."

The eighth sermon

or

A short concept of the sermon preached on the Sunday Reminiscere of the [secret] Confession.

We have now heard the things that have happened here, except for the confession, which we will also deal with recently.

(2) First, confession is grounded in Scripture. If someone had sinned publicly, so that people knew about it, he was accused publicly before the crowd. If he repented of the sin, they prayed for him before God and helped him to be reconciled. But if he would not renounce it and would not listen to the mob or the congregation, he was banished and rejected from the congregation and set apart, so that no one had to send or deal with him.

3 Christ says this about confession in Matthew: "If your brother sins against you, go and punish him between you and him alone. If he hears you, you have won your brother. If he does not hear you, take one or two more to you, so that the whole matter may rest on the testimony of two or three witnesses. If he does not hear them, tell the community. If he does not hear the congregation, consider him a Gentile and a publican," Matt. 18:15, 16, 17. And if the congregation rejected him or received him back, he was also rejected or received back before God. Therefore the Lord says there soon after v. 18: "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

This confession we have no more sign in the church. In this place, the gospel is lying low. Whoever could re-establish this confession would be doing a deliciously good work.

(5) All of you, dear friends, should have made an effort and set up this confession again, and should have left other things in order, because no one would have been annoyed by this piece. And it should be so with this confession: If you saw a usurer.

or a robber, an adulterer, an adulterer, a drunkard, and other such vices, you should go to him in secret and urge him to desist from that or those vices. If he does so, well and good. If he does not, but continues in his vice, you should take two or three to you and again, in the presence of these three, admonish him fraternally. If he does not accept this admonition, but despises it, you shall announce it to the priest in front of the whole congregation and have your two witnesses with you and say it publicly: Dear priest, this man has done this and that vice, and has not accepted our brotherly admonition, so that he might desist from this vice of his, but has despised it and has remained in his vice forever: therefore I accuse him here publicly before the whole congregation, with these my witnesses, who have heard my brotherly admonition. And if then he would not desist and willingly accept the accusation, the priest should separate him from the whole congregation and put him under ban, until he would recognize himself and be accepted again. This would be a Christian work, who could accomplish it; but I do not dare to do it alone.

6) Secondly, confession is when we confess our sins to God alone and confess to God Himself, before whom we pour out all our infirmities. And this confession is of great need to us, yes, so much so that we should do it every hour and every moment, and we are also commanded to do it.

(7) Of this confession David says in the Psalm: "Therefore I make known my sin, and hide not my iniquity. I said: I will confess my transgression unto the LORD against me, and thou forgavest me the iniquity of my sin. For this shall all the saints pray before thee in due time," Ps. 32:5, 6.

The third is confession, where one confesses to another and takes him alone to a place and tells him what his need and concern is, so that he may hear from him a comforting word to ease his conscience. This confession was strictly commanded by the pope, who made it a stable of distress, so that it could be used to

is mercy. I have rejected and severely attacked this gracious God and merciful Father, who will not impute coercion and compulsion when I preached and wrote your sin to you, believe this promise and absolution about confession. And for this very reason I do not want freshly and cheerfully, and be sure that God Himself will to confess, because the pope has commanded it and give you such a promise through your brother's mouth. wants to have it. For he shall leave confession free to me But he who has a firm and strong faith in God, and is and shall not make any compulsion or commandment out certain that his sins are forgiven, may well leave this of it, which he has no power or authority to do. confession and confess to God alone. But how many are

(9) Nevertheless, I will not let anyone take away my there who have such strong faith and confidence in God? secret confession, and I would not give it for the sake of Let each one look to himself, so that he does not deceive the whole world, for I know what strength and comfort it himself.

has given me. No one knows what secret confession can 12 Therefore I have said and still say that I do not want do, because he often has to fence and fight with the devil. to be deprived of this secret confession. I also do not want I would have been overcome and strangled by the devil to force or have forced anyone to do so, but rather to allow long ago if this confession had not preserved me. For everyone to go home freely. Our God is not so meager there are many doubtful and erroneous things in which that he would have left us only one absolution and only one consolation for the strength and comfort of our man alone is not well able, nor can he understand them. conscience, but we have much absolution in the Gospel and are abundantly showered with much comfort. Which When he is in such doubt and does not know where to consolations and promises we should not despise to go, he takes his brother to a place and holds up his and demand and hear from our brethren. distress before him, laments his infirmities, his unbelief and his sin, and asks him for comfort and counsel. For what harm does it do him to humble himself a little before

In addition to the fact that we should ever be sure that our sins are forgiven, Christ has also left us the sacraments: baptism, his body and blood in the sacrament of the altar. I should not despise to take these sacraments. For in baptism I am assured of the grace and mercy of God, that I am his and he is mine, that I have united myself with him and am now accepted by him. After this I receive the body and blood of Christ, thereby also becoming certain that my sins are forgiven. And therefore, as a sign and assurance, I eat the body that was given for me and drink the blood that was poured out for my sin, so that I may never despair that I have a gracious, merciful God and Father.

14 So you see that secret confession is not to be despised, but is an excellent thing, which I would not want to do for the whole world.

(11) Now if any man is troubled with sins, and would 15 Because we must have much comfort if we are to fight against the devil, death, sin, and hell, and if we are to stand firm, we are to have a great comfort. gladly be rid of them, if he would hear a certain comfort and saying, that he may quiet his heart, let him go and bewail his sin secretly to his brother, and ask him for absolution, and for a comforting word. If he now gives you absolution and tells you that your sins are forgiven, you have a

we must not let any weapons be taken from us, but keep our armor whole and let the comfort given to us by God remain unwavering. For you do not yet know what effort and work it takes to contend with the devil and overcome him. I know

If you had known him as well as I do, you would not have thrown the secret confession to the wind. That is enough of that, we want to call upon God for His grace, so that we may remain on the right path and not be led astray.

1b. D. Mart. Luther's eight sermons against D. Carlstadt's innovations,

after the first and from the preceding in many pieces different impression, Wittenberg 1523. *)

Dominica Invocavit Sermon of D. Martin Luther.

(1) We are all called to death, and no one will die for another, but each in his own person will struggle with death for himself. We may well cry out in our ears, but each must be sent for himself at the time of death. I will not be with you then, nor you with me. In this way, each one must know well and be prepared for the main things that concern a Christian, and these are the ones that your beloved heard from me many days ago 1).

(2) First, how we are children of wrath, and all our works and mind and thoughts are nothing. Here we must have a clear, strong saying, testifying to this; as is the saying of St. Paul to the Ephesians 2:3, which notice well; and though there are many of them in the Bible, yet I will not overwhelm you with many sayings, "We are all children of wrath"; and do not presume to say, "I have built an altar, I have offered a mass," 2c.

3. secondly, that God sent us His only begotten Son, that we might believe in Him; and he who trusts in Him shall be free from sin and be a child of God.

As John says at his first cap. v. 12. "He hath given them power to become children of GOD, to all them that believe on his name." Allhie we should all be well skilled in the Bible, and armed with many sayings, [to] hold [them] before the devil 2). In the two pieces I do not yet sense any error or deficiency, but they are preached to you purely 3) and I would be sorry if it had happened otherwise; yes, I see it well, and may say it, that you are more learned than I am, not only 1. 2. 3. 4. but probably ten or more who are so enlightened in knowledge.

4) Thirdly, we must also have love, and through love do to one another as God has done to us through faith; without which love faith is nothing, as St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 2 (Cap. 13, 1. 2.): "If I have tongues as angels, and could speak of faith in the highest terms, and have not love, I am nothing. All this, dear friends, is almost lacking, and I do not feel love in anyone, and I almost realize that you have not been grateful to God for such a rich treasure and gift.

5. here let us see that from Witten-

1) Instead of "many days ago" it should probably read "[too] many times ago". In the previous redaction: "now often".

2) These insertions are from the previous redaction of these sermons, No. In this volume.

3) In the previous redaction of these sermons: "loud and pure".

*Compare the first note to the heading of the previous version of these sermons. Only the first two sermons are reproduced here.

berg [not] 1) Capernaum. I see that you know a lot of doctrine to speak, preached to you by faith and love, and is not miraculous; can yet almost a donkey sing lection, 2) should you not speak and teach the doctrine or words? So, dear friends, the kingdom of God, which we are, is not seen in speech or words, but in action, that is, in deeds, in works and practices. God does not want hearers or persecutors, but followers and overcomers, 3) in faith through love; for faith without love is not sufficient, indeed is not faith, but a semblance of faith. As a face seen in a mirror is not a true face, but only a semblance of the face.

6) Fourth, we also need patience, for he who has faith trusts in God, and shows love to his neighbor, in which he practices daily, yes, he cannot be without persecutions, for the devil does not sleep, but gives him enough to do, and patience works and brings hope, which freely surrenders and disappears in God. 4) And so, through much trial and temptation, faith always increases and is strengthened from day to day. Such a heart, gifted with virtues, can never rest nor abstain, 5) but again exerts itself for the benefit and good of its brother, as has been done for it by God.

7 Allhie, dear friends, not every man must do what he has right, but see what is useful and beneficial to his brother, as Paul says [1 Cor. 6, 12. 10, 23.]: OM-rra Mr/rr-rs-r onr-rr'a ahnn/. All things we may well do, but all things are not beneficial, for we are not all equally strong in faith; for

Some of you have stronger faith than I. 6) Therefore we must not look to ourselves or our wealth, but to our neighbor, 7) for God said through Moses, "I have borne you and brought you up as a mother does her child."

What does a mother do to her child? First she gives it milk, then porridge, then eggs and soft food. If she were to give it hard food at first, it would not be good for the child. 8.

(9) So shall we also do unto our brother, bearing with him for a season, enduring his infirmities, and helping to bear them, giving him also milk, as it hath been done unto us, until he also be strong, and go not alone to heaven, but bring with us our brethren, which are not now our friends. Should all mothers throw away their children, where would we be left? Dear brother, if you have sucked enough, don't cut off the hat 9) immediately, but let your brother also suck as you have sucked; I wouldn't have gone as far as I did if I had been here. The matter is well, but the haste is too fast; for on that side there are also brothers and sisters who belong to us, 10) they must also come.

10) Notice a similitude: The sun has two things, as the brightness and the heat. There is no king so strong that he can bend or direct the brightness of the sun, but it remains in its 11) places. But the heat can be directed and bent and is always around the sun. So the faith must always

1) This "not" is inserted by us from the previous redaction.

2) Ibid: "you can almost teach a donkey to sing."

3) The Erlanger offers here: "about that" 2c. That the reading of the old Walch edition reproduced by us is correct is evident from the fact that this sentence in the previous redaction reads: "who practice faith, which is strong through love."

4) In the previous redaction: "swings".

5) Thus placed by us after the preceding, instead of "received".

6) Taken by us from the old edition. Erlanger: "have a strong faith, if I."

7) In the previous edition, this sentence reads: "Therefore, we must not look at ourselves and our faith alone, but should look at our neighbor" 2c. The Erlangen edition offers: "see, and regard."

8) In the old print, "wafted," i.e., "weaned. The expression is still found in English: to vsun, and in Low German: to "turn" or "turn away" the child (from the breast). Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1784, No. 398, and on this the Leipziger Literaturblatt of June 29, 1888, p. 248, Col. 2.

9) Dutte - teat.

10) Thus set by us according to the previous redaction; "born", which also the Erlanger offers, is obviously a printing error.

11) Thus placed by us instead of "his"; also a printing error which the Erlangen edition has brought back.

remain pure and immovable in our hearts, and must not depart from it, but love bends and directs itself, [after it] our neighbor 1) may understand and follow. There are some who can run, some who can walk, and some who can hardly crawl. Therefore we must consider not our own ability, but our brother's, lest the weak in faith, if he would follow the strong, be torn asunder by the devil: The devil will tear him apart. Therefore, dear brethren, follow me; for I have never perverted it; I was also the first whom God set on this plan; I cannot escape, but [must] remain as long as God gives it, 2) I was also the one to whom God first revealed it, also to preach such His words; I am also sure that you have the true word of God. 3)

(11) Therefore let us do this with fear and humility, and let one lie under another's feet, joining hands together, helping one another. I will do mine as I owe, and mean you as I mean my soul. For we do not contend against the pope or bishop 2c. but against the devil. Do you think he sleeps? He is not asleep, but he sees the true light rising; so that it does not get under his eyes, he would like to tear it off to the side, and he will do it, we will not look up. I know him well. I also hope, if God wills, I am his master. If we give him a foot of space, we will see how to get rid of him. Therefore, all those who have helped and consented to do away with the mass have erred; not that it was not good, but that it was not done properly. You say, "It is right from Scripture; I also confess it, but where is the order? For it was done in a sacrilege, without all order, with the annoyance of the neighbor; for 4) one should have asked for it with all seriousness beforehand, and should have taken the superiors to do it, so

one would know that it had happened because of God. I would have started it well, if it had been good, and if it had not been such an evil thing about the mass, I would have started it again. For I do not know how to defend it [that you have done well in this.] 5) I have just told you. For I could well do it in front of the papists and coarse heads, because I wanted to speak: What do you know, whether it was done in a good spirit or in an evil one? since the work itself is good. But before the devil I do not know how to look for it 6). For if the devil will reproach those who started the game with these sayings or the like when they die: *Omnis plantatio, quam non plantavit Pater meus, eradicabitur, ode? den: Currebant, et non mittebam eos*, how would they stand? He pushes them to hell. But I want to hold a point in front of his nose, so that the world will also become too narrow for him, because I know that I am called by the council to preach, even though I have resisted. So I would also like to have you like me, you could also have asked me in this. 7)

I was not so far away, you could have reached me with writings, since it is not the smallest piece; it would have been worthwhile that you had sent to me for this. 8) Did you want to start something and I should be responsible for it? That would be too hard for me. I will not do it. All this shows that you do not have the spirit, even though you have a high knowledge of the Scriptures. Notice the two pieces: "must be" and "be free. For "must be" is what necessity demands, and must exist immovably, as there is faith, which I will not let be taken from me, but must always have in my heart and be free before everyone.

5) Thus we put after the previous redaction instead of: "For I do not know it to refute; I also want to have just said it: then" 2c. Likewise in the Erlanger.

6) Thus put by us instead of "I". In the previous redaction: "I do not know how to dispute it.

7) Instead of this last, obviously incomplete sentence in the previous redaction: "Therefore you have done wrong that you have started such a game without my command and consent, and have not asked me about it beforehand.

8) Thus set by us according to the previous redaction, instead of the meaningless sentence that the Erlanger also offers: "sintemal ich nicht das geringste Stück hergeschickt."

1) So set by us instead: that it may comprehend and follow our neighbor." This is also found in the Erlanger.

2) Erlanger: "denied" i.e. denied.

3) Erlanger: Hand.

4) Erlanger: when.

confess. But "to be free" is that which I have freely, and may use it or leave it, so that my brother, and not I, may have the benefit of it, and do not make "a must" "a being free" for me, as you have done, lest you should have to give account for those whom [you] have deceived by your uncharitable freedom. For if you tempt one to eat meat on Friday, and he is challenged when he dies, and thus thinks, O woe is me that I have eaten meat! and cannot stand, God will require an account of him from you. I also wanted to raise many things, since [not] 1) few would follow me; but what is the use? For I know that those who have begun such things, when it comes to the meeting, will not be able to stand, and will be the first to withdraw. What would it be like if I brought the bunch to the plan, and I, who was the first, stopped the others, and wanted to flee, not waiting for death happily? how should the poor bunch be seduced!

(13) Therefore let us also give milk to others as long as we do, until they also become strong in faith; for there are still many of them who otherwise fall to us [in other things] 2) and would gladly have and accept this thing also, but 3) they cannot well understand it [yet]; we drive them back. Therefore let us show love to our neighbors; if we do not do this, our deeds will not stand. We must also be patient with them for a while and not reject those who are still weak in faith; how much more can we do and not do, if love requires it and does not harm our faith! If we do not earnestly ask God and send ourselves right into the matter, then the game looks to me 4) that all the misery, so started on the papists before 5) us, will come upon us. For this reason I have longer not

1) "not" inserted by us after the previous redaction. It is also missing in the Erlanger.

2) Thus in the previous redaction.

3) We have put "but" instead of "special".

4) So put by us after the previous redaction instead of: "sechent nicht", which also offers the Erlanger.

5) Thus set by us instead of "and". This "and" is also found in the Erlanger.

can be omitted, but have to come to tell you such things. Now enough of the mass; tomorrow we will tell you about the pictures.

Another sermon of D. M. Luther on the Monday after Invocavit.

Dear friends! Yesterday you heard the main parts of a Christian man, how the whole life and being is believing and loving. Faith is directed toward God, 6) love toward man and neighbor, [so that we show ourselves toward man] in 7) love with benevolence, as we have received from God without our merit and work. So there are two things: the one that is necessary, 8) which must therefore be done, and not otherwise; the other, which is free and unnecessary, which may be kept or not, without danger to faith and soul. 9) In the two things, love must act with the neighbor as we have received from God, and must therefore go the right way, falling neither to the left nor to the right. In the things that must be and are necessary, such as believing in Christ, love nevertheless acts in such a way that it does not force or drive too hard. Thus, measurement is an evil thing, and God is its enemy, in which therefore it would be done as if it were a sacrifice and meritorious work; therefore it must be done away with. Here is no question or doubt, as little you should ask, 10) whether God is to be worshipped? In this we are in complete agreement, that the special masses must be stopped, as I have also written about them, and would that [they] were stopped in the whole world, and only the common evangelical mass kept. 11) Nevertheless, love should not be strict in this and forcibly break off, but it should be preached, written and proclaimed, that the mass, in the manner of

6) Thus set according to the previous redaction instead of: just.

7) So added by us after the previous redaction, and "in love" put instead of: "at love".

8) So put by us instead of: "the most necessary".

9) "Soul" put by us instead of "hell". In the previous redaction, "the bliss of the soul".

10) So put by us instead of: "as little which should ask".

11) So put by us instead of: "all the common evangelical mass held".

is sinful 1). But no one is to be pulled or torn from it by the hair of his head; for God is to be given home, 2) and his word alone is to work, not our doing or our work. Why? Because I do not have in my power or hand the 3) hearts of men, as the hewer has the glue, to create with him according to my pleasure. I cannot reach further than the ears; I cannot reach the heart. Because I cannot pour faith into the heart, no one can force me to do so, for God does it alone and makes it live in the heart. Therefore one should leave the word free, and not add our work to it. We have *jus verbi*, but not executionem: we are to preach the word, but the consequence is to be God's alone in his pleasure. If therefore I fall into it, and would forcibly put it away: there are many of them that must enter into it, and know not how they are in it, 4) whether it be right or wrong, speaking: I do not know whether it is right or wrong; I do not know how I am in it; I have had to follow the church and authority. So then the constraint or commandment alone becomes a mirror fencing, an outward being, a monkey game, and thus becomes a human statute, seeming saints or gleissers, for there is no good heart. I don't give a damn about that. One must see the heart of the people first. But this is what happens when I preach God's word alone, preach the gospel and say: "Dear lords or priests, leave the mass, it is not right, you sin in it, that is what I want to tell you! But I did not want to make any rules for them, nor did I want to insist on a common order; whoever wanted to follow, would follow, whoever did not want to, would stay outside. With him the word fell down into the heart and worked. So now he who is caught, and gives guilty, goes and falls from the fair; tomorrow another comes 5): thus God worked with

beuem word more, deuu if you and I melt all power into one heap; so if you have the heart, you have now won him: so then the thing must finally disintegrate and cease from itself. And if after that all mind and heart would be united and united, then do it; where all mind and heart are not [yet] present, there 6) let God rule. I ask you for that, you do no good. Not that I want to set up the mass again, but let it lie in God's name. Faith does not want to be bound or constrained, nor to be constrained by order to a work. There straighten you after. I know that you will not carry these things out, but if you carry them out with such vile commandments, I will revoke all that I have written and preached. Neither will I stand with you, and have told you arid 7). What harm can it do you [if you bear with such outward things for a while]? 8) You have your faith pure and strong in God, so that this thing cannot harm you.

2 Therefore love requires that you have compassion on the weak. This is what all the apostles did. Paul, when he once came to Athens, Apost. 17:22, 23, into a mighty city, he found old altars built in the temple. 9) He went from one to another and looked at them all, but he did not touch any of them with his foot, but stood in the middle of the place and said that they were idolatrous things and asked that they be removed; he also did not tear any of them down by force. When the word took hold of their hearts, they themselves fell away; then the thing itself fell away. So if I had seen that they had kept the mass, I would have preached and admonished them. If they had followed it, I would have won them over; but if not, I would not have torn them away by hair and force, but would have let the Word act and prayed for them. For the Word created heaven and earth.

1) So put by us instead of: "peculiar".

2) So put by us instead of: "give in this".

3) So put by us instead of: "their".

4) So put by us instead of: "to be in it".

5) Here, this redaction is again meaningless, because it is extremely incomplete. In the previous one it says: "If one did so, today the word would fall into the heart of one, tomorrow it would fall into the heart of another."

6) So put by us instead of: "that".

7) So put by us instead of: "will you therefore".

8) This insertion is made from the previous redaction.

9) "old" is missing in the previous redaction.

and all things; that must do it, and not we poor sinners.

Summa Summarum: I want to preach it, I want to say it, I want to write it, but I do not want to force anyone by force, because faith wants to be attracted willingly, unnecessarily. Take an example from me. I have opposed indulgences and all papists, but not by force. I have only practiced, preached and written the Word of God; otherwise I have done nothing. When I have slept, when I have drunk Wittenberg beer with my Philippo and Amsdorf, this has done so much that the Pabstthunx has become so weak that no prince nor emperor has ever broken off so much. I have done nothing; the word has done it all. If I had wanted to go on with mischief, I would have brought Germany into a great bloodshed; yes, I would have caused a game at Worms, so that the emperor would not have been safe. But what would it have been? It would have been a fool's game. I have done nothing; I have let the word act. What do you think, what the devil thinks, if one wants to arrange the thing with rumor? He sits behind hell and thinks, "Oh, how can fools play such a fine game?" But then he suffers, because we alone do the word and let it work. That is all-powerful, that takes captive the

The heart, and when it is caught, the work must fall apart by itself.

4 A gross example. In time past there were sects among the Jews and Gentiles because of the law of Moses concerning circumcision; some would keep it, and some would not. Then Paul came and preached that one should keep it or not, for there was no power in it, and that one should not make it an obligation, but leave it free; one should keep it or not, and there would be no danger, until the time of Jerome, who came and wanted to make it an obligation, and to make an order and statute out of it: one should do it. Then St. Augustine came, and was of St. Paul's opinion: one should keep it or not. St. Jerome was a hundred miles away from St. Paul's opinion, and the two *Doctors were* very much at odds with each other. When St. Augustine died, St. Jerome was the one who brought it to the point that it had to be abolished. Then came the popes, who also wanted to do something about it and also made laws. Out of the abrogation of the one law grew thousands of laws, so that they have completely overwhelmed us with law. So it will also happen here, because 1) one law soon makes two, two make their three 2c.

That is enough of the things that are necessary. Let us take care that we do not deceive the weak conscientious.

1) "For" put by us after the previous redaction instead of "that".

2. to take Martin Luther's opinion of both forms of the sacrament and other innovations. *)

Mid-April **) 1522.

Grace and peace to all my dear lords and brothers in Christ from God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

1 Saint Paul calls the holy gospel a word of the cross and a sermon of foolishness to the Gentiles, and a sermon of offense to the Jews [1 Cor. 1:18, 23]. But now, out of the unfathomable riches of the mercy of God our Father, we have again been graced with the wholesome, pure word of the Gospel, we must consider that it is and remains for us no other than, according to its nature, a word of the cross, of trouble, of foolishness. It is a great sign of a right faith and teaching among us that Satan attacks us with his scales so bitterly and grievously. If our doctrine were of the world, it would praise the world [John 15:19], as the teaching of the Pope has done until now; but now it is not of the world, but God has given it to us, therefore the world hates us.

Now this is the least challenge, that the world hates and persecutes us. Satan is not satisfied with this, but intends to exercise his will of courage among us, and whether we are too strong for his larva, the papists, from the outside, he wants to cut us apart and destroy us from the inside through ourselves. God our Father forbid him, amen.

(3) Therefore, we are to look more to ourselves than to our external enemies.

"We know well what he has in mind," says St. Paul 2 Cor. 2, 11. Now seeing that he cannot deceive us on the left, he throws himself on the right. Earlier he made us all too papal; now he wants to make us all too evangelical. But God has commanded us many times in the Scriptures: "We shall keep to the right road, and not turn aside to the right hand or to the left" [Is. 30:21]. Truly, it is time that we arm ourselves and protect ourselves with prayers and teachings, Satan wants to get at it. He has hitherto wrestled with me alone through vain rude heads, which can do nothing but blaspheme and lie; but now they stand in great hope, we shall disturb ourselves with our own dissension and discord.

4 But therefore be not dismayed. St. Paul had it worse, namely, false brothers and false apostles among his group [2 Cor. 11:26], and all who were in Asia fell away from him; also his special dear friend and disciple Demas left him [2 Tim. 4:10]. So here we must also wait for some of our own to fall away when the conflict begins; about that, when the real main conflict begins with the devil among ourselves, we must wait for those to fall who are now leading the way, be it Luther or whoever. It is not a sophistical disputation who should fight with Satan.

5 But I know where my teaching comes from and who has raised me up. The work also proves it sufficiently. For whether I may

*This writing appeared around the middle of April 1522 (on April 12 it was under the press. De Wette, Vol. II, p. 180) in Wittenberg under the title: "Von beider Gestalt des Sacraments zu nehmen und ander Neuerung, D. M. Luthers Meinung", and was reprinted in the same year there and elsewhere several times. Only one of the seven individual editions gives a printer, namely "Egydius Fellenfürst zu Coburg"; several of them do not give the time; two are also without indication of the place. In the collections: Wittenberger (1554), vol. VII, p. 355; Jenaer (1585), vol. II, p. 82; Altenburger, vol. II, p. 120; Leipziger, vol. XVIII, p. 185 and Erlanger, vol. 28, p. 286. We give the text according to the Jenaer edition.

**) The Erlangen edition has at the superscription, vol. 28, p. 286: "M. Mart." i.e. LIsE Nartio, which seems to be reprinted from the old edition of Walch, because in the Wittenberg collection, from which the Erlangen edition has allegedly reproduced the text, this closer time determination is not found. Walch's statement had its justification in the fact that at the end of this writing in the Jena edition this date is written: "XXIII Lliartio Anno MDXXII."

of the small signs that we might have done (if it were necessary), it is to be considered a great miracle that Satan's highest head and greatest power, the papacy 1) with its body, has received such a blow from me that no temporal or spiritual power has ever been able to prove to him. Satan himself also feels well who is master of my teaching; therefore he rages and thus seeks weak grips.

(6) The temporal power, the servant of the pope, has now also interfered in the matter, which I do not like to see. But if it will not be otherwise, we must take comfort in Christ that he will help us, since we have beaten and despised the angry Lord, so that we will not be afraid of his ungracious servant. We believe that Christ is our Lord and theirs, and that he will help those who rely on his help. Let us pray for them, that God will enlighten them in this annual time, and that they will pull their hands out of the pope's sod, so that they will not be wrapped up with him and destroyed, because I am afraid they will make the main scratch. Christ has ever had it in mind that he does not want to be afraid that some angry pope's servants want to put body and goods on it, but he thinks it would be necessary for them to think about how they would bring body and goods away from it; it is already too far set on it. If they dampen my teaching, then God has certainly not spoken through me. But it must of course remain as it has been from the beginning, that no class has so many fools as the great classes, as the Greek proverb says: One shall be born a prince or a fool.

(7) I am saying all this so that we may be undaunted by Satan's manifold attacks and troubles, for St. John says: "He who is in us is greater than he who is in the world" [1 John 4:4]. For this reason I humbly ask all my dear lords and friends in Christ,

These would kindly accept my instruction and opinion in such a rumor, and with earnest prayer help to preserve and promote before God this evangelical cause, which has now become common to us all, so that through it the poor souls who are still to come here may also be enlightened, and we together with them be strengthened in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ; to whom be praise, thanksgiving and glory forever and ever, amen.

First of all, it should be known that I do not want to dispute here whether the holy sacrament should be given and received in both forms, and whether the laity have the power to take and receive it with their hands, and whether one has the power to do so in vessels other than chalices, in garments other than chasubles, in houses other than the church. In such and such external practices, even if they are contrary to the pope or not, God does not give us much discretion; but we Christians should and will have the power and right to keep the institution of Christ in whatever way we please, regardless of the false, lying titles of the church, ecclesiastical order, and of all tyrants, spiritual and secular, who are angry.

(9) And place our foundation in Him who cannot lie, saying Matt. 15:7, 8, 9: "The prophet Esaias hath said of you hypocrites, This people honoureth me with their lips, and their heart is far from me: but they serve me in vain, because they teach the commandments of men" (Isa. 29:13). On this a Christian should comfort his conscience and firmly believe that Christ does not lie. If he does not lie, then it must be true that all that is added and kept in this sacrament by the teaching of men, about the first institution of Christ, is a vain service. In spite of all the devils, that they protest against this.

(10) Now it is certain that it is vain man's addition and doctrine, that one should not use both forms, should not touch with hands, should not act with unconsecrated garments, in common houses and vessels. For through Christ, the apostle, and for a long time thereafter, this was neither established nor kept, but rather contradicted, as the evangelists clearly prove; therefore it is certainly a vain service of God to teach and keep this as a necessary commandment.

1) Erlanger "Bißthum", allegedly from the Wittenberg edition, which however offers "Bapstthum". That this cannot be a printing error is evident from the fact that "Pabstthum" is listed as Walch's variant.

11) The other reason we place again on Christ, Marci 3, 1. ff. and Matth. 12, 8: "The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath. The word says Christ that his disciples had power to break the Sabbath. Now every Christian man is Christ's brother, as St. Paul Rom. 8, 14-17, Gal. 4, 6. 7. and he himself Ps. 22, 23. testifies. For "He has given power to all who believe in His name to become children of God," Joh. 1, 12. Therefore every Christian is also a lord over the Sabbath, much more over all human commandments, doctrine and statutes. As also Paul 1 Cor. 3, 21-23. says: "All things are yours, whether Peter or Paul, life or death, all things are yours. But ye are Christ's; but Christ is GOD's."

(12) For this reason we have, and will have unhindered, that we are masters over all papal and human doctrine and commandments, and it shall be at our will and pleasure whether we will keep them or not. Let us see what all devils may say or do against this. I mean that I am speaking German now, and that my words are not mine, but Christ's. They will not push Christ out of heaven, the ungracious nobles. For he who has set him at his right hand has in mind to keep him there. We defy and take comfort in this, and we will surely refrain from their wrath.

(13) But this Christian rule, freedom and power of ours must be understood only spiritually. For Christ did not want to have anything to do with worldly rule, to which he himself also gave subjects and interest, Matth. 17, 27. But this is called spiritual freedom, when the conscience remains free. This means that I do not make a conscience of myself before God if I transgress the teachings of men, as if I had committed a sin in doing so. Again, that I do not make a conscience of it, as if I had done a good work with it and deserved something before God, if I kept it. For that is what Christ himself says, that it is vain service; but I should respect such doctrines of men as eating and drinking, sleeping and walking, all of which I can do and refrain from doing, freely, without any injury to my conscience.

or correction, so that faith in Christ alone is my good work, life and merit, for the comfort of my conscience, and after that love toward my neighbor.

14 The third reason is St. Paul, Gal. 5:13: "Brethren, ye were called to liberty: but see ye give it not for a cause to the flesh, but serve one another in love. This is also said to Christians, that they owe nothing but to serve one another in love. For by faith they have all that they have before God and according to conscience: they are lords over sin, death, the devil, and all things; therefore no commandment can be laid down for them, by which their conscience should exercise itself to become pious, or by which they may sin, just as little can a healthy man be commanded to eat and drink, by which he may become healthy or unhealthy; for he is already healthy, and may become unhealthy without such a commandment, and may freely use or leave such a commandment.

(15) For there is a great difference between these three, to keep the commandment of men, and to serve in the commandment of men, and to be lord over the commandment of men. Christ did not reject the Sabbath, but wanted to be a master over it, that he might keep it and not keep it. Item, he also did not reject the teachings of men. For what harm would it have done him to wash his hands as the Jews commanded? But he would not serve in it, saying that it was a vain service of God, that is, they wanted to trap consciences with it, as if he who kept it was doing a necessary service, which he would have to do in mortal sin and would be guilty of doing; this is false and seductive.

16 So also here, that we keep papal laws, where they are not against God, would not be evil in itself, like eating, drinking 2c. But that he wants it to be done in obedience to the church and in mortal sin, and that no one can be saved who does not keep it, and is not a Christian, is a heretic 2c., thus wants to entrap the consciences, that is the devil himself. Here goes our freedom, and [we] speak: This is a lie; we are masters of such commandments according to conscience, and will be without sin if we transgress them.

and without piety, if we keep them; that and no other.

(17) We now return to the first, and say by command and in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, amen, that those who attack the holy sacrament with their hands, or have acted without consecrated garments, vessels, or houses, or would still do so, whether in Wittenberg or Eilenburg, in Bohemia or Hungary, in Prussia or Prussia, should not, on losing their salvation, have any conscience about it, as if it were evil, as far as the work on him is concerned. Instead, he should insist on it and allow himself to be killed ten times before he wants to revoke it, condemn it, or confess it to be wrong, regardless of whether papal, imperial, princely, or even diabolical statutes, judgments, and orders have been issued against it. But I am talking about the work in itself, because we will talk about the abuse and the persons later.

The reason for all this is that those who have condemned or will condemn such things cannot prove that they were done contrary to Christ's first institution, but must confess that Christ himself and common Christianity have long done so, leaving us free to do so. Thus it is for the loss of every man's salvation that he should not recant, nor reprove for unrighteousness, nor blame what Christ himself and all Christendom have done in time past; for that would be as much as to deny and condemn Christ, together with all the apostles and all Christendom, when it was at its best. But that the papists should reproach such things for heresy, and that some angry princes should proclaim their Christian honor by blaspheming and persecuting such things, is not evil to them. What could Caiphas and Herod do more cheaply than crucify and mock the Son of God?

19 The other cause, they must also confess that all that they insist on, and therefore rage about, is man's law, or, as they lie and deceive, church commandment. For they will not prove for a long time yet that Christ has performed the sacrament in consecrated vessels, garments, houses, or has commanded it to be performed, or has put it into the mouth, not into the

the hands. Because we are Christians, we are masters over such human commandments, as far as consciences are concerned; therefore we owe it to ourselves to venture our necks over them, and not to forsake such liberty. For to do so would be to deny and condemn Christ, who has commanded such liberty so harshly and severely, and is not at all in our power to change or forgive it.

(20) Let them be content that we do not reject their statutes and ways, and may keep them; but let them make a nuisance of it, as if it ought not to be otherwise, and bind consciences in it, and let it be heresy who do otherwise, we will not suffer it, and put life and limb upon it. The conscience should be free to do otherwise or so in this matter, and the freedom should remain intact, that and no other; Christ should help us, who gave it to us and commanded it.

They write, the ungracious papists, and dress it up with a big trunk, that one has received the holy sacrament with the listening hands. What do you think? Delicious thing it is, listening hands, who does not know them, should well think, they trunk themselves thus very much in honor of the holy sacrament and out of Christian movement. If I now ask them with what kind of mouth they themselves receive the sacrament on Easter, whether they receive it with a listening mouth or with a priestly mouth, they will perhaps say: their mouth is then an angelic or episcopal mouth. I would humbly ask such gentlemen, if they would listen to me in front of thick ears, that, if they wanted to deceive and fool, they would do so in their goods, and leave God's work and the souls' business in peace. I am not saying this to be too close to the worldly authorities, but that it is our right, if they want to deceive and fool in God's business, that we should not suffer it nor remain silent. Those have attacked the Sacrament with eavesdropping hands, but these, when they want to joke like this, they fall in with their lay butts, and still boast of great Christian love.

22. is it wrong, therefore, to listen with your hands?

If a person touches the sacrament, that the hand commits sin, or that it is unconsecrated, then it would be more appropriate not to receive the sacrament with the mouth, much less in the stomach, nor to let a person see it; for neither the mouth nor the stomach nor the eye is consecrated; so much more sin is committed with the mouth and eyes than with the hand. Such wise brains should also finally persuade us that we do not have to speak or hear the holy word of God, lest the holy word be received with the lay mouth and ears. But with such nonsensical blindness, Christ uses to afflict his enemies, so that one may see how mightily he reigns over those who think they have eaten him, and must disgrace and punish themselves with their own foolishness.

23. 1) A Christian should know that there is no greater sanctuary on earth than God's Word; for even the Sacrament itself is made and sanctified by God's Word, and through it we are all born spiritually and consecrated as Christians. If a Christian understands the Word, which sanctifies all things, and is higher than the Sacrament (as much as one can grasp it with one's hands), nevertheless both with mouth, ears, heart, yes, with one's whole life, how should he not also be allowed to attack such a thing, which is sanctified with it? Or should he also not attack himself? For he is sanctified with it as well as the sacrament.

24. with the wise the Pharisees would come, of which Christ says, Matth. 23, 2) 17-19,

1) This paragraph, together with the following two, forms the conclusion of the unauthentic scripture, which was published under the title: "Das Hauptstück des ewigen und neuen Testaments, von dem hochwürdigen Sacrament beider Gestalt, Fleisch und Blut Christi, Zeichen und Zusage, die er uns in denselben gethan hat. Gepredigt von D. Martin Luther zu Wittenberg am Gründonnerstag 1522" was published in several individual editions, without indication of place and printer. This writing is not found in the old editions. First it is included in the Leipzig Supplement p. from it passed over into the old edition of Walch, vol. X, 2659. The Erlangen edition also brings it, vol. 22, p. 38. By mistake it has also found inclusion in the St. Louis edition, vol. X, 2164 ff.

2) Here the Erlangen edition has reprinted from the old edition of Walch: "Matth. 22". In addition, three other false bible quotations of Walch are reprinted in this publication.

That they made the gold more holy than the temple, and the sacrifice more holy than the altar. And it is just as if one were to begin to teach that it is a sin to touch the chalice's food, but one might well attack the chalice itself. I would like to hear a piece from the papists that they could present without being particularly foolish. But what else should they do, who judge and blaspheme God himself!

(25) A Christian man is holy in body and soul, whether he be layman or priest, man or woman; whoever says otherwise blasphemes holy baptism, Christ's blood and the Holy Spirit's grace. It is a great and strange thing about a Christian, and God is more interested in him than in the Sacrament. For the Christian was not made for the sake of the sacrament, but the sacrament was instituted for the sake of the Christian; and these blind heads want to dispute whether he may attack the sacrament, and even want to make a heresy out of it. Out with the stubborn and blinded heathen, who know nothing at all about what a Christian is called or is!

26 Therefore we also beseech those who have received both forms, and if it will help, we command in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that they should not make a conscience of it, as if it were unjust or evil done, but should let life go before they recant or deny it, regardless of what the pope, emperor, prince, and devil may oppose, do, or want. For the text of the Gospel is so clear that even the papists cannot deny that Christ instituted both forms and gives them to all disciples. Therefore you are guilty, for the salvation of your soul, not to deny this or let it be blasphemed, since it would be just as much as if you said that Christ himself had done wrong in it and was a heretic, because he acts differently from the pope and the angry papists (who make themselves the church). The papists should put such blasphemy on the works of Christ; you must praise, honor and justify them with life and limb if you want to be a Christian and be saved.

27 And here again see how strongly the Lord Christ rules over his blasphemers, and by their own cleverness brings them to the sun.

bring. At Nuremberg, it came out of the regiment 1) that the matter of receiving both forms of the sacrament should be postponed until a future council, because the wise gentlemen do not want to condemn it, but do not want to allow it, but to condemn it unrecognized. What do you think now? I mean, these are Christians, they confess that Christ instituted it and that it stands in the Gospel, that is true; but they want to take a concern whether it is right or wrong, to keep or not to keep, what Christ sets and does. I would like Christians to consider whether the gospel is right or wrong, to suffer or not to suffer. He also commanded that one should not commit adultery; but now I see first of all whence the great lords commonly regard adultery so lightly: they have perhaps taken it into a consideration whether it is rightly commanded or not.

28. Since our Lord Christ publicly makes fools of his enemies, the great Hansa, both spiritual and secular, in this matter, so that they proceed in such a childish and shameful manner that Claus Fool would be man enough to answer them, we should be confident and despise their raving and foolishness, and not worry how we answer them; for they can do nothing by the grace of God, as the pope with his bulls and papist protectionists, 2) and now also the angry lords, have sufficiently proven, but we must put flesh and blood out of our eyes and remember that we base our conscience on God's word pure and alone, so that we can meet the devil in death and stand our ground. Dear brother, believe me, I who have experienced it, the devil is not afraid of man's word and commandment. Therefore, if he finds you dying, that you are casting your conscience on man's commandment, 3) and you want to say: thus the pope, church, princes 2c. have commanded me, he will overthrow you, so that your 4) conscience will not be afraid of man.

1) Cf. Luther's letter to the Elector Frederick of March 7, 1522, Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 2391, § 12.

2) Thus the Jena; Wittenberg: Schutzschreiben.

3) stönen - to support.

4) "dein" is missing in the Jenaer. Instead of "Fußstapff" in the Jenaer, the Wittenberg has "fußstab"; the Erlangen: "Fußstaf."

The footprint will remain. Again, if he finds you defying God's word and saying, "Thus Christ has commanded me, there is his word, so you will make the world close to him.

29 This is what St. Paul means - Eph. 6:12: "We have no quarrel with flesh and blood, but with the spiritual wickedness in the air, with the rulers of this darkness. But these only contend that they either seduce the conscience with wiles and doctrines, or overthrow it with false terror. But no weapon can help against this, except the word of God alone, the sword of the Spirit [Eph. 6:17]. Therefore we should always remain steadfast that both forms are right and Christian and evangelical; and whoever says otherwise is lying and blaspheming God, be it pope, emperor, princes, or the devil.

(30) So also we are to confess and maintain the liberty to receive the sacrament with our hands or with our mouths, to act with and in consecrated and unconsecrated garments, vessels, and houses, as we please. Whoever denies this freedom, or calls any of these things heresy, is lying again and blaspheming Christ and his word, be it pope, emperor, prince, or devil. We have the bright and clear gospel, as they themselves confess, but they have their own doubts whether they want to keep the gospel and their own mind against the gospel. Let the foolish go, let them go!

Summa Summarum, as St. Paul says Gal. 1, 8: "If we ourselves, or an angel from heaven, preached to you differently than we preached to you, let it be forbidden. So I also say here: You must therefore rely firmly and surely on God's word in this matter and all others, that even if I myself became a fool, since God was for me, and revoked or denied my teaching, that you therefore do not step away from it, but say: Even if Luther himself, or an angel from heaven taught differently, so be it. For you must not be a disciple of Luther, but of Christ, and it is not enough for you to say, Luther, Peter, or Paul said this, but you must feel Christ himself in your conscience,

and feel insensibly 1) that it is God's word, even if the whole world disputes it. As long as you do not feel, you have certainly not tasted God's word, and still hang with your ears on man's mouth or pen and not with your heart on the word, and do not yet know what it is, Matth. 23, 10: "You shall not call yourselves masters on earth, for One is your Master, Christ. The Master teaches in the heart, but by the outward word of his preachers, who drive it into the ears; but Christ drives it into the heart.

Therefore think for yourself, you have death or persecution ahead of you, I cannot be with you, nor you with me, but each one must stress there for himself, overcome the devil, death, the world. If then you would look around at the time, where I would stay, or I, where you would stay, and let yourself be moved, whether I, or someone on earth said otherwise, then you are already lost and have left the word out of your heart; because you do not stick to the word, but to me or to others. There is then no help. You can see what terrible murderers of souls these are, who do not preach the doctrine of men to the souls, or even God's word loudly and surely; in addition, how few cling to it with their hearts, even though it is preached loudly and preached by many. Let this be said of the first part.

The other part.

(33) If then this is certain, and there is no doubt about it, why is it not done? Yes, why do you yourself not let it go in Wittenberg, since it has begun, and elsewhere more? I answer, "I do not like that it should not be done, but my complaint is that it cannot be done. A prisoner should be able to travel, he would have the power and the right to do so; but he cannot, it is not up to him, but to others who hinder him. Take a like

niss. 3) The gospel should be preached rightly in all the world; where is the fault? Not in the gospel, for it is right and true, useful and blessed. But there is a lack of people who are fit for it. Where there are none, it is better to be silent than to preach, for the preaching is falsified and harmful.

(34) So here too, the sacrament and the above custom is right and good; but where are the people who are fit for it, so that they start it and do it? If it were so arranged and a Christian were to use the sacrament in this way, it would be no easier thing than to be a Christian; a sow would also like to be a Christian. 5) I have striven for this and would like that the pope's law would also be abolished, from the annual reception of the sacrament at Easter, and that each one would be left free to go to it without restraint out of his own conscience and out of the hunger of his soul, so that the horrible un-Christian abuse and blasphemy would be worsened, and henceforth hardly anyone would go to it, since now many hundreds go.

(35) Thus I see that Satan deals with it, that he wants to make both forms so common and even more common than the pope has made his one form (6) before Christians are made who are to do this; and he intends to make it worse on the right side than on the left. Therefore it is necessary for us to stay on the right middle road and ask God to help us and keep us on it, because Satan seeks us with earnestness.

I will leave the reason for not having this custom in Wittenberg. For this is a special

3) What is now in this paragraph and in the two following paragraphs is likewise used for the above-mentioned inauthentic writing. Cf. the note to § 23 of this paper.

4) In the old editions here and immediately following instead of "a Christian" "Christians".

5) The preceding sentence is omitted from the print just mentioned.

6) In the Wittenberg and the Jena: "sein eigen Gestalt". We have made this change according to the above-mentioned print, which offers "sein ein Gestalt". Erlanger Ausgabe, Vol. 22, p. 42. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. X, 2167. The reading we have given is confirmed by what is said in the following § 39.

1) imponderable i.e. without wavering. The Jenaer, which has this reading, gives as a conjecture in the margin: "inwendig". The Wittenberg and after it the Erlangen: impassable.

2) Thus the Erlangen; in the Wittenberg and Jena editions: "reissen".

I do not want to confirm or help to strengthen such beginnings. Even if it were even more delicious and even more heavenly, I still do not want to confirm or help strengthen such beginnings. It is not the duty of every man to approach or do all that is right, but it is enough that he should do that which is rightly appointed and commanded him. For where this order is reversed, it is not right, however good the right may be. Therefore I will only tell the causes which hinder and promote that this custom of the sacrament cannot or may not proceed or continue.

The first is that this sacrament with its custom is not in our power, but is imprisoned by papal laws; just as the golden vessels of the temple were imprisoned in Babylon. But the prison is made so that the common man's conscience is so severely entangled and weakened in the faith by papal tyranny and laws that he cannot so suddenly let it go and strengthen his conscience that the pope's thing is wrong and this custom is right and evangelical.

(38) After all, I myself labored three years before I was delivered from the laws of the priest, with daily practice of the gospel, in preaching, reading, contemplating, discussing, writing, and listening; how then should the common man be brought out so quickly? Where such weak men go and take both forms, their conscience bites them afterwards and they confess that they have taken both forms, as if they had done evil. As some have already done. This is an abominable thing, and has become worse. With such confession and conscience they deny and condemn Christ and his institution. Only stay away from these people of both kinds, because they are following the saying of Christ, Matth. 9, 17: "No one puts must into old wineskins, otherwise the must breaks the wineskins, and the must is spilled and the wineskins spoil. The must is the doctrine of the Gospel; the old wineskins are these outdated weak consciences; therefore they cannot get along with each other. The conscience becomes angry and then denies the doctrine it had grasped.

(39) Yes, I say further, keep away from such people, even from one form and from the whole sacrament; for those who need only one form, the devil will be afraid to die with the gospel, which uses both forms. 1) Where they then do not know counsel, they must perish, and it will not help them to apply papal laws and old customs. The gospel asks neither for pope nor custom. That is why I said that there is no lack of law, but of people. The Pabst's law cannot be kept in all the world without atrocious murder of souls, to enjoy one form against the gospel. Again, it is not less harmful to raise both figures so suddenly among the whole community of such imprisoned weak consciences according to the Gospel.

40 Thus you speak: What will happen here? Is it so dangerous on both sides with this sacrament, that the devil at death with the gospel drives against 2) one form, and the pope at life with his law against both forms; where then shall we go? Answer: For this reason St. Paul proclaimed that the reign of the last Christ should make perilous times [2 Thess. 2:9, 10], that one cannot walk securely on either side, neither in the gospel nor out of the gospel, yet through no fault of the gospel, for the must is good, but through the fault of the pope, who has caused the consciences, the tubes, to grow old and corrupt, so that they cannot grasp nor keep the gospel, and yet cannot be kept without the gospel. What then shall we do? Answer: Nothing else, but what Christ teaches and says, Matth. 9, 17: "Put the must into new bottles, and they will both be kept.

We must first become coopers and make new barrels before the grape harvest begins and the must is gathered: the old ones must be put aside, that is, one must preach strongly and much against the pope's law of one form, and well drive the evangelical institution of Christ of both forms. But in

1) So the Jenaer. Wittenberger: inserts.

2) Erlanger: "again", probably after Walch's old edition.

that the people reject the whole sacrament, be it in one or both forms, and do not add to it, neither on Easter nor on Pentecost, and thus let the order of the pope fall, so long, until the people, sufficiently understood, without enticements and charms, but driven by their own conscience, come of their own accord, and [each one] wrestle and press for the sacrament to be given to him. Thereby one could feel that the barrels and tubes were new, and their consciences sufficiently strengthened; so the others, the weak, remained behind in their being until they also became strong.

(42) But if a man beget, or call, or entice, or provoke to the sacrament, the whole multitude shall fall down, and take the must in his old tube, and perish. Therefore it is not possible, and the sacrament cannot suffer it, that one should put a common ordinance on it, who should enjoy it, as the pope does, but one must first well preach to the people, and draw the weak consciences away from it, until they, fully informed of the gospel, come humbly of themselves, announce to the priest and ask for the sacrament out of spiritual hunger. With the others, all only far from the Sacrament, regardless of the pope, laws, church customs and all things. For Christ says Matt. 11:12: "The kingdom of God is preached, and suffereth violence: and they that do violence take it to themselves." That is, one should not compose men with commandments or laws, nor provoke them to the gospel with custom or words, but preach freely, and then let them come and press on to it from themselves.

But where do we find such preachers? And if we had them, how could they drive the common man away from going to the sacrament on Easter? The law of the pope is too deeply ingrained that we cannot put away all the old vessels and casks; we must let them continue in the old abuse for a while, until the casks become new, and the gospel comes to the people. If now these old barrels and hoses alone were the people who are repugnant to us, and condemn both forms, and put them to the test, we should not be able to do anything.

If Pabst's law and custom force the consciences, we would easily advise the matter in this way: We would again condemn their law, as it not only teaches against the gospel and both forms, but also, even if it teaches the gospel, still forces the consciences to it, and compels them to believe. This is not only foolish and unevangelical, but also impossible. One should not and cannot force anyone to believe, but let the gospel freely fetch whom it will. Therefore, we would only use such fools to defy and oppose both forms through and through, and trample their law underfoot.

44 But among their multitude are many good-hearted, simple-minded people who would gladly lead rightly and well if they knew or could grasp it. Here, then, we must confront the tyrants so that we do not shatter or mislead the poor group. Let faith contend against the tyrants, and hold fast to the gospel against their law, and thrust such old, useless barrels into a heap; but let love embrace and receive these weak, simple consciences, and work on them to make new barrels of them.

(45) Now here is the doctrine and example of St. Paul, who, when he came to stubborn 1) Jews who insisted on circumcision and the law, did and taught the contradiction with joy, and would be unconquered. But where he came to the weak simple-minded, he also circumcised, and let the law go, until he strengthened them, and brought them out of the law. So he boasts 1 Cor. 9, 20: "With the Jews I was a Jew, with the Gentiles I was a Gentile", and yet Gal. 6, 15. says, 2) in Christ there is neither Gentile nor Jew. All this because he did not want to suffer the law and the pressure on the conscience, but to have free power to do or not to do such things.

(46) So must we do here also; because we cannot draw the common man from the sacrament, as it ought to be, until the gospel be known, we must spare the simple who are under it, and not let them

1) Wittenberger: starrigen.

2) "speaks" is missing in the Erlanger.

The following table shows the different types of use of the two forms:

In the first place, let the old custom remain that one says mass in Latin with consecrated garments, with singing and all the usual ceremonies, considering that such a thing is a vain outward thing, in which the conscience does not care. In addition, the consciences must be kept free with the sermon, so that the common man learns that this does not happen because it must be done this way, or because it is heresy who does otherwise, as the mad laws of the pope urge; for such tyrants, who want and force this with laws, must be attacked sharply and harshly, so that Christian freedom remains whole.

48 On the other hand, priests who say mass must avoid all words in the canon and collects that refer to the sacrifice. For this is not a thing that is free to do or not to do, as was said next, but it must and should be avoided, and whoever wishes to do so may do so. But the priest can avoid such things, so that the common man will never find out, and he can do it without any trouble. But he who is stubborn and does not want to avoid such words, let him answer for himself, and let him always do it.

49. thirdly, that the words of the sacrament be well practiced in the sermon: "This is my body, given for you; this is my blood, shed for you," 2c., and that every Christian take them to heart, and especially model and act them when he takes the sacrament or hears mass, for there is a thousand times more in the same words than in the forms of the sacrament; and without such words the sacrament is not a sacrament, but a mockery before God. Therefore, in the Papist Church the Sacrament is indeed given, but it is not given to anyone, because they hide the words and give only the form, which is abominable.

(50) In the fourth place, when thou comest to the place where there is but one form, take but one form, as they do. If both are given, take both, and do no special thing, nor sit down against the multitude; without confessing that it is not evangelical (if you are asked). To take a form. For with the gospel, and not

With the deed or ordinance, the two forms are to be restored. The common man is not taught by deed or ordinance, but by the gospel, that both forms are right.

(51) If Christ's institution of both forms challenges you here, as it does not befit you to take one form, you shall report yourself thus: First of all, you have the words of the sacrament, which are the main part of it; you can grasp and practice them, so well, 2) if you take one or both, or no form at all, that you are completely without driving, and still receive the power of the sacrament.

On the other hand, the fault is not yours, because you take only one and do not keep Christ's appointment. You would have liked to have both, but now the one is imprisoned by Pabst's law, in which the weak consciences are entangled, which you must not shatter, but tolerate and reject until they also become strong. Just as St. Peter in prison could not practice the preaching of the gospel, as he was guilty of doing [Acts 12:4], because necessity has no commandment. Therefore in such a case the commandment of love is to be placed far ahead of the institution of both forms. For Christ is more interested in love than in the sacramental form.

53. because Satan has so confused the matter by the pope's law that one cannot use both forms without damaging love against the weak consciences, again, one cannot practice love without damaging the institution of both forms: so love shall be incumbent and the institution shall depart for a time, but shall not be denied or condemned thereby. For love is a thing that must and should be. It is not necessary to receive the form of the sacrament, but one can leave it and keep the words alone. For Christ did not command to partake of the sacrament, but he set it free to be partaken of by whomsoever he will, so that he may take both forms if he can. But in this case it is not possible to keep for the sake of consciences, which love owes to serve.

1) "the" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer: "as well, as."

(54) With this I do not want to deny 1) those who want to and can take both forms, whether secretly or openly, without doing it especially, not on a common altar, or at the same time, when the weak need their way, that they do not also go along and confess again afterwards. But if someone is so weak on this side that he would rather do without the whole sacrament than take only one form, let him also be tolerated and let him live according to his conscience.

(55) This way, which has been rejected, is now going to Wittenberg; not that I want to condemn the previous one with it, or that it is sufficiently evangelical, or that I want to strengthen the tyranny of the pope with it, but that the weak consciences may be ministered to out of love for a time, until we better drive the gospel into the world. I do not see anything particularly wrong done, without Satan having insisted too much on haste, wanting to overleap love, and not letting the weak be aware of it. Thus, in the end, new ordinances would arise, which the gospel could perhaps suffer less than Pabst's law. It is a clever devil, he wants to go either to the left or to the right side, but the gospel wants to go freely on the right road, written with no ordinances, but to be a lord over all ordinances and to have power to hold now this, now that. Such freedom, however, cannot be brought to the people in a hurry, God would have it understood even by the most intelligent.

Fifth, I would have it so that there would be no mass at all, but only at the time when there were people who wanted the sacrament and asked for a mass, and that this would happen only once a week or in a month. For the Sacrament is to be administered only by the suggestion and request of hungry souls, not by duty, pen, custom, law or habit. But it is too early to begin this; the consciences will not follow me until it is truly preached and understood. Nevertheless, I cannot give the chaplains and priests who have to say mass

They should advise otherwise than to do this for the poor, erroneous consciences, out of love; but besides this, they should drop some masses and make a clean break-in with time, as much as they can and want to suffer, and confidently preach that this mostly falls away through the word.

57 Some would say: Yes, how would one care for the sick? Answer: I leave it at that, that one keeps the Sacrament for the sick in the monstrances; but if this custom of the masses would arise through a clearer knowledge of the Gospel, one would see that the Sacrament's form would not be necessary in death, since the words of the Sacrament are there, since the power lies in it, and it would be enough that one would take the form in good health, or would not despise it in death. The papists have made the sacraments so necessary for the dying, and yet they have concealed the words, which alone are necessary.

58) In the sixth place, the corner masses, done as sacrifices or good works, are well done and to be done, of which I have written enough in Latin. 3) But since no one is to be driven to faith, the priests who want to keep them should not be torn from the altar. Let them answer for it before God; if it is enough that one preaches against it and tells the people that they give nothing to it and neither let nor establish any, then they will probably fall themselves by such preaching in time.

In the seventh place, I have taught that secret confession is not to be commanded, but much less to be forbidden, as my booklet on confession 4) teaches; here I still stand up. For everything that is evangelical, Christian, or faith should be free, so that people, without law and activity, may press toward it with desire and love. Therefore, whoever does not like to confess, let him stay far away from it and trample the pope, princes, devils, laws underfoot, and let him be satisfied with the secret confession before God. But even though I do not urge you, I advise you to confess with pleasure before you go to the sacrament,

2) "den" is missing in the Wittenberger.

3) Os ni-roAAQaa missa privutu. On the abuse of the mass. Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XIX, 1068 ff.

4) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XIX, 814.

or ever not despise them. For although in the words of the Mass, as in the main part, there is absolution, nevertheless you should not despise the other absolutions. God has given us His absolution abundantly and much, none of which is to be despised for the sake of 1) the others.

60. as, in the Lord's Prayer he has set an absolution, that our sins shall be forgiven us, if we forgive our neighbor; which you shall not despise, nor leave the Lord's Prayer because of it, although in the Mass there is also an absolution. Thus he has Ps. 32, 5. made an absolution in secret confession before God, saying, "I have said, I will confess against me my iniquity; and thou hast forgiven me the iniquity of my sin." This absolution you shall also not despise for the sake of that which is in the Mass words, 2). Item, Matth. 18, 18. He gives absolution to all Christians, and says: "What you dissolve on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." And afterwards v. 19: "If two become one with one another on earth over anything, it shall be done for them." Therefore, do not despise any absolution, whether public or secret, that God gives. The more God's word 3) you have, the better it is.

61 Some of the images have acted shamefully, without the knowledge and will of their authorities and teachers, who would be worthy of good punishment. But let Satanam be Satanus, and let us speak to the matter. To have a picture is not wrong. In the Old Testament, God Himself set up the serpent of brass [Deut. 21:8], and the cherubim on the golden ark [Deut. 25:18]; but God forbade the worship of images [Deut. 20:4]. It is true that they are dangerous, and I would that there were none on the altars; but because they burn and desecrate and do not suffer, we shall not prove that it is right. Therefore I say my cause. The devil and his papists also want to be beautiful and have done nothing wrong. If you now pretend that the images are

in great abuse, therefore have none, but profane them, and burn them; so shall they say, We abuse you not; how wilt thou persuade them? Woman and wine is also dangerous thing and in abuse; and what is not in abuse? But thou hast not reviled the abuse, but the images themselves, which I may well use. What wilt thou say to this? Behold, thus they have seized thee. Now if they break off a leaf from thee, they will have gained the whole forest; for they are hungry, and seek it indeed.

(62) Therefore we must wisely fight against the handsome devil and allow the images; but we do not preach strongly against this abuse or this driving alone, that one worships them, which is the least, and they should probably say that you are nonsensical, that you blame them, they worship stone and wood, but against the main abuse, which the papists are full of, namely, that they therefore put images in the churches, so that they think they are doing a good work and serving God with it. Although no one will confess such unbelief to them, even though it must be in the heart, where true Christian faith is not. Behold, with such a word you have quickly done more harm to the images than all the world can do with guns and swords. If the common man knows that it is not a service of God to set images, he will probably let it go himself, without your activity, and let them be painted on the walls only for pleasure, or for ornament, or otherwise need that it be without sin. How would we get into the prison, that men should forbid us, what God has not forbidden? and just those, who we 5) fence against the 6) human doctrine and statute.

The ninth, that priests should move and monks and nuns should be free to leave the order, also greatly annoys and enrages the papists beyond measure. But there is nothing to it. I have said above that where one can give way to weak consciences, one should do so, so that one does not shatter them, but so far that it may and can be done without damaging the things that must be.

5) "we" is missing in the Jena.

6) "the" is missing in the Wittenberger.

7) Wittenberger and Erlanger: man.

1) Wittenberger and Erlanger: others.

2) In the old editions: the Messen Wort.

3) ^Word" is missing in the Jena.

4) This reading is a conjecture of the Jena edition. In 4en editions: "bei ihrer".

The fact that the mass is not a sacrifice or a good work is 4, 1. 2. 3. when he interprets the devil's teachings and also almost annoying, so far unheard, but therefore one lies, take it to heart, it will be necessary for you; and take must not let it bother the strong or weak conscience. Since comfort in the fact that [it is] God's words, who cannot lie; Christ was preached, it was also annoying to all the world; read *Libellum de votis* 1) well, and strengthen yourself as best should he therefore be silent? Thus, that the priests have you can. It is a miserable murder of souls that the devil forbidden the devil's marriage and established monks' has wrought by the pope's prohibition, in which the souls status is indisputably proven by St. Paul 1 Tim, 4, 3. are deeply weakened and hard to strengthen against Therefore, one must and shall confess that marriage is such devil's vows.

freely given to them by God, and may also not be written The tenth, that one is free to eat eggs, fish and meat with any vow against God's word, or be committed to the every day of the year, and that the pope or the church devil's teachings. has no power to forbid some days or food, is certainly

(64) He therefore that can abstain, do well to remain true, as St. Paul's word 1 Tim. 4:3 clearly states: without a wife. But he who cannot is not guilty of remaining *Prohibitum nubere et abstinere a cibis*. But since one can spare without a wife, for he should not serve his neighbor with the weak consciences in this, and there is no need to such love as would condemn him and corrupt his own practice this among the simple who do not yet know, I do soul, but others are guilty of not taking offense at him. not resent that a good beating should befall them, Necessity has no commandment, necessity has no because they have such freedom, out of sheer wanton shame, necessity has no disgrace, necessity has no wickedness, contrary to the simple, without correction of vexation. If there were such a need to avoid both forms: body and soul, and yet otherwise do not lift a finger to we would not want to look at anger or a weak conscience. right Christian conduct, and thus make a shameful

It is true that I worry that some will move or run away, defamation of the gospel and the noble name of not because of Christian opinion, but because they are Christians, so that one speaks: These are Christians, of glad that they have gotten a cover and a reason for their what? Well, they can eat meat on Friday. Well then, they evilness in the evangelical freedom; what can we do about have not learned it from us in this way, and yet we have it? After all, the pope's prohibition of chastity has hardly to bear their bad habits.

one priest among a thousand who keeps such chastity Christ will one day come behind them and save his publicly; I will keep silent about the secret impurity. What name from their disgrace. We have thus taught and wonder is it that even some of our gospel do not need it? thought to free the consciences from the laws of the devil, They have gallows, wheels, swords and water; those who who by the pope, in mortal sins 2) and in hell, gives away do not want to do right can be resisted. the food and the days. When we have thus freed the

Here, see which priest wants to move, or which monk consciences, we shall use them wisely and subject them or nun wants to run away, that they start it with a strong to the service of our neighbor, so that we may bring him conscience, so that they can stand before the devil at there as well; then you, mad head, approach and push death. It is nothing that the unlearned and foolish Papists the simple before the head, so that they recoil, and say, strive against, but the devil will drive you with your vows Behold, I can eat flesh. Yes, you dear sow, you should quite masterfully and force you to confession, and make eat something else. your marriage and freedom a sin, if you are not well armed 69. summa, it is grievous in the sight of God and in the with God's word, on which you rely and despise him. sight of men, that we should not keep our Christian Therefore understand the saying of Paul, 1 Tim.

1) Luther's *Urtheil von den geistlichen und Kloster vows*. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XIX, 1500 ff.

2) Erlanger: "at death sins, and" 2c.

We begin with the outward things and leave the right inward things. We want to prove ourselves evangelical by taking both forms of the sacrament and attacking it [with our hands]. We do not want to outline the image, eat flesh, fast, pray, and the like. But no one wants to fast from faith and love, which alone are necessary, and since all power lies with, and that is not necessary. But it is the devil's ghost who leads people in such a way that they fall from the pope and yet do not come to Christ, and thus become neither papal nor Christian, but remain attached to an external thing just as the papists do.

I have taught, then, that my teaching is based first and foremost on the knowledge of Christ, that is, on right, honest faith, true love, and thereby on freedom and 1) all outward things, be it eating, drinking, clothing, praying, fasting, monasteries, sacraments, and whatever else they may be called, that such freedom is actually possessed and blessed only by those who believe and love, that is, by those who are true Christians; to them no human law can or should be laid down, kept, or suffered to catch their conscience. One must first have the people who are to have such freedom, so that the must is put into new barrels and kept.

Thus the rabble plods in, and wants to establish such freedom with the fist, and with the head through; does not even think that it should believe and love; remains nevertheless full of avarice, affliction, unchastity, anger, swearing and cursing, as before. Truly I say that I do not recognize such for Christ disciples. Christian people only fight with the word against the devil's doctrine and work, and first tear the hearts and consciences away from him; after that it all falls away from him. The apostles never overthrew an altar among the Gentiles. St. Paul sailed in a ship that had a sign of the idols called Castores 2) and did not tear down the images or the ship [Acts 28:11]. I have also written hard enough against the Pabst's idolatry, when perhaps no one, but still no one.

1) It is here to take "and" - "also".

2) In the Vulgate: insiMk Oastorum - the panier of the twins.

We have never done it with our hands, nor have we been called to do it without God's authority and power. We have done enough, if we preach against it and loosen the consciences; let God carry out the deed. For it is written that the last Christian shall be destroyed without hand, by the spirit of the mouth of our Lord Jesus Christ, Dan. 8:25 [2 Thess. 2:8].

For this reason I ask all Christians to listen to my advice in the Sacrament and in all other matters: First of all, since Satan, by papal law, has thrown the Sacrament under the swine, so that he forces all the world to go to the Sacrament at Easter, whether they believe or not, whether they love or not, and has hidden from them the words of the Sacrament, in which faith should hang and be nourished, let us work to remove the Sacrament from the swine first. But we do this by drawing people away from it and turning them away with teachings and petitions, so that no one ever goes to it out of papal law compulsion or obedience. For the Sacrament cannot suffer people to be drawn or compelled, but, being taught by the Gospel, they should ask and press for it of their own accord, out of hungry faith.

73) On the other hand, whoever thinks he has such a hunger, let him see to it that he does not deceive himself, and that there is no fleshly, human desire, but let him examine such faith to see if it is right, as St. Paul teaches in 1 Cor. 11:28: "Let man examine himself. But the test is in your whole life, namely, that you feel within yourself an aching conscience, which is oppressed by sin, desires mercy, or is afraid of death or hell, and would like to be strong, and so, with good confidence in Christ's word, seeks and takes the sacrament to get such grace, strength, and help. For, as I have said, a hungry, meager, oppressed and distressed soul demands this sacrament, which is to be added to itself, irrespective of Pabst's law or lawlessness, but only of its own need and thirst, in good faith.

3) Erlanger: "the", which is not found in any edition. We are not dealing here with a mere printing error, because "or" is given as Walch's variant.

advocates. This is the test of faith and inwardly.

The third test is that you look at your outer being, whether you also show love toward your neighbor and serve him. If you do not find such a test in yourself, but live as before, still full of unfaithfulness, hatred, avarice, anger, unbelief, O dear one, then stay away from this sacrament until you become a different person; do not let yourself be driven to the pile, nor to Pabst's law, nor to habit. Oh, Lord God, if this doctrine were well practiced, you should see that where now a thousand go to the Sacrament, hardly a hundred would go to it. In this way, there would be fewer of the abominable sins that the pope has washed into the world with his infernal law; in the end, we would again come to a Christian assembly, who are now almost vain pagans under the Christian name; then we would be able to recognize from ourselves, who recognized by their works, that they neither believed nor loved, which is now still impossible for us.

Oh God, we are still far from Jerusalem; we have hardly begun to leave Babylon, and we want to go as if we were already at home. Everything wants to be called Christian, and we must allow it; but faith and love will not follow. Making sects is no good and does not help. Therefore there is no advice left but to preach the gospel and turn people away from the sacrament and all outward things, until they feel and prove themselves Christians, and press from themselves first to faith and love, and then to outward sacrament and the like. However, we must let go of what is possible. We are in Babylon in prison, and our enemies are sitting in the middle of the temple and need our sacrament and all our goods. We must do this with lamentation and prayer, as Jeremiah and the 137th Psalm do, so that God will help us back to what is ours, amen.

76. at the end. I see that a good admonition is needed to those whom Satan is now beginning to persecute. Among them are some who think they want to follow the ferry.

If they are attacked by saying, "I do not hold with Luther, nor with anyone else, but with the holy gospel, and with the holy church, or with the Roman church, they are left in peace, and yet in their hearts they keep my doctrine for evangelical, and stick to it. Truly, such confession does not help them, and is as much as denying Christ. Therefore I ask them to be careful.

It is true that you should not say in body and soul, "I am Lutheran or Papist," for no one of these died for you, nor did your Master, but Christ alone, and you should confess yourself a Christian. But if you think that Luther's teaching is evangelical and the Pope's is unevangelical, you must not throw Luther out altogether; otherwise you would also throw out his teaching, which you nevertheless recognize as Christ's teaching. Rather, you must say: Luther is a knave or a saint, I am not interested in that; his teaching, however, is not his, but Christ himself. For you see that the tyrants do not deal with killing Luther only, but they want to destroy the doctrine; and because of the doctrine they touch you and ask you whether you are Lutheran. Here you must truly not speak in tongues, but freely confess that Luther, Claus or George preached him. Let the person go; but you must confess the doctrine.

78 St. Paul also wrote to Timothy, 2 Tim. 1, 8: "Do not be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me, who am bound for His sake. If Timothy here had been enough to confess the gospel, Paul would not have commanded him not to be ashamed of him either; not as of Paul's person, but as of him who was bound for the gospel's sake. If Timothy had said, "I do not hold with Paul nor with Petro, but with Christ," knowing that Peter and Paul taught Christ, he would have denied Christ Himself. For Christ says Matth. 10, 40. of those who preach Him: "He who receives you receives Me; he who despises you despises Me." [Luc. 10, 16.] Why is that? Because they keep his messengers (who bring his word) thus, therefore it is.

as if he himself and his word were thus kept.

79. Also see to it that everyone does not forget to love his enemies, and pray for those who persecute and blaspheme him, and do not seek vengeance, as Christ teaches Matt. 5:44. For the wicked people have already been punished too much, and we, unfortunately, have sensed too much that it is time to stand up for them against God, whether we might avert the punishment and judgment that presses upon them, as Christ did for us, when we also sinned in blindness. You see their horrible stubborn blindness; they do not want to hear, nor let us come to questioning; so they also do not want to answer, nor let themselves be heard, but like the Jews about St. Stephen, they cover their ears and eyes, and impudently pass their judgment without answer.

perform them with knowledge. If you are a Christian, you will know what kind of wrath, plague and punishment this is for them, and how you should hold yourself against God for them. They do not do otherwise than the frenzied and foolish who speak: We want to act so near to God and so wickedly that he must strike us on the head quickly. And be sure, they shall not long continue their raving. Wait a little while, and be satisfied that your God promises you, "He who touches you touches the apple of my eye." Help us to pray for this, and if we ever do not receive it, that God will not take His word from the whole German nation for the sake of their tyranny and blasphemy, and deprive the rest of the poor people who sigh for it. God's grace and strength be with you all, Amen.

3. D. Andr. Carlstadt's writing on the anti-Christian abuse of the Lord's bread and cup. *)

About September 1524.

I, Andreas Bodenstein of Carolstadt, publicly confess and make known to everyone that because of the abominable error and the poor deceived Christianity, I can no longer conceal the fact that many Christians are taking the Lord's bread and cup to great harm, and by their blind and unworthy practice are forfeiting the glorious Lord's Supper and making themselves guilty of the death of Christ, and are losing the great righteousness of Christ, 1) which Christ had and communicated to all believers. Therefore I must break out and punish myself in my previous letter about the Sacrament, and tell the truth. Although others should have done it justly before me, who are considered to be the princes of the

Scribes 2) and have attached us to them in such a way that we should neither write nor do anything physically before them; But because they keep behind the bush, and lay or stick themselves into pits and stakes for the simple, I must confess the truth of God and the high righteousness of Christ, at the cost of life or death, asking that none of you look to me or to any other, but let each one look to his inward testimony of the Spirit, but if he needs outward and written testimony for himself or others, let him look diligently to the Scriptures, which I will guide, for I ever guide them from me to God's true judgment, as John did when he said: It is he,

1) So set by us instead: Dungeons.

2) This is aimed at Luther.

*The full title of this writing in the original edition is: "Von dein widerchristlichen Mißbrauch des HErrn Brod und Kelch, ob der Glaub in das Sacrament Sünde vergebe, und ob das Sacrament ein Arrabo oder Pfand sei der Sündenvergebung: Auslegung des XI. Cap. in der Epistel Pauli zu den Corinth, von des HErrn Abendmahl". It is found only in Walch's edition. The timing is according to Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 447. On August 24, Luther arrived in Orlamünde. Immediately after Luther's departure, Carlstadt began to write this paper against him. At the end of September or beginning of October, Carlstadt had to leave Orlamünde by order of the Elector of Sept. 17, 1524 (Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I, p. 715.); however, this writing (§ 64) presupposes his expulsion as future.

I am not; he is in your means, whom you do not know. If he finds that this instruction is right and that he is helped out of his peril, then he praises God and grasps the truth. But if there is anyone to whom this admonition is contrary, let him be at liberty to instruct me and to ascribe something better to the world. I also want to ask anyone who thinks that I am going astray to teach me amicably, or even with sharp words, whether God will give me grace to recognize the error I think I have committed and to correct myself.

(2) Where I shall call the Lord's bread and cup in the sacrament, let no man count it that I have read it so called in the scriptures, but that I will speak with children, that they may hear me.

Whether the Sacrament forgives sin.

(3) It is a common and grievous pity that our Christians seek forgiveness of sins in the Sacrament. Namely, when their conscience, as they speak, is troubled or grieved because of their sin, they send to receive the reverend Sacrament, and when they receive it, they are satisfied by a false delusion and faith, which I will call false, until they indicate a word of their faith in the Scripture which they trust. Since 1) faith is from hearing the sermon, but preaching is from the word of God, Rom. 10, 17. Therefore no one should give them faith until they preach a word of faith, indicating that the Lord's bread is a sacrament, or forgives sin. And when they have preached and signified a word of true faith, then ye shall cleave unto the plain truth, and not unto their persons. You must also understand them from their speeches, whether they pretend true and divine things.

(4) The faith that pretends or prefigures a thing to itself, as it wants it to be, is a magical faith, and basically a false light and unreasonable knowledge. Faith in Christ must be after the manner of Christ, recognizing Christ as and what he is; not making Christ into what or how he wants; otherwise faith would present him with a fictitious image. And if he had long known and believed, he would not know that he believed a false and invented thing. So, I say, whoever makes his conscience a peace and forgiveness of sins in that which God does not make a peace and forgiveness of sins?

1) i. sintemal.

If a man has put himself under the bondage of sins, he does not have peace and forgiveness of sins because he is satisfied with a false comfort, but he will and must be put to shame all the way, even though he stands peacefully for a while.

5 Accordingly, all men must be put to shame and ridicule who, without the word of faith, attribute to the sacrament peace of conscience and forgiveness of sins, or make the sacrament a pledge to assure our conscience [2 Cor. 1:22, Eph. 1:14], because they do not find a letter of it in the words of faith.

But that this is not right, I will shortly take Paul's teaching into account, which he wrote about the worthy use of the Lord's bread and cup in 1 Cor. 11. For I have written about this matter in its breadth and width in a booklet on conversation 2) and in other books.

7 Paul says why, how and when we enjoy the Lord's bread and cup worthily and usefully, and immediately writes that the prophets and apostles wrote about the knowledge of the body and blood of Christ.

(8) Whoever teaches otherwise or produces a different gospel is an exile and an accursed one [Gal. 1:8, 9], and his teaching is also an exiled, abominable and accursed teaching.

Text: 1 Cor. 11.

As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you shall proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes.

(9) This form and manner should be observed by men, and after it they should eat the Lord's bread and drink the cup, for Paul has given it as a rule by which all people who want to partake of the Lord's Supper must be guided.

(10) Now it is to be noted that this proclamation is the fruit of one tree, namely, the remembrance of the body and blood of Christ, of which Paul soon spoke above, introducing the words of the Lord Jesus Christ. For everything must spring from the foundation of the heart and be created rightly in the inwardness, which is done by outward works or things. God judges the heart, and the inner man is a precious good and noble thing in God's eyes, if he is skillful, as God wants to have him skillful.

2) This refers to paper No. 3 in the appendix of this volume.

Therefore God says through Isaiah [29:13] and Christ himself [Matth. 15:8]: The people praise me in their mouths, but their hearts are far from me. Therefore the proclamation must flow out of a good hidden well, if it is just. Paul indicated the same well and reason to the Romans on the 10th when he said: "He who believes from the heart is justified, but with the mouth one confesses to salvation.

(12) It is quite impossible for any outward thing to be righteous or justified unless the heart is first justified, as it is written: He that believeth not hath in himself a justified soul, Hab. 2:4. To the unbeliever all things are unclean and defiled, Titus 1:15. Again, to the believer all things are clean, good and justified. The eyes of God look upon faith, Jer. 5, 3. If a man has a right heart and a right spirit, he pleases God, and his outward confession also pleases God.

13 Therefore I say that the proclamation of the death of Christ, which is an outward work or thing, must spring from a secret and hidden heart, where it is good and pleasing to God.

14 Therefore, we must seek the same ground on which 1) the outward eloquence of Christ's death stands. But the reason is easy to find 2) if you are desirous of it, Paul did not want to leave it undisclosed.

What is the same reason, you ask? Answer: memory.

(1 Cor. 11.) For the Lord Jesus, on the night that he was betrayed, took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, saying, Take, eat. This is the body of me, which is broken for you. This do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup, the new testament in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink, in remembrance of me.

(16) There Paul lays the foundation of the proclamation of the death of Christ, out of which this fruit of our lips flows, that is, the proclamation which edifies and improves other people, and for this reason is called a confession of salvation.

(17) Whoever then will outwardly justify the death of Christ by proclaiming or confessing it, must before all have gone into its foundation, and come forth from the foundation or inwardness, and his heart must bear this fruit of his lips, namely, the proclamation, as a tree 3) bears its fruit from the root.

1) In the old edition: from.

2) So from us-put instead of: "liederlich", which by the way at Carlstadt and otherwise often stands for "easily".

3) So put by us instead: Farmer.

What memory is.

18) Memory is a fervent and loving art of knowing the body and blood of Christ. No one can ever remember that which he has not known.

19) But the knowledge must be formed and put into practice according to the opposite 4), that is, to recognize the body and blood of Christ in such a way and with the causes, as Christ gave his body and shed his blood for our sin [Gal. 1:4].

020 Wherefore Christ said plainly, Eat the bread. For this body is the body which is given for you; and this is my blood, which is to be shed for you. 5) Whether he wanted to say (Luc. 22.) (although the disciples did not learn this until Pentecost): Moses and the prophets wrote to you and all men about a body that would be given for you, which would be the seed of a woman, and would crush the head of the serpent (Gen. 3, 15.), which would also stretch out its hand for the wood of life:

My body, or, this my body, is the same of which they all prophesied, which shall be given for the world: therefore shall ye eat my bread in remembrance of me. Likewise of his blood Christ says, or would have said: Moses and the prophets have written of a blood which shall make a new testament, and shall be shed for sin. Behold! My blood is the same blood that shall be shed for you in remission of sins. In this way the given body of Christ and his shed blood would have to be recognized, if anyone wanted to have a justified remembrance and an unpunishable proclamation of the death of Christ. If the memory is not justified in this way, then Mosiah and all the prophets are lacking, from which Christ firmly points out and says: Christ had to suffer, shed his blood, die and rise again, and thus enter into his glory (Luc. 24, 26.); as it is written in the prophets.

(21) Those who have the right knowledge of Christ have righteousness at the bottom of their hearts, as

4) Counter-image - model, type. The remark in Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 336, fits here: "For the mystics, the historical Christ is predominantly a mere model and type of our spiritual life.

5) From these words one recognizes that, according to the interpretation of Carlstadt, Christ with the words "This is my body" did not point to the bread, but to himself, to the body, of which Moses and the prophets prophesied. This is also shown by the immediately following execution.

Paul says: Faith is the righteousness of the heart (Rom. 10, 10.). Yes, this is true, if it is not a frozen or dead knowledge, but a fervent, heated, busy and powerful art of Christ, which transforms the knower into the known life and death of Christ, and for Christ's sake wants to do or not do everything that Christ wants. But that the righteous faith in Christ is a knowledge of the death of Christ and its causes is shown by Isaiah (Cap. 53), who first depicts the delivered body of the Messiah in his own form, and then he speaks: In his art or knowledge the righteous man will make many of his servants righteous.

Twenty-two you ask: When and in what form will Christ be known, so as to justify his art and knowledge? Answer: Look at Isaiah, and you will find that Christ was sacrificed as a lamb to death, because he wanted it: because he was wounded for our sin and was held as a despised and cursed one, whom God had rejected 2c. And when Isaias has presented Christ thus crucified, he says: In His art He will make righteous; that the Christ, thus mocked, wounded, and raised, makes righteous. This is what Christ says: "The Son of Man must be lifted up, so that everyone who looks at Him lifted up or believes in Him may be saved and not perish. Joh. 3, 14. f. This is what Paul says: Through one man's obedience many men have been justified (Rom. 5, 18.¹). Understand the obedience of which it is written: He became obedient unto death (Phil. 2, 8.). That is why he first brought the name of Jesus into the highest essence in his obedience to the death he suffered, so that Christ was called a Beatificator. This is the reason why Paul (Phil. 3, 8. ff.) so highly esteems and values the exuberant knowledge of Christ, and says that righteousness comes only through the knowledge of Jesus Christ; and neatly declares that the righteousness that comes from God is in the knowledge of Christ, and in the power of His resurrection, and in the fellowship of His sufferings, so that one becomes similar and like His death. Therefore Paul also writes: I know not but Jesus crucified. From this it follows that the art of the resurrected Jesus makes one righteous.

23 Recently, the knowledge or art of the given body of Christ and his shed blood is the first reason to take the Lord's Supper. But you must see to it that you do not make of the Lord's body and blood vain flesh, which is good for nothing.

1) Wrong in the old edition: Rom. 4.

is. You must have before your eyes and understand in the depth of your heart the great invisible love, the abundant obedience, the excellent innocence of Christ, and the like, and you will be justified, redeemed from sins; and so you must hold the words of Christ, "This is the body of mine (of which it is prophesied), which is to be given for you! for the true and joyful gospel, which all the apostles proclaim, which was a promise before, and is now no longer a promise, but has ended in Christ, has become a clear gospel, as Paul says. Moses wrote long ago about the body and blood of Christ. Prophets promise the body that will be given for us; but the apostles and we proclaim the joyful message of the delivered body and shed blood of Jesus Christ, of which Christ speaks before his death.

(24) From the knowledge of Christ grows the memory of Christ, which is not a crude, cold, and lazy memory, but a fresh, fiery, and vigorous memory, which makes or gives gladness, which esteems the delivered body and shed blood of Christ, which cherishes, which gives thanks, which makes Christian, and which makes ashamed of all that is contrary to Christ. Take an example of this. Behold, if thou shouldest have died on the gallows, or on the wheel, or in the fire, and the sentence had already been pronounced against thee, and thou shouldest have gone to death, and there shouldest come one to die for thee, and set thee free by his death; wouldest thou not be eternally ashamed, if thou didst any thing that thou shouldest leave for the love of such a good friend? and again, wouldest thou not be glad, if his name were called Good? Wouldn't you say it 2) well to him forever? and if he left you something for last 3) that you should use in his memory, use it with fresh heated memory? with horror of yourself that you had done such a deed, because of which right would have strangled you, if the innocent had not taken your guilt upon himself and paid with his death. So we should also have the remembrance of the Lord, understanding and remembering from our hearts that Christ gave his body in death, and shed his blood for our sake, innocently, out of great love, out of incomparable obedience.

(25) The memorial of Christ has two parts: one is for the body given, the other for the blood shed.

2) So put by us instead of: eternal. - "To speak well" - to commemorate praisingly.

3) So put by us instead of: to last. To the last, i.e. to the farewell.

(26) He then that would partake of the Lord's Supper must look into the causes, and know why our Lord Christ shed His blood, and gave His body for us, together with the fruits, when the apostles and disciples of Christ received the Holy Ghost after the day of Pentecost, and knew the causes of the body and shed blood of Christ, 1) which the apostles' books, the histories, and the epistle to the Hebrews indicate. Behold, as Christ was a sacrifice and a priest, why he offered himself (Heb. 6. and 10.), so thou shalt surely know that by One sacrifice, One death, One body, One obedience, One innocence, One holiness, One redemption, One washing away, we have all obtained forgiveness of our sin and righteousness.

(27) Therefore it is not true that the sacrament forgives sin. It is against Moses, the prophets, the apostles, and Christ, plus a promise of Christ's suffering and high obedience. Those who seek forgiveness of their sins in the sacrament are as foolish and bad, 2) as the priests who sacrifice Christ daily for new sins; it does not take much for them to be so bad. Christ's obedience, or the will of Christ, which was the Father's will, understood (Ps. 39. Vulg. or 40.), is our justification, and cleanses the heart and forgives guilt; we want to see this more comfortably, if we continue to act on the text.

28. Now it is declared that the proclamation of the death of Christ flows from the memory of Christ, and the memory of Christ from the knowledge of the given body and shed blood of Christ; that we must know the causes, powers, and fruits of the crucified body, together with the shed blood of Christ, where the proclamation is to be right, lest our own wisdom and thoughts be found in us. Beware of the punishment of Christ, who said: O fools! do you not believe what the prophets and Moses have written about me? Of the body and blood of Christ they wrote, that Christ in his body and with his blood would wash away our sin; of the sacrament, that [it] forgives sin, none wrote. Christ also wrote to us about the body that was crucified.

1) In the old edition: "wüßten" and immediately thereafter "Episteln".

2) This refers to Luther and his followers. "Carlstadt blames his opponents for the nonsense of substituting for the once-for-all completed death of Christ on the cross, of which the words of institution speak, an alleged offering of Christ's body for the world, repeated in every celebration of the sacraments, and making Christ suffer and die not in his body but in the form of bread." Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 449 s.

No prophet, nor Christ, nor any Christian brother has written that Christ forgives sin in the sacrament. For if it could be that Christ forgave us sin in the sacrament, it would follow that we would have to recognize Christ not on the cross but in the sacrament, and that Christ would not have forgiven us sin through his body, nor would his death have been sufficient.

But that would be trampling Christ underfoot, promising His suffering, and making a lie of God the Father. Show me a small letter that the sacramental essence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament is useful to us for the forgiveness of sins! Christ says: My blood is poured out for the forgiveness of sins. Then I ask: Is the blood shed in the Sacrament or on the Cross? If it is poured out in the sacrament, then the glory of the cross of Christ has been taken up and is false, and Paul has become an unman who boasts of nothing but the cross of Christ. If it is shed on the gallows, we must direct our knowledge to the cross and not to the sacrament.

(30) We are truly anti-Christians, false witnesses or despisers of the passion of Christ, inasmuch as we attribute to the sacrament that which belonged to Christ on the cross. Christ says: this do in my memory; so they say: Ye shall remember the sacrament. Christ: You should remember my body, which is given, not which is now in the sacrament (as they think), but which is given on the cross. But they say: You should remember the body in the sacrament, and yet they are not able to show a hint of Scripture by which we could understand how the body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament, or why they should be in it.

31 Paul says, "As often as you eat the Lord's bread and drink his cup, you should proclaim the Lord's death. But against this they teach thus: You shall believe that Christ is in the Sacrament; you shall believe that the Sacrament forgives your sins; you shall believe that the Sacrament is a sure pledge, the forgiveness of sins and your holiness. And go with all fours into the dreadful contradiction of Christ's righteousness, love, innocence, and wisdom, which he proved by his death. Paul saith, Ye shall speak of the death of the Lord. But they say: You shall speak of the sacrament.

32. what this is "until he comes", I wrote in my Dialogo 3).

The text follows (1 Cor. 11.):

Whosoever therefore shall eat of this bread unworthily, and drink of the cup of the Lord, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

(33) Christ declared the guilt when he said, "The Son of Man departs when it is written of him; but woe to him by whom the Son of Man is betrayed (1) (Matt. 26), (and) Peter said, "You have murdered the Lord of life (Acts 3:15), 2) and have denied and thrown away your Savior. He that partaketh of the Lord's supper unworthily is guilty, as the murderers of Christ, who not only promised Christ, but strangled him.

(34) What unworthiness is and what it consists in, I will unfold through the following text, which reads thus (1 Cor. 11):

(35) He that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh his own judgment. Why? Because he distinguisheth not the body of the Lord. There you have the cause of unworthiness, namely, that he eats and drinks unworthily who does not distinguish the body of the Lord. Show me a little word from Paul, that he may say, He eateth the Lord's bread unworthily, who discerneth not the sacrament. I know that we must distinguish the body of the Lord. It is also true that I should sit at the Lord's table with proper manners, and take his bread and drink in the manner in which he presents it to me. But that I should keep his bread and wine as myself is not commanded me. The Lord can give me life, salvation, redemption, righteousness, and such like goods and treasures, none of which bread or drink can give me. Therefore I must not look to his bread or drink, but to him.

If I set my heart, courage, mind, and thoughts on the Lord, and am enraptured with delights in him, it will not harm me at all if I lose something of the sacrament 3) or spill it. In his knowledge, and not in his supper, lies the worthiness, unworthiness and guilt of death 2c., standing on the ignorance of the body and blood of Christ, or on the carelessness that does not distinguish that it should distinguish.

37 These words "do not discriminate" may also be pronounced thus: do not judge well,

or: not to recognize exactly. For Paul bases his whole teaching on the speech of Christ, who thus says: This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood, which 2c. And he wants to show, as he does in all the epistles, that Christ said: My body is the body that is given for you; and: This is my blood, which is to be poured out for you. One had to come, who had to present his body and blood for our sake; we have to understand the same body and blood, if we want to escape from destruction and be saved. We must eat His flesh and drink His blood (John 6:53) and know that we cannot be saved without His knowledge, judgment, judgment or discernment.

038 Whosoever shall not in this manner separate the body of Christ from all other bodies, and set it apart above all bodies, and eat the Lord's supper thereat, shall be guilty of his death and of judgment. For Christ has given us his bread and his cup to eat and to drink in remembrance of him.

39 But he that remembereth must understand the word of the Lord, saying, This is my body, 2c. this is my blood, 2c. He that understandeth not, remembereth not; or remembereth not the Lord, when he ought to remember him. If he does not remember, he does not distinguish the body of the Lord, and he does not respect the body of Christ, or does not esteem the body as great and high as he should esteem it. Therefore he is guilty first of all when he eats the Lord's bread and drinks the Lord's cup, and does not recognize the Lord's body and blood.

40 Now I ask, Where shall we discern the Lord's body, judge evenly, and judge well? Do you answer: In the Sacrament; I ask, Did Christ die in the Sacrament? Did Christ give his soul for us in the Sacrament? Where was the great and wide bread in which Christ stood with his cross and the great multitude of scoffers? 4) If the Jews and Gentiles mocked the Lord in the Sacrament, they must ever have been inside with Him. The two thieves would also have been inside with their gallows, bodies and words. If Christ was obedient to his Father in the Sacrament even unto death, why did not his disciples flee from him when he gave them his bread and cup, when they became fugitives, singing of Christ? Did Christ sacrifice outside the gates of Jerusalem, or in Jerusalem in the city where they ate the Sacrament? Did the betrayer sacrifice Christ in the Jews?

4) Note how flat a rationalism Carlstadt preaches here.

5) So put by us instead of: flew.

1) The bracketed words are added by us.

2) In the old edition wrong: Apost. 2.

3) So put by us instead of the incomprehensible to us: verreret.

Hands answered as Christ sat at table with the disciples, or did he hand him over afterward?

(41) I hold that no one may say that Christ gave his body in the sacrament for our sin. For one thing must fall and be destroyed: either that Christ gave his body in the sacrament for us; or that Christ gave his body in death on the cross for us. The other, however, is true and has often been prophesied by Moses (Deut. 21, John 3), the prophets, especially by Jesus, and then 1) most clearly by Christ. Therefore the first must be false and become null and void as it is. If the first also existed, all the apostles' writings would have to fall and would become an eternal mockery.

42. Because we must judge the body of the Lord, and distinguish, not when it is in the sacrament, but when he freely offered his body as a sin offering, a grain offering, a heave offering and a woven offering to his Father, and demonstrated the greatest innocence, the highest obedience, the most tender love, It follows that they have taken the Lord's bread and cup all unworthily, and have made themselves guilty of the death of Jesus Christ and judgment, who do not look back, and do not look at the figurine of the risen serpent, but only have regard for the sacrament, that they received Christ with the sacrament. It would also be better for them if they ate figs for it. The body of the Lord is the promised body, which was to bear the sins of the world through his suffering and death. Therefore, what was written about him, how he was to be wounded for the sake of our redemption, 2c., all this Christ wanted to remind us of, and to understand, if we want to eat his bread. That Paul here [v. 29] calls the body alone, he does not do this because we are to recognize the blood of the Lord prepared and unjudged, and not differently, and to value it above all blood, but with the body we must also hear that we are to distinguish the blood of the Lord, if we do not want to become guilty of his blood. Therefore Paul [v. 27] called all things body and blood.

(43) If we had such a serious mind about the body and blood of Christ, none of us would eat our fill or drink our fill, as the Corinthians did, who had no understanding; but each one would abstain from all the vices that are contrary to Christ or bring him to disgrace. Therefore let each one examine himself sufficiently beforehand,

And so, as it is said, eat of the Lord's bread, and drink of the cup.

44 To test is to know for certain, that is, to experience. Paul uses the word in the Greek tongue in many places, Rom. 2, 18. and 12, 2. 1 Thess. 5, 21. and means at all times: to actually experience, to certainly understand; in the sense in which John uses it 1 Ep. 4, 1, when he says: "Know before the spirits whether they are of God. Paul puts it in every man's home, and puts it in every man's own bosom, and wants every man to test himself, that is, to understand by certain experience whether he recognizes the body and blood of Christ, which the prophets promised, with loving and esteeming art, or not.

45. For when he has the worthy and fervent knowledge of the body of Christ, which bore our sin with great bitterness and mockery, and of the blood that washed him from his evil works and sins, he will be Christlike, and thankful to the suffering, sober, moral, wise, sensible, chaste; He will temper himself against the evil ways of the Corinthians, who are drunk to the brim, and will sit at the Lord's table chastely, taking care not to take the Lord's bread for his own pleasure or bodily satisfaction, nor as other bread, nor without knowledge of Him who gave it to him to eat in remembrance of Him.

This test is inward-looking, and looks straight into the ground of souls, in which God has to work and create His gift. Therefore Paul leads each one to himself, and not to other people, as the Popes did, who directed the table companions of Christ's supper to poor, blind leaders, who call themselves confessors. For Paul was wiser in these matters, and led every man to himself and to his own inwardness. For the cause that no man knoweth what is in the spirit of man, but every man's spirit.

47 If you want to take the Lord's Supper, you should go into your inner being (1 Cor. 11:28). Do not judge above whether you have a true and worthy memory of Christ to take it, but have an experience, that is, a certain knowledge, as Christ wants you to have.

The Sacrament is not an arrhabo, arrha, pledge, or God's penny.

48) From this speech of Paul, namely, that each one should examine himself, 2c. follows a subversion of another speech, as it is commonly said: the bread and the cup of Christ are assurance and

certain document by which a man can be sure and certain that Christ's death has brought him his redemption. For if a man could or should be assured of his redemption, that is, forgiveness of sins, through the Lord's Supper, it would not be necessary 1) for each one to examine himself before taking the Lord's bread and cup. It would be enough for him to feel and understand whether he is fit, as God wants him to be. But this is against Christ, who says, Do this in remembrance of me; that is, take my bread and my cup in remembrance of me; the bread in remembrance of my giving my body for you; the cup in remembrance of my shed blood. Therefore let each one, before he takes it, examine himself to see whether he has the remembrance of Christ or not. If he has it, then he is also sure of his salvation, and has peace with God through Christ (Rom. 5, 1.), not through the sacrament, and may take it cheerfully. If he does not have it, and does not find in himself that he has a sure knowledge of his salvation, then he is not fit, as Christ would have him eat his supper; as little was he fit to sit at the king's table, who had no wedding garment on (Matth. 22, 11.). Therefore he should abstain from the Lord's supper, lest he should be guilty and cast into utter darkness, when he was cast. But that this assurance before the reception should be in those who would take the Lord's supper, and not happen to us or come to us through the bread and cup, which are called some signs, Paul has clearly and abundantly indicated when he says: "Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread 2c.

What does the little verse mean: "And so"? Does it not mean that he should examine himself and really understand whether he has the Lord's memory and could proclaim the Lord's death in the intention, will and manner that Christ wants? If he has this in his heart, then he also has the Spirit of Christ, which shows him his Savior Christ hanging on the cross, and the same Christ dying in full obedience, in high righteousness and tender love and innocence, and assures his heart that he has redemption through Christ.

If he has this assurance of the Spirit of Christ, which he must have, then he may eat of the Lord's bread and drink of the cup.

49 But so he eats and drinks, when he has already been assured and made sure that Christ is of all things.

1) It seems to us that, according to Carlstadt's argumentation, "not" should be inserted before "vonnöthen". Perhaps it should be read: von unnöthen.

He has paid for the sins of the world and carried them away before receiving the sacrament.

50. Christ points us all to him on the cross, when he obediently dies and accomplishes all that is written about him; then we must look at him with blessed eyes, that is, believe in him, and know for certain that he redeems us 2c.

51 If we know this and thus look back to the death of Christ we have suffered, then we are justified in ourselves and worthy to eat and drink the Lord's bread and wine worthily. If we also know that we are such discerners and thinkers, then we may eat and drink joyfully. Therefore he says: "Test yourself before a man, and so. The word "so" means skill and time. Skill of memory, time, that the skill must precede, as one must have a wedding dress before he goes to a king's table.

52. even if I admit and admit that through some signs one can experience God's promise or work and become certain, if they are so above reason that the soul secretly experiences a high power of God from the amazement of the signs that have occurred; as Ezekiel experienced God's power and will through the setting of the sun, it is still not certain nor good that we give and appropriate to the bread and wine of Christ that which is actually due to Christ and the Spirit of Christ. Christ is the way, truth, life and peace; and we have all these things through Christ.

(53) Who then ascribes these things to the Lord's Supper, the bread and wine of the Lord, what else does he do but take Christ into his treasures, and confess to inferior creatures than he is, that which is Christ's alone, and which Christ alone bestows?

(54) He is a thief and a murderer who does not enter by Christ. But that would be to enter by bread or wine and not by Christ, or at least, it would be to enter not only by Christ, but all by Christ and his supper. But Christ hates this, because he wants to have a whole heart, which in the former way would be almost divided and incomplete.

(55) But if Christ is our peace and assurance, what peace and assurance can we have from creatures that have no soul? His blood washes us and our consciences from dead works, that is, the fervent knowledge of the shed blood of Christ.

(56) But if the blood can do this, it must also assure us of it, as it does when it is known. But if the cup does, then the cup that we take today has been poured out for our sin before it grew in the vine. 2)

2) Compare the note to § 27 of this paper.

The lack is in the knowledge, and therefore Christ did not want to give us a sign that would move our strength and soul, when he did works that no one else had done, so that we should attribute them to him alone, and not to the signs that many foolish people now give to the unworldly signs. Christ promised to send us his Holy Spirit, saying, "When he comes, he will tell you all things; and he will bear witness to you, and you will bear witness to me. Behold, the Spirit of Christ gives us the testimony that he gave his body for us, and shed his blood for us.

(58) But if this is due to the Holy Spirit, it is sacrilege and impiety for us to attribute it to bread or wine. It is theft to steal from the Spirit his proper work and attribute and to give it to a poor creature, thereby making a new idolatry.

59. the childlike spirit (Paul speaks to Romans on 8. v. 15.), which makes us cry: Abba, Father! that assures our spirit 2c. The Sacrament does not make us cry out to God: Father, Father! For it is much too crude to touch the ground of souls, let alone teach them. Now the bread or the cup does not teach us to cry out to God, "Father, Father!" which we must do in the suffering of Christ, if we understand rightly, so the sacrament cannot assure our spirit and help the weakness of our spirit; for such crying and assurance belong to a master craftsman. The assurance belongs to God's spirit and not to any creature; the spirit of Christ anoints us, it seals us; it is the pledge of our salvation (2 Cor. 1, 22. Eph. 1, 14.). Since it is the right of God's Spirit to assure our spirit and make us certain of our salvation, we should hasten after the Spirit, long to learn from Him, and receive through the Spirit that which belongs to the Spirit, which no one but the Spirit can give, namely the assurance of forgiven sins.

60. if it had been safe 1) for us to have

1) i.e. not necessary.

We would like to seek such high things in creaturely things as in the sacrament, that is, the bread and wine of Christ; undoubtedly Christ would have been so wise that he could have told us this, and so kind that he would have refrained from doing the same;

61 Since Christ ever commanded His disciples to go into the world and preach everything He commanded (Matth. 28, 20.), and Paul says that the Scriptures are rich and sufficient.

(62) Since it is not found in any Scripture that we are to be assured or satisfied by bread or wine of the Lord, or to receive our salvation from it, it is an addition against Scripture (Deut. 4:2, Prov. 30:6), and to flee as a blasphemy against the Spirit of God and Christ.

63. He who has understood me rightly cannot conclude that I bring such new things to light, for the sake of folly or glory; but if I do, God will be my judge; but this I must confess, that for fear I would rather have kept silent.

(64) For I know that I shall suffer calumny and persecution for it, especially from those who would be thought good evangelicals. But because it concerns the surpassing obedience of Christ, the death and suffering of Christ, and because by the delusion which we now hear preached in all the churches, the gospel of Christ is reviled, and the death of Christ is belittled, and Christ's righteousness is made nugatory, or ever so slightly pronounced insufficient, which I and all Christians ought to resist, each according to his measure: So I had to break out and direct the Christians to the true gospel, which all the apostles preached, and only broke the bread of the Lord in remembrance and knowledge of the death of Christ, and therefore enjoyed it according to the sermons preached. May God grant that we may hear the true gospel of Jesus of Nazareth, for it is still almost hidden and held in dishonor, promised very near in all sacraments, none of which has been preached properly in several hundred years.

4. D. Urban Rhegius' warning against the new erring Doctor Andrew of Carlstadt, because of the sacrament . *)

Towards the end of 1524.

D. Urbanus Rhegius [wishes D. Andreas Carlstadt] true knowledge of Jesus Christ!

(1) You testify highly and earnestly that you will no longer be silent, but that necessity and Christian faithfulness compel you to report the right custom of Christ's supper, and that you are very grieved that until now the bread and the cup of Christ have not been used properly according to the will of Christ our Lord. You punish the Wittenbergers and all of us who preach the gospel, as if we had gone astray and did not understand Paul. We have taught that our Sacrament should be received with the highest inward and outward reverence, for there is the Body and Blood of the Lord: but you come with a new fiddle and teach that it is nothing but bread and wine, of course, and you swear on your insanity some Scriptures, suppose that the whole of Christendom should mop up and eat bread with D. Andreas Carlstadt and his seducing prophets for the reverend Sacrament. You use a lot of heated mocking words, call our Sacrament idolatrous bread, and us dog-slaughterers 1): God forgive you your unchristian anger and monstrous words, of which in such excellent matters a libertine should be ashamed, let alone a doctor of the Scriptures, who takes upon himself to reform the whole world and to diminish Christianity's comforting sacrament, where it finds peace of conscience. I do not know what kind of spirit drives you to pour out such things so freely; but this spirit shall soon be tested, whether God wills it. You desire that you should soon be taught another, where it is a fact that you have erred; this will undoubtedly be done by those whom you call princes of the Scriptures. If thou hadst heartily desired to receive instruction, and hadst written for the love of truth, thou shouldst have abstained from bitter words of shame. But you write with such

Joyfulness, that perhaps you can notice how you already prove yourself right and despise all people's judgment, who would like to tell you better from the word of God.

(2) I will do my duty, and hasten to show the church, as I now preach the gospel, how weak and unsound your reason is: lest the simple be confounded and led astray by the colored appearance of your pretended reason and some mirror causes, but stand firm on the foundation of sound doctrine, which, for the sake of this sacrament, according to the right understanding of divine Scripture, they have now heard from me for some years.

Your two booklets 2) hold three points in sum.

The first: [The] Sacrament does not forgive sin.

The other: In the Sacrament there is neither body nor blood of Christ, but one bread like another bread, and one natural wine like another wine.

The third: The Sacrament is not an arra or pledge or assurance that sins are forgiven.

Now see only manly, with what reason you tractirst these three points.

I worry, my Carlstadt, that your mind is prevented here with envy or vain honor, otherwise there would have been no need for the first point.

For no one has taught that the sacrament forgives sin, actually speaking of it. Who does not know that the forgiveness of sin belongs to God alone? Isa. 43, 25: "I am, I myself am, the one who takes away sin for my sake." Some have attributed such power to the sacraments as if from the same [external use the same

1) In Carlstadt's Gesprächbüchlein, No. 3 in the appendix of this volume. This word is rendered in Luther's writing "Wider die himmlischen Propheten": "Hundschlaher", i.e. dog beater.

2) One of these "two little books", against which this writing is directed, is "Carlstadts Gesprächbüchlein" (No. 3 in the appendix of this volume). The other one is the previous writing (No. 3 in this volume), in which mainly the first and third point made by Rhegius is asserted.

*) Compare the note to § 2 of this writing. The determination of the time is according to Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 448. - It is probably this writing that Luther asked Spalatin to send on December 29, 1524. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, appendix, no. 119, is this letter with the wrong year 1525.

Forgiveness of sin] 1) worked in man and would justify him, which, however, has long since been dismissed and rejected in the schools as an unfounded thing. Nor have people been deceived, as you suppose, into attaching their hearts and trusts to any 2) visible thing or sign.

(6) But when they were exhorted to the sacrament, they spoke of it in a different way than you claim here. It has been said: "If someone's conscience is troubled by sin, he should go to the Sacrament, having God's word to be gracious and merciful to him. From such a joyful message, when he hears the eternal unchanging truth that the precious sacrifice, the innocent body of Christ, was completed for us on the cross, the pure blood shed for the washing away of sin (Rom. 3, 25. 1 Petr. 1, 19. Eph. 1, 7.), the 3) conscience becomes joyful and receives confidence; through which faith sins are forgiven and man is justified, and for a stronger continuance of this faith he receives the reverend sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ; which sign certainly reminds us of the grace that is given to us through Christ 4) and assures us as a seal of His spirit 5) (Eph. 1, 14. f. 2 Cor. 1, 22.).

(7) Here you hear that we do not teach how the sacrament itself makes pious and quiets the conscience. Who, then, would hideously desecrate the precious treasure of Christ's suffering and give it to a creature 6) that is the Creator's alone? One gives to God what is God's, and to the Sacrament also what may be given to it without dishonoring Christ our Lord. Therefore, is anyone who exemplifies to himself anything else than the word of faith may suffer, he has not learned it from us; therefore you would have saved many words. We have never given any teaching in this matter, unless it is well founded in divine Scripture, of which you truly boast too highly, but often use against Christian love.

(8) Because you also pretend to be a great Pauline, we would have had no way to come to you for such a war of words, each one of us.

1) This insertion is made by us to give meaning.

2) So put by us instead of: iendert.

3) So put by us instead of: the.

4) Christ alone is our peace and righteousness. (We have taken this note from the old edition, because we do not know whether it comes from Walch or from Rhegius).

5) So put by us instead of: his figure.

6) So put by us instead of: one created.

This is a little word that may be well and truly understood, as if one were to say: one finds grace and forgiveness of sin in the sacrament; this sounds quite bad to your ears, for you must always think of something special. But it does not sound bad to a believer, for he knows well the value and esteem in which he should hold the reverend suffering of Christ, through which alone salvation came, Rom. 3, Eph. 1. He also knows that God alone forgives his sin through the merit of Christ, without any preceding merit of his own, and that no creature in heaven or earth forgives his sin and gives him grace. But because in the sacrament the believer has a word and a sign, namely a word of faith, in which, if he truly believes, his sins are forgiven, and because a sign has been instituted and ordained by God, the believer may well speak such words, and every right-minded person may easily understand them. For what we attribute to this sacrament, as forgiveness of sins, consolation, peace of conscience and the like, is not attributed to visible things, but to the invisible power of God, which is hidden here.

It is not almost Christian, dear Carlstadt, to consider that a speech, which may be spoken and understood in a Christian way, should cause such a hue and cry 7) throughout the world. You should not consider us or our listeners so childish that we should put such a high thing on a creature as forgiving sin, bringing peace to the conscience, and the like. Therefore, if you had loved peace and unity, this first article of yours would have remained at home.

(10) Secondly, you pretend that the sacrament is nothing but wine and bread, of course, and you use a lot of swear words that are terrible to hear, but you bring scripture very clumsily.

First, you suppose that Christ gave only bread to his disciples, and not his body, and almost torture yourself over the text, speaking Greek for a while, then Latin, and changing into all shapes, like the slippery Proteus, if you want to get the text on your side. You say that these little words "this is my body" are a separate speech, closed with dots differently, and say only about his natural body, as it was promised by Moses and the prophets as a sufficient sacrifice for our sin, so that Christ pointed to his body and spoke: This is

7) i.e., blubbering.

I gave them bread and drink, commanding them to enjoy it in remembrance of him when they ate and drank.

But I say, dear Carlstadt, that this opinion of yours is such an inconsistent thing, that every peasant sees how you force the bright words and opinions, and by the hair of your head you point to your insanity. Then, looking at the words as they are attached to each other, it does not rhyme at all that Christ begins to give his disciples bread to eat, and immediately in the middle of the speech falls on something else and says, "This is my body," as if they had never known before that this was his body, which they saw before their eyes. If the text is taken with all circumstances, he connects these words "this is my body" 2c. with the previous words, namely: when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to the disciples and said: "Take, eat, this is my body!" (Matth. 26, 26.) Here no one can see or understand anything else, except that the speeches about the bread and his holy body are so intertwined that you have to confess that he did not point to his sitting body, but to the bread, which is his body.

Here Carlstadt has forgotten his philosophy, and what he admitted some years ago in his Scoto 1) he does not want to understand here, how the body of Christ may be, especially at many ends. But that you make a great feast out of the Greek word ταῦτ, and show yourself on the verse τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, it is good to see that you are struck on the hands with the Greek tablet alone. 2) Then you speak of it so childishly that there is no need to answer you about such things; although you still have to suffer enough ridicule for your graces, because it is very bad for you. But that you say: Luc. on the 22nd this verse, that is my body 2c., begins with a capital letter, does not help you: for nevertheless the clause is attached to the preceding verse.

1) "Although a Thomist," says Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 3, "yet in the Minorite Convention -during the year 1514 he explained Scotus in the sense of his adherents for an hour every day, and worked out concordances for the Scotists to their master." From Carlstadt's Novas 6onoor-tantiu6 ssu eonvkuientias mi torum eontsntlosurn p6rtin6nt68, juris tana oanonwi guam olvllis 6t äootorum 8oüo1u8tiourum 8. Hioinao 6t suktilissirrü 8ooti, in guiftu8 N66688itnsiin6in 6t H6xurn äuurum 8tuäiourin 80. ti^oloZiei 6t juricioi c>8t6nait says Jäger 1. o.: "they were not yet printed in 1514 and never appeared."

2) He did not quite appreciate the point of H^podia8tol6 nature, which often distinguishes attached sentences of One ?6rioäi. (This note is taken from the old edition).

He took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and gave it to them, saying, This is my body. 2c.

14. now say, how do you like that he says: when he took the drinking vessel, having given thanks, he gave it to them, saying: drink from all this, for this is my blood 2c.? What did Christ point to here? Is not clear enough what Christ says? He commanded them the drink, saying: Drink, this is my blood! Now what kind of strange sophist speech would this have been if Christ had offered them the drink and pointed to his body, saying, "This is my blood"? You have been writing with great earnestness for many years about the intrigues of the Sophists, and only now do you want to make a Sophist out of Christ? You yourself make such great use of the sophists' wiles and ways in your two little books that one can well see how you have lost clear writing. Therefore, dear Carlstadt, you and your prophets have now been otherwise angry that everything does not go according to your will. Look at the text carefully, it will turn out much differently.

15) Do you say, "Who gave you authority to bring the body and blood of the Lord 3) into the sacrament? Answer: The very one who first did it himself; for thus says Paul 1 Cor. 11:23 ff: "I received it from the Lord, which I also taught you; that the Lord Jesus, in the night when he was betrayed, took bread, and after he had given thanks, he broke it, saying, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you.

16 Then we see how the holy apostle of his Lord holds up the word and work of Christ to the church at Corinth and teaches them by the power of the words: "This do in remembrance of me! If then all these things take place in the church in order, that there be ministers who in faith do the worthy supper of Christ, the same have command enough of Christ to do his body and blood, and to present it to the church, for he saith, "This do!" What "this"? Here, see what comes before, and you will find that this little word "this" even shows the above-mentioned action. Therefore do not be surprised to death, when the figure of our Lamb Christ has been eaten, that Christ also gives himself to his church to eat out of incomparable love.

17 Further, if our sacrament should be bread alone, as other bread, why then did Paul say, "As often" and "ye eat THE bread" and "drink of THE drink," proclaim the death of the Lord until He comes. Why

3) "Blood" put by us instead: Brod.

Did he just say: "the bread", "of the drink"? If it had no difference from other bread, he would have said badly, "As often as you eat bread and drink wine. But he makes a fine distinction and says: "the bread", "of the drink", since it is insurmountably decided that it is a much different bread and drink than the common bread and wine.

(18) For this purpose he attaches the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ, saying, "Whosoever eateth the bread, or drinketh of the crockery of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. Now if it were bad bread and wine, as another, Paul would not have said that it is so dangerously tampered with, with disorderly feeling, that it costs loss of salvation. Also he wants "that one should try beforehand", which diligence and seriousness it would not need, if it were only bread, like another bread.

19 Is it not serious enough that he says, "He who eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord"? What does Paul mean here by the body of the Lord? Why does he so precisely link the bread and the body of the Lord? How blind would we have to be if we did not understand this? How would we have to be so ungrateful and unbelieving, if we let ourselves destroy the super-delicious joyful testament, the super-delicious meal of Ahasueri, 1) in this way? One knows well how you deal with the Scriptures, and how you hold your particular face and opinion. It is now two years, your companion Thomas Münzer wanted to swallow my bibles, and thought he wanted to teach a peasant the faith from natural things. I noticed at that time that he was carrying rotten fish; God grant him a spirit of love and gentleness, so that he may be able to preach the peaceful gospel with ease! Paul then goes on to say how the unworthy recipients of this holy bread were punished with death, which would have no sense or meaning if it were only natural bread and wine.

20 You also make much of the image of the Crucified, which is imprinted on the host; you think that Christ shuns it and therefore does not come into the Sacrament, because all images are an abomination to the Lord. One knows well how you are an enemy of images; therefore, one must take this anger to me. It is ridiculous to hear and needs no condemnation. You mean, I hear, that if one wants to drive Christ out, then

1) In the old edition: Assveri.

If one should take a crucifix, he will flee because of it. O Andrea! such a great article must have much other probation.

(21) It also seems improper to you that every priest should bring Christ into bread with his silent talk from heaven, saying that there are only two futures of Christ from heaven into this world: the first when he came in a sorrowful and humble form; the other when he will come gloriously and immortally on the last day; the two ways of coming are public, and the Scriptures know nothing of the silent future of Christ into the sacrament; therefore it is nothing but deceit.

(22) My Andrea, if it is a deception to you, what you do not grasp and what you do not bump your head against, then the whole faith should be a deception to you, because it is the foundation of things that we do not see. You do not see Christ in the sacrament; so I hear that you do not want to believe that he is there. Nor do you believe that there is a soul and that God exists, for you do not see either the soul or God. Behold, how carnally thou speakest of things! But that thou wonderest how Christ, who is long and tall, may be under the small stature, methinks it is thy jest. For thirteen or fourteen years ago you brought your understanding out of your cat-bellied theology to such an extent that it allowed itself to be talked into such a thing, and it is shameful to report such a thing and to set a goal for God's power.

(23) But you have undertaken to write something strange, for which it was necessary to seek strange reasons and causes. Thou imaginest, as Christ sitteth up in heaven, and holdeth heaven in abeyance, take not so much care of us on earth, as to come unto us, until the voice of the archangel shall declare the last day. Is not Christ our head, not only of those who reign in heavenly glory with him without remnant, 3) but also of us who still fight on earth with blood and flesh? Eph. 1, 7. Did he not promise to be with us always, even to the end of the world? Matth. 28, 20. Did he have the ability in his mortal body to be with his disciples so quickly on land and water, where he wanted, without hindrance, and now, according to Carlstadt's opinion, he should not be able to do this, if he is glorified? We are his temples (1 Cor. 3, 16.); we have his spirit (1 Cor. 6, 17. 2 Cor. 6, 16.); and where his spirit is, he is also. And does it seem strange to you that he is with us in his bread? This his constant attendance with the sons

2) If not perhaps "more bodily" should be read, "more suffering" is in the meaning of "suffering".

3) Bresten - infirmity.

of man does not hinder his other glorious future. Therefore it is pitiful to hear you speak of the power of Christ as dishonestly as if a peasant were doing it.

24) Further, you think that Christ commanded his disciples all things that were necessary, but to put his body into bread is nowhere 1) not a command. This is so childish that I must ask you where your Paul is? Does not the apostle say with bright words, "I received it from the Lord, and taught you"? 1 Cor. 11, 23. Is not this command enough? There he writes [the] institution, word and work of Christ, also worthy preparation to God's table, in which no one has ever had any fault or doubt; for you are now beginning a doubt at these last times, since purer; have taken enough little to heart, how many simple-minded people you would fall into doubt and grief with your strange writing.

(25) What you have drawn from the knowledge of Christ in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah is a good, noble, true thing; also what you have from memory and proclamation.

26. but you want the examination before receiving the sacrament to be too narrow; you reject that one goes to the scribes for instruction; which is your opinion against God, because he also wanted that one learns his will from the priest's mouth, Mal. 2, 7, Haggai 2, 12. and Paul Tit. 1, 9. and in other places wants a bishop or pastor to be composed with sound doctrine, so that he may exhort, teach and silence the opponents.

27 Thou sayest, Let Paul lead every man unto himself, and not unto other men. It is true that each one must be led into his own heart before receiving, but this leading cannot always be done without means. For I suppose that there is a simple man who does not know much about the knowledge, effect and fruit of Christ's death, because of which he would have a bad memory of death, since he has no knowledge of these things: Truly there it will be necessary for him to be well informed from the prophets and evangelists about the surrendered body of our Messiah, and after that he may be fruitfully led into himself and there heartily realize the greatest innocence and love of the surrendered Lord for the sake of our sin, from which then comes a right effect of repentance, if he sees his sin in the bloody wounds of Christ; after that he may rightly measure the highest obedience and love, from which living thoughts then comes the manly prayer.

know the death of Christ by heart, Rom. 10, 9.

28) But if everyone must have such a certain knowledge of himself before worthily receiving this sacrament, and that everything must be as plain as glass beforehand and perfect, as you suppose: how then did Christ's disciples receive the sacrament? was Peter also, as Christ would have him, completely perfect in faith and knowledge of himself? I think not. For he did not know his own ability at all, and thought he would defiantly join the heap and go to his death with his Lord, but soon after he fled and denied his own. Item, when he struck Malchum, he wanted to have prevented the surrender of the Lord's body, as much was in him. Therefore you should have written more with difference.

29 Thirdly, you teach how the Sacrament is not an arrhabo, pledge or assurance that sins are forgiven. Here I say: Dear Andrea, if you say this about your Sacrament, it is true. Your Sacrament is not a pledge or assurance, or certainly a sign, because your Sacrament is only a bread 2) or a piece of bread, like other bread. But our Sacrament may well be called an arrha, pledge, or certainly sign in the faithful that they have a gracious God and their sins are forgiven.

Your reason for the third article is that in sum: one must be sure beforehand; ergo, one does not need to get it at the Sacrament, according to the words of Paul: "Let man examine himself and then eat" 2c.

Answer: It is true that there should and must be a test in man before he goes to the Sacrament; this is so that he may know why he wants to go to the Sacrament. Namely, God gave me His only begotten Son without my merit (Joh. 3, 16.), that He might become a sacrifice for me on the cross, and His holy blood shed for the washing away of sin (Tit. 3, 4. Eph. 1, 7. Rom. 8, 3.). What was necessary for the redemption of the human race, our dear Lord Jesus Christ accomplished in true innocence, highest obedience and greatest love, [was] obedient to the best will of His heavenly Father even unto death and the most despicable death of the cross (Phil. 2, 8.).

32 I shall and must remember this with the highest gratitude, such kindness never again.

2) "Weck" put by us instead of "Werk" according to § 1 in this writing: "Wecke essen".

3) "Before" put by us instead of "before and". The same "ehe und" is repeated in § 63 of this scripture.

forgotten. The murderous damage of my sin should always be before my eyes, for which I would have been eternally condemned; but Christ, my Savior, has done divine justice enough for me, and has atoned for me again through his great death to God, my Creator and Lord (Rom. 5:6, 8). And that I may never forget the supreme death and unspeakable love, he has given me a comforting sign of it, namely, under wine and bread, his own body, which has killed my death; his own blood, in which I am washed from dead works.

See, this is the test, so that one recognizes himself as a wretched sinner, worthy of all punishment, and also recognizes God's love and grace, and thus a test and a faith in the heart of such great things precedes. But not the less, with the sign we also have an assurance that in some way helps and strengthens our faith in the words: all out of the causeless mercy of God, who has provided and helped our weakness not only with the inward testimony of the spirit, but also with outward, visible signs.

34 Further, you say: Let the Spirit of Christ bear us witness and assure our inward spirit that we are assured of the forgiveness of sin through the death of Christ. This opinion of yours is based on Romans 8:15, Ephesians 1:14, so if your mind is to assure the human heart that we are certain of God's gracious will, this belongs to the Holy Spirit alone and not to any creature.

Answer: We all confess that the Spirit of God alone anoints us inwardly, 1 John 2:27. From Him alone is the right knowledge of Christ our Savior; from Him alone is the right constant assurance. He bears witness to our spirit that we are God's children (Rom. 8, 16.), God's medicine and help for our infirmities. His fatherly will towards us, all truth and all good teaches us the anointing. The Spirit of God alone makes us know what things are given to us by Christ, 1 Cor. 2, 10. He alone is the one who seals us. He alone is the certain pledge of our heavenly inheritance, Eph. 1, 14. 2 Cor. 1, 22. For we must be taught by God, not by a creature alone (Joh. 6, 45.). Therefore we confess that assurance of forgiven sin is actually a work of the one Spirit of Christ. It has also never been our opinion to attribute to any creature that which belongs to divine power alone.

36. nevertheless, without all disgrace to the spirit, the reverend Sa.

crament of its form may be called an assurance of forgiven sin. For man may be assured in two ways that his sin is forgiven and that God is now gracious. First, inwardly, as has been said above, through the Spirit of Christ Himself; and this is the right assurance, by which the conscience comes to right peace and rest; this is the inward assurance, which is necessary above all things. For if the heart is not satisfied by the Holy Spirit in true faith, and assured that God is gracious to it, a thousand sacraments by heart would not help.

(37) Therefore all your arguments do not enforce more than that the right, constant, and most necessary assurance of consciences comes without any means from within from the Holy Spirit, without which there is nothing to assure our consciences rightly and constantly of the forgiveness of sin. We say all this, and confess it no less than thou. Therefore we want you to exalt us in your words of reproach. We are neither thieves nor murderers; we enter by Christ, as by the right way, truth, life, and peace. And though we seek in the sacrament which Christ hath ordained for us, yet we get no other entrance but by Christ.

(38) Another is also an external assurance or pledge, to which is attached [in] its measure, that it may admonish, assure, or testify, as there are the signs which God has commonly set for His promise.

(39) Here, dear Carlstadt, you will not make angels out of us for a long time yet, as you think you will do away with all visible things and signs and make them null and void, and live only as angels in all things of the spirit. 1) Because body and soul are with one another in this visible world, and we use the service of the five senses, we can accomplish nothing without outward things and signs. We must have outward signs beside words, by which we may keep ourselves and come together; understand, then, that such signs are outward, and yet have and signify spiritual things, that we may be drawn by the outward into the spiritual, and comprehend [the] outward with bodily [eyes], the spiritual 2) with inward eyes of the heart.

(40) Now the Scriptures abundantly show you how God the Lord, in addition to the word of promise, has also given you signs by which Our Lord has made a sign.

1) In the old edition: geleben.

2) In the old edition: "and external comprehension with bodily, the spiritual with" and so on.

faith will be strengthened in some way, and we are thereby assured. In the first book of Moses on the 9th, God promised His servant Noah that He would no longer destroy the world with a river of sin, and gave him a visible sign, saying [v. 13 ff.]: "I will set my bow in the clouds, and I will remember my vow with you. He promised the archfather Abraham the inheritance in his seed, and gave him the bodily circumcision for a seal of the righteousness of faith, Gen. 17, 10. Rom. 4, 11. To Gideon God gave the dry and wet lamb skin as confirmation of the promise that he should overcome the Midianites. Judg. 6, 37. ff.

(41) So Christ also dealt with us here. In the New Testament we have a great word of promise, namely, that the comforting body of Christ, promised by the prophets, has been given for us; the blood, not of an unreasonable animal, but of the Son of God, shed for the forgiveness of sins. So that this divine promise might be absolutely certain, and our faith might not waver in any way, Christ attached to it the most noble pledge, the most certain and most precious seal, namely the ransom itself of the promise, his own body and blood under the bread and wine; by which offering he merited that the abundant riches of the promise might be given to us.

Now as the circumcision admonished Abraham in Genesis 17 of the promise, and was for him also a certain testimony of the divine will towards him (for the text speaks [v. 11]: "That it may be a sign to you of the vow between me and you". Note the little word "vow," by which it is understood that the thing is certain), so also, when I receive the reverend Sacrament, which God has ordained for me as a sigil and sign, I am reminded of the death of the Lord, and what has been acquired for us through it. And although inwardly faith brings assurance and peace, nevertheless, since here we have only the beginning of the Spirit (Rom. 8:23), we also have great need of what is due to us from the outside for admonition and strength, so that one may help the other; for this also faith in the promise and word of God is strengthened through the sacrament.

43) Do not let it seem strange to you, 1) whether some strength and certainty is due to the internal through the external; for thus Peter speaks (2 Petr. 1, 10.): "Dear brothers, be diligent to make your calling and election firm.

to make." Here you see, although the election and eternal providence of God is firm enough in itself, and through true faith you are a child of God, who now cries out in the spirit: "Father, Father! Gal. 4:6, so that there is already an inward testimony of the Spirit: nevertheless, from the outside there should still be some 2) assurance and fortification. There is still a deficiency here, that you must first establish such calling and election with good works.

(44) Therefore, if we seek such assurance in the Sacrament that God has given it, and your Holy Spirit does not interrupt its work, we will not turn to your error at all, but will speak of our Sacrament with the highest reverence, as is fitting. And because we firmly believe that Christ gives us his body and blood under bread and wine, which body and blood is our salvation, we must not fear that it is unjust, although we say: it is all sweet grace, comfort and life in our sacrament. We also say: whoever considers such our Christian speech as an addition, falls into the judgment of which Paul writes 1 Cor. 11, 29: "For he does not distinguish the body of Christ."

One thing I cannot forget is that you write of the body and blood of Christ, even of the Lord's supper, and yet you do not remember the New Testament with a single word. But it has not served you in your opinion, therefore you are bravely silent, as if the Scriptures had no word of it. For if thou hadst remembered the testament, thou shouldest indeed have spoken much differently of the pledge and assurance than thou hast done.

That much is answered to you now, dear Carlstadt, to which I would much rather have nothing answered. But I was driven by my official duty; for I saw that this opinion of yours was beginning to eat away at the Christian assembly where I was evangelizing; so I had to counter the insanity with haste.

Now I must speak to you, to whom I have written this short report in great haste. You know, dear devout Christians, as I have often faithfully admonished you, that you see before you in these last perilous times, and try the spirits whether they are of God. This has truly never been so necessary as now, when the evil spirit is taking it upon himself not only to awaken persecution, which is to be respected as small, but he would also like to make the word of our faith uncertain to us, abusing it with great speed to confirm his

1) In the old edition: gedünken.

2) In the old edition: "nailß was".

Irrsale, that it is truly frightening to hear. But it cannot be otherwise, we must send ourselves into this dangerous time with weapons of Christian knighthood, faith, love and hope, and never let the double-edged sword of the Holy Spirit out of our hands, so that we may defend ourselves against the prince of the world.

48. cling to the word of the Lord with a humble heart, that he may give us understanding according to his word, and he will not let you go astray. St. Paul writes just now in the chapter to Corinthians, where he speaks of the Lord's supper [1 Cor. 11:19]: How there must be divisions among us, so that those who have been proven may be revealed among us.

We must suffer temptation, but we want to pray to God that He will not let us be led into it too deeply. God allows us to be tempted, as Moses writes in the 5th book, Cap. 13, 1. ff: "If a prophet appears in the midst of you, and says to you, 'Come, let us serve foreign gods,' then you should not follow the words of that dreamer; for God, your Lord, is tempting you, so that it may be revealed whether you love him or not, with all your heart. So the Scripture has also warned us against the false teachers of the future, that we should beware of their hell. We will be challenged; but "blessed is he who perseveres" (Matth. 24, 13.) and says with the prophet David: "Lord, your word is a light unto my feet" (Ps. 118. Vulg. or 119, 105.).

50 Now, so that you may be all the more wary of the above-mentioned insanity, I will briefly run over for you in one sum the teaching I gave you a year ago and recently some weeks ago concerning the reverend Sacrament, and ask you, for the sake of God's mercy, to form it in your heart and never forget it.

51. first. Damnable sin has separated us from God and made enemies of God out of us, therefore we would have been justly condemned (Rom. 5, 18.).

52) Secondly. But God does not show His mercy 1) in the midst of wrath, but through which He created us, through which He wanted to bring us back from Adam's heavy fall (Eph. 1, 4. Col. 1, 14. Hebr. 1, 3.); but as the fall was great, the sickness unspeakably heavy and deadly, so the remedy had to be great, expensive and powerful.

53 Thirdly. So now the Father of all mercies has given a help immediately after the fall.

1) In the old edition: Erbärmde.

The same seed was to become a sacrifice of temptation, through which innocence would be brought back to God, which before had turned away from God through guilt.

54. fourth. This seed is promised even more clearly to the archfather Abraham, as: in him shall be given all nations that were corrupted and destroyed by original sin in the first birth, Gen. 22, 18. After that (2 Sam. 7, 12. f.) it was promised to King David with the indication of his glorious kingdom that will last forever.) he was promised to King David, indicating his glorious kingdom that shall last forever; whom Isaiah Cap. 9, 6. calls a prince of peace, as the one through whom a true eternal peace is established between God and the elect.

55. fifth. The seed is now the pledge of God's mercy and our salvation. All those who are mortally wounded by the poisonous bite of sin must look upon it with the eyes of true faith, and they will be cut off from death, just as the Israelites were cut off by the serpent of brass, Deut. 21:8, 9. The seed given is our only way to God, our only peace and salvation (Eph. 2:14); through it alone sin is ended, wickedness is eradicated, and an eternal righteousness is established. (Dan. 9, 18.)

56. sixth. This is the great prophet, of whom Moses says (in the 5th book, Cap. 18, 18.), to whom God has put his words in his mouth; whoever does not follow him, God will avenge. Moses and the prophets point to the One as the goal and fulfillment of the Law; all promises go to Him (Heb. 7). So many sacrifices of the Old Testament prefigured this Righteousness Maker (Heb. 9 and 10). The law does not make us perfect, their sacrifices did not purify properly, it was all a previous shadow. But John pointed to the rightly cleansing sacrifice, saying: "Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world", Joh. 1, 29.

57. seventh. Therefore, in the time provided by God, when the confidence of Israel was to be sent, God sent His angel from heaven to a virgin of the lineage of David, named Mary (Luc. 1, 30. f.), fulfilled the prophecy of Jesse on 7, 14. and 9, 6., proclaimed the birth of the true Messiah, gave Him a name above all names, said [through the angel v. 32.]: He will be a son of the Most High, His

2) In the old edition: to the cunning snakes his u. s. w.

Kingdom for ever and ever, by the name of Jesus, that is, the Beatificator; for His ministry is to save the people from sin, Matth. 1, 21. Then the angel announced to the shepherds the true joy of the world, that the Beatificator had already been born and was lying in Bethlehem, Jesus Christ, Luc. 2, 8. ff.

58. to the eighth. What Isaiah saw in the prophetic spirit as future, we sing and say with joy, as already happened, namely: "A young child is born to us, a son is given to us", Is. 9, 6. The promised seed has already come, the sweet message of the reconciliation of man with God has rung out into the whole world: "Blessed is he who hears it and keeps it", Luc. 11, 28.

59. ninth. Yes, he is not only our Messiah, but he has already completed all the tasks and commands which his heavenly Father has laid upon him for the redemption of the human race, in true innocence, unpretentious obedience and the greatest love. He was ordained in death to overcome our death with his death. He was to become a sacrifice on the cross for us, so that we might be redeemed through him. As Isaiah described him in the 53rd chapter, so he became: "He became the most despised, he truly bore our pain, he was smitten by God and humbled, wounded for our wickedness, contrite for our vices. We have all strayed like sheep, but God has laid on him all our sin. He was sacrificed because he willed it; he gave his soul to death and was numbered among the wicked." And all that was prophesied of him by the prophets was fulfilled in him. And as Micah Cap. 7, 19. 20. says: "He hath put away from us our wickedness, and cast into [the] depth of the sea all our sin; he hath given the truth to Jacob, the mercy to Abraham, which he swore unto our fathers from the days of old."

60. to the tenth. Therefore we do not wait for another, we do not accept another Christ, but we now cheerfully speak with the Samaritans, Joh. 4, 42: "We know that he is truly the container of the world, Christ." And with Petro and the disciples, Jn. 6, 9. "We believe and know that you are Christ, a Son of the living God." Also with Martha, Jn. 11, 27. who said, "I believe that you are the Christ, a Son of GOD, who was to come into the world." The light has come, the shadow is gone, one no longer sacrifices unreasonable

Animals; the long awaited host, 1) the right paschal lamb has come. In the Old Testament, a sacrifice was offered for sin, blood was shed for purification; the priest offered for his own sin, then for the sin of the people (Hebr. 7, 27.): such is all dead and gone; the imperfect gives way to the perfect, the figure of truth.

61. to the eleventh. For now is already come, who alone is innocent among the sons of men, Jesus Christ, a sacrifice and a priest, "hath offered himself for our sin once upon the cross [for a sacrifice that] endureth for ever," for "with One sacrifice hath he perfected for ever them that are sanctified" [Heb. 9:12, 10, 14.]. He is our dear Melchizedeck, our King of righteousness and peace; he is our chief priest and bishop according to the order of Melchizedeck, set in 2) eternity and consecrated by God the Father, Ps. 110, 4.: "Who once entered into the 3) holy things by one offering, which endureth for ever; not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood," namely, into [the] heavens, that he might now appear before the face of God for us (Heb. 9, 12.). That if we sin, we have with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous; who is a "propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:1, 2), yea, for sins past, present, and to come. Notice, believer, your abundant riches! 4) But be afraid, you wretched, miserable, desperate enemy of God, because of your more than devilish blindness! Recognize Christ, your only Savior, because eternal death is dragging on your back, like a shadow on a fine body.

62. to the twelfth. See how the Gospel proclaims such great things! We were in ourselves poor forsaken sinners; now by the sacrifice we become pious, for enemies of God and children of wrath now children of God and the dear sons of grace; for damned now blessed. By what? Truly, "not by our works, but by the mercy of God" (Tit. 3, 5.), as Paul writes Rom. 3, 23. ff.: "They are all sinners, and are justified without merit by His grace, through the redemption that came by Christ, whom God presented to a mercy seat."

63. to the thirteenth. Here now lies our

1) üostia - sacrificial animal, atonement.

2) In the old edition: in dre.

3) Old edition: the.

4) In the old edition: your überfichtvenkliche Reichtung!

Treasure and all, therefore all thoughts must be drawn to this, so that with a grateful heart one may earnestly and fervently contemplate this wonderful gracious transaction of our redemption through this most worthy and precious sacrifice; how God ordained for us His beloved only begotten Son, before 1) the foundations of the world were laid (Eph. I, 4.), out of grace and love, for the "restoration" of the lost man, and after that, regardless of the manifold horrible sin of the world, according to His promise, He sent the promised one and delivered him into the hands of sinners for the sake of our salvation. This good deed of our redemption through his body and blood, ordained from eternity, and graciously accomplished and conquered in time through Christ, we should and must not forget, even if we lose our eternal blessedness, but rather 2) believe, remember and proclaim.

64. fourteenth. For from right knowledge and proclamation of such love of God in this delivered body and shed blood comes to us all our righteousness, life, peace and salvation, according to the words of the prophet Isaiah, 53:11: "The righteous in his knowledge shall justify many of my servants."

65. fifteenth. Whoever believes in Christ (who is promised in the prophets, John 3, and given in the New Testament), that he was born to us, suffered for us, was raised from the dead, and glorified by the sanctifying Spirit, 2c., will be saved (John 3:16, Romans 4:24), and through right faith Christ's death with all its fruits becomes ours, his sacrifice ours, and his priesthood also ours. For "he that spared not his only begotten Son, but delivered him up for us, how shall he not give us all things with him?" Rom. 8, 32. Behold! who would harm us, if by faith we are surrounded with such great unspeakable goods of Christ? What need is there of much [words]? Christ's body once offered and blood once shed has brought us redemption and forgiveness of all sin, holiness to us all who know and desire such things.

66 To the sixteenth. Therefore it is necessary above all things that we have a right knowledge of our salvation, a constant and fervent remembrance in true living faith, a cheerful and undaunted confession. "For if one believes with the heart, he becomes godly; and if one confesses with the mouth, he becomes blessed", Rom. 10, 10. So truly and not otherwise God will

1) Old edition: marriage and.

2) Old edition: special.

We are known to ourselves who we are, and here comes faith in God and love for our neighbor, without which we are nothing. Now proclaim this. No one is right, if he believes before; but he does not believe, if he knows before from the word of God. But how can he know them, if he does not hear them preached and proclaimed? Therefore it is necessary that the death of the Lord with its fruits be diligently preached and publicly proclaimed. He who conceals this deed wants to make us forget God's fatherly mercy, to blaspheme God and to bring about our eternal ruin.

67 To the seventeenth. Therefore, since Christ now wanted to completely fulfill the will of His Father with the work of redemption, He earnestly commanded that such a remembrance of His sacrifice and death should never be forgotten, gave a consoling pardon, promised remission of sins (Matth. 26. Marci 14. Luc. 22. 1 Cor. 11.). And because the human heart was well known to him, as it is foolish in faith, he gave, to strengthen faith in the promise and word of God, outward signs as a seal, by which he would help the weakness of our faith, prepared a table, where faith was nourished, love was kindled, hope was supported; to which his words and deeds we take heed and obey this command, as he has ordained.

68 To the eighteenth. This institution of the reverend supper of Christ was described by Paul, as he had learned it from the Lord himself, with all the pertinence, in the first Corinthians at 11. Accordingly, when we want to celebrate the supper of the Lord, we take before us the words of Christ, as he uses them, and speak them over the bread and wine; and if they are spoken rightly in faith, there is no doubt in our minds that there is the body and blood of JEsu Christ. And so after his business 3) we eat the bread, that is, his 4) body, and drink the wine, that is, his blood, proclaiming the death of the Lord signified by the signs, which was done for the payment and atonement of sin, by which we have obtained victory over sin, death, and hell, that we might put away the works of death, serve our Savior in the joy of our consciences; Even though sin still rages in us, and we are exercised under the cross and bear the death of the Lord Jesus in the body, so that His life may also be opened in our body. Whoever then would change and despise the custom of this supper, would have us

3) d. i. according to its order or foundation.

4) In the old edition: be.

certainly deprive our hope and some comfort of the soul.

69. to the nineteenth. For here is the new testament, the new irrevocable gracious covenant, the promise of all promises, a summa of the whole gospel, namely remission of sins, and bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Here no calf's blood is sprinkled, 1) as in confirmation of the old covenant, but the innocent most precious blood of the righteous Christ, a seal of the new testament. Paul, Gal. 3, 16. 17., says: "To Abraham the promise was made, and to his seed"; and soon after: "the testament is confirmed by God." Here it is clear that he calls the promise a testament. Therefore we may call the Lord's supper, since the head of all promise is inside, a testament, and Christ also called it so Luc. 22. the 2) drink, the new testament 2c. For Christ, as a testator, has procured for us remission of sins, the Father's favor, and eternal life, which inheritance no one obtains except through the death of the testator. But now he has already died for our sins, and has risen again for the sake of our piety (Rom. 4, 25.); the testament is therefore confirmed, and we are heirs who come with right faith to receive the inheritance.

(70) Here, for the comfort of your fearful conscience, notice a great assurance, which is shown to us in the outward signs, and sums up all things. Just as a covenant was made between God and Abraham and his seed (The Lord promised Abraham and his seed that he would be their God and give them the land of Canaan, but asked them to circumcise every child, Genesis 17:12), so too we have a promise from Christ that our sins will be purged and washed away through his body and blood. But this we are to know and believe, for by faith the heart is cleansed (Acts 15:9), which faith, of course, is the science of God, according to Jeremiah 31. And this is not without the Spirit of God, which Spirit is the law that God wants to write in our hearts, as promised in the same place [Jer. 31:33]. Again, we are required to do this in remembrance of Him as often as we do it. Now here you see sufficiently what belongs to a testament. The new and everlasting covenant is made; now therefore see that thou come into it, and therein

1) In the old edition: ausgesprenzt.

2) Old edition: that.

remain. Redemption and remission of sins are due to the merit of the blood of Christ and the grace of God, but only through faith, as Paul testifies Rom. 3, 28.

71 The twentieth. For the purpose of decreeing that the Lord's Supper be properly celebrated, there are five things in particular:

The first is the supper, the food and drink, the body and blood of Christ; after the words have been expelled. Now the flesh alone is not useful (Joh. 6, 63.); "but the spirit makes alive" (2 Cor. 3, 6.). Therefore, the body and blood only become the proper food and drink for the hungry, thirsty soul when they are consumed in faith. For the right food of the soul is that the soul is certain that Jesus Christ, the innocent, is its Savior before God; His flesh was given into death for the life of the world. Whoever then firmly believes that the body of Christ, as an eternally paying sacrifice, is given into [death for] our sin, His blood shed for our cleansing, to him the death of Christ is bread and drink, makes him alive, and keeps him in spiritual life, as the body is kept in natural life by material bread and wine. Although everything depends on faith in the Word that became flesh, even though no sign would be received, God, for the sake of our weak faith, also wanted to give His body and blood under visible signs, so that such good deeds would be pressed into the mind from within and imagined in the senses from within.

73. the other: Guests who eat and drink. These are those who hunger and thirst after godliness; they, invited to this supper, become heirs of this testament. Luc. 1, 53: "He has filled the hungry with good things."

The third is preparation. For this meal, of course, requires a wedding garment. So Paul commands: "Let the man try himself, and then eat" 2c. The rehearsal and preparation is in the right discernment of the body and blood, so that you may recognize in faith the body, that it is the very body and blood which Moses and the prophets promised would pay for our sins and wash them away, and now, according to the evangelists and apostles, has already done so. His body is the sufficient sacrifice, his blood your cleansing: whoever rightly recognizes and remembers this in faith, has what belongs to the preparation. He recognizes himself as a wretched sinner, for whom such a great atonement by God's Son is necessary. He recognizes himself as a wretched sinner for whom such a great atonement had to be made by God's Son. He alone recognizes the one and only Son of God, his physician, his righteousness maker.

and salvation through his bitter death. He desires to become pious; there is now repentance and sorrow for his sin, and a heartfelt confession to God, so that he says: "Lord, I am a sinner and you alone are righteous; have mercy on me through Jesus Christ, who shed his blood for me. Immediately, realizing how things stand, he willingly surrenders to the cross of Christ to put his flesh to death and be conformed to Christ his Savior; this is now the Christian life.

The fourth is time. There is no hour appointed. It is food and drink; therefore, if you thirst and hunger for godliness and want to comfort your conscience, come to God's table. Here no one shall be forced, but through the

Word to be driven into his own knowledge, that the fear of his conscience may drive him, and believe in the Word.

The fifth: Those who prepare the table of the Lord, these are servants of Christ, ordained by the church, who act and execute the word and command of Christ in right faith, as and for what He has chosen, so that according to the business of 1) Paul all things in the church may be done duly and properly, 1 Cor. 14, 40.

That is enough in a hurry now. Soon, if God wills, I will write more about it. May God's grace be with you. Amen. 1524.

1) i.e. according to the order.

5. D. Martin Luther's writing "against the heavenly prophets, of the images and sacrament"*)).

The first part towards the end of 1524;

the second at the end of January 1525.

First part.

Their foolishness will be revealed to everyone,

2 Tim. 3:9.²)

1. walt's god and our dear lord jesus christ. There is a new continuation. I had almost laid myself down to rest, and thought it was all over: so it lifts up first of all, and goes to me as the wise man says [Sir. 18:6]: "When a man ceases, he must lift up."

2) Doctor Andreas Carlstadt has fallen away from us and has become our worst enemy. Christ does not want to frighten us, and give us his mind and courage, so that we do not 3) err or despair before Satan, who pretends that he wants to justify the sacrament, but has a very different thing in mind, i.e., the sacrament.

2) This motto is on the title of all single editions of both the first and the other part of this writing.

3) So the Wittenberg and the Jena, "yes" is missing in the Erlanger.

The first step is to corrupt the whole teaching of the Gospel, which he has not yet been able to deaf by force, with a cunning action of the Scriptures.

Now I have proclaimed it, and my prophecy will come true (I am worried) that God will visit our ingratitude and strike down the truth, as Daniel says [Dan. 8, 12], because we persecute them and do not accept that we must have vain error and false spirits and prophets again, some of which have now been present for three years; by His grace they have been prevented 4) until now, otherwise they would have broken down long ago. Whether he will continue to endure, I do not know, because no one cares, no one prays for it, and all are safe, as if the devil were asleep, who nevertheless walks around like a fierce lion [1 Petr. 5:8]. Although I hope that there will be no need for it in my life. Therefore, as long as I live, I will resist,

4) "they" is missing in the Erlanger.

*) This writing appeared in many single editions at Wittenberg, at Strasbourg, at Basel in the time indicated by us, also without indication of time and place. In no single edition is the name of the printer given. I" the collections: Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 11b; Jena (1556), vol. III, p. 41b; in the Altenburg, vol. III, p. 40; in the Leipzig, vol. XIX, p. 156 and in the Erlangen, vol. 29, p. 136. We give the text according to the Jena, comparing the Wittenberg and Erlangen editions.

as God gives me, let it help whom it can help. And this is my sincere and faithful warning and admonition:

First, that everyone with all earnestness pray to God for right understanding and for His holy pure word, considering that under such a powerful prince and god of this world, the devil, it is not at all in our power to preserve neither faith nor God's word, but there must be divine power alone to protect it, as the 12th Psalm [vv. 7-9] prays very finely and says: "The words of God are pure, purified sevenfold. Thou, O Lord, wilt preserve 1) them, and keep us from this generation for ever. For the wicked are around and around, where the loose people arise." If we presume to have it, and care not how we keep it, it is soon lost.

(5) Secondly, that we also do our diligence and do not let our eyes slumber, but be steadfast, for God's grace nevertheless always keeps us stiff above the world, so that he does not allow any false prophet to do anything other than outward things, such as works and subtle pointed feet of outward things. No one takes on faith and a good conscience before God, but only what glitters and shines before reason and the world. Just as the Arians had a subtle appearance before reason, since they claimed that God was only One Person, the Father, but the Son and the Holy Spirit were not true God.

Item 6: The Jews and Pelagians found it gentle and easy to believe that works without grace made one pious; and under the papacy it was sweet to say that free will also had something to do with grace. Therefore, because it is in accordance with reason, it is well to say that in the sacrament there is bad bread and wine; who cannot believe this? 3) If it were admitted to the Jews today that Christ was a pure man, I think they would be easily converted.

(7) Now then, let us be diligent to separate far from each other the two doctrines: one that teaches of the principal things, the spiritual, and the spiritual of the other.

1) In the German Bible: "wollst".

2) Walch and the Erlanger: wiire.

3) Walch and the Erlanger: one still.

know how to rule in the spirit before God; the other, which teaches about outward things or works; for it depends more on the teaching of faith and a good conscience than on the teaching of good works. Since, although works are lacking, there is help and counsel 4) that one can do them where the doctrine of faith remains firm and pure. But where the doctrine of faith is set aside and works are brought forth, there can be no good, neither counsel nor help, unless the works bring vain honor with them and want to be something great in the sight of men; so God's honor perishes.

8) Just as these ambitious prophets do, who do nothing but storm images, break churches. They do not master the sacrament and seek a new way of mortificationis, that is, self-chosen killing of the flesh. They have also never yet taught the doctrine of faith, never taught how to raise consciences, which is the most noble and necessary thing in Christian doctrine, as has been said.

(9) And if they had 5) made all things equal, that there was no image, that there was no church, that there was no one left in all the world that the flesh and blood of Christ was in the sacrament, and they were all dressed in gray peasant's skirts, 6) what would have been the result? What would they have gained by this, since they are so nearly pressing, 7) driving and hunting? If they had become Christians, where would faith and love be? Shall they come after? Why should they not go first? Glory, vain honor and a new monk's certificate would be acquired, as happens in all works, but the conscience is not helped. Such false spirits do not inquire, just as the pope does not inquire where faith or love will remain, if only the works of his obedience and law will go, there he penetrates; and if they happen, nothing has happened.

10 Because now D. Carlstadt goes the same way and among so many books does not even teach what faith and love are (yes, they speak mockingly and derisively of the same).

4) Walch and the Erlanger: Rath da.

5) Walch and the Erlanger: it now.

6) Carlstadt walked along in such peasant clothes.

7) Erlanger: nordringen.

Let every man be warned against him, and know that he has a perverse spirit, which intends nothing 1) but to murder consciences with laws, sins, and works, and yet nothing is accomplished thereby, even if everything were done which 2) he pretends to do in all his books, mouths, and hearts, but even wicked men may do and teach all such things as he practices. Therefore there must be something higher to solve and comfort the consciences: this is the Holy Spirit, which cannot be obtained by breaking images or by any work, but only by the gospel and faith.

(11) Now, lest we open our mouths too wide, and be astonished at the art of these false spirits, and so let the right principal things pass away, and be led craftily out of the way (so that the devil may go about by these prophets), I will tell here lately the principal things of Christian doctrine, which every man ought above all things to remember and keep in mind.

The first is the law of God, which is to be preached in such a way that sin is revealed and recognized, Rom. 3:20 and 7:7, as we have often shown in our writings. But these prophets do not understand anything right about it, because this is called the law preached spiritually (as St. Paul Rom. 7, 14.³⁾) and used rightly. 1 Tim. 1, 8.

13. the other, when sin has been recognized and the law has been preached so that consciences may be frightened and humbled before God's wrath, then the comforting word of the gospel and forgiveness of sins should be preached to comfort consciences again and raise them to the grace of God 2c.

14. these two pieces in this 4) order teaches Christ himself Luc. 24, 47.: "One must preach repentance and forgiveness of sin in his name." "And the Spirit (He says Joh. 16, 8.) will punish the world for sin, righteousness and judgment."

1) In the issues: not.

2) Erlanger as well as Walch's old edition: that.

3) These brackets are set by us. In the old edition Walch's: "1 Timoth. on 1, 8. says", which the Erlangen edition has reprinted.

4) Walch and the Erlangerens: such.

(15) These two things are not found in these or any other false prophets, nor can they be, yet they are the most important and necessary things.

The third is now the judgment, the work to kill the old man, of which Rom. 5. 6. 7. There the works begin, the sufferings and tortures also, since we kill our flesh by our own compulsion and fasting, watch, work 2c., or by other persecution and shame. These false prophets also do not do this killing rightly; for they do not accept what God inflicts on them, but what they choose themselves, wear gray skirts, want to be like farmers, and much of the fool's work.

(17) Fourth, let works of love toward one's neighbor be done with gentleness, patience, charity, teaching, help, and counsel, both spiritual and corporal, freely and in vain, as Christ has done for us. Joh. 13, 15. 34.

(18) Now the last thing is to do the law and its works, not for the Christians, but for the rude and unbelieving; for for the Christians it must be done spiritually, as it was said above, to recognize sin. But for the rough people, for Him *omnes*, *it* must also be done physically and grossly, so that they do and leave His works, and thus must be outwardly pious with compulsion under the sword and laws, as one keeps the wild animals with chains and imprisonment, so that outward peace remains among the people, for which secular authority is decreed, which God wants to have honored and feared in it. Rom. 13, 1. 1 Petr. 2, 13. 17.

19 But besides this, care must be taken that Christian liberty be preserved, and that such laws and works be not practiced upon the consciences of Christians, as if they must thereby be pious or sinful. And to this belongs the question of how to break or tolerate images, food, clothing, place, person, and all manner of outward things. 2c. He who does not teach according to this order certainly does not do it right. From this you see that D. Carlstadt and his spirits put the lowest for the highest, the least for the best, the last for the first, and yet wants to be seen of all-

supreme spirit who ate the Holy Spirit with feathers and If the teaching of the law is not done, but is a lost service with everything. and food, the people themselves willingly fall before it,

(20) Therefore I beseech every Christian who is despise it, and do not let it be done. But where such entitled to us in this matter, as we dispute, to remember teaching is omitted, and only the fist is used, nothing that we are not dealing with high things, but with the very follows, except that those blaspheme who do not least, and to know that the devil would gladly magnify understand it, and who do it only out of compulsion of the such low things and draw the eyes of the people to law, as a good necessary work, and do not do it with a free himself, so that they may disregard the right, noblest conscience, but think to please God with the work. Which things and gape at them; so that every one may know opinion is a true idolatry and false confidence in the heart. how D. Carlstadt's spirit is a false and evil spirit, so that This is what happens through such legalism, that they he leaves the high, right things alone and gapes at them. outwardly remove images and set their hearts full of idols Carlstadt's spirit is a false, evil spirit, which is not against them. sufficient for him, that he so silences and leaves the high, I say this so that it may be seen what kind of spirit is in right things, and so inflates the least things, as if the Carlstadt, who blames me for wanting to protect images world's salvation were more important than Christ against God's word, and yet knows that I want to have himself; but also forces us from such high, necessary them torn out of all hearts, despised and destroyed, things down to the little things, that we lose time with him without putting up with his free fist and impetuosity. If the and give way to forgetting the high things. And this is the Holy Spirit were here, he would not lie so knowingly and first fruit by which this tree is known. impudently, but would say: "Yes, dear Luther, it pleases

21 But lest there be too many books, I will answer him me that you are destroying images in the heart so much; with this one book to all his; and because I have not yet so that I will destroy them all the more easily before my written anything special about images, this shall be the eyes, and I accept your service as conducive to this. Now first. Because he has started the work from his own head, I shall act against God's word and protect images, who he wants to mend himself afterwards and cover the destroy them of all things by heart and inwardly, and I shall shame with fig leaves. not say that he acts against God's word, who only destroys them by heart and leaves them in the heart, and sets up others beside them, namely, false trust and glory of the work.

From the iconoclasm.

22 I attacked iconoclasm by first tearing it out of the heart by the word of God and making it worthless and despised, as was done before Carlstadt dreamed of iconoclasm. For where they are from the heart, they do no harm to the eyes. But D. Carlstadt, who cares nothing for the hearts, has reversed this and torn them out of the eyes and left them in the heart. For he does not preach faith, nor can he preach it, as I only 1) unfortunately see. Which of these two storms is the best, I will let everyone judge.

23. for where hearts are taught that by faith alone one pleases God, and by images he is not pleased. spirit is so stubborn in his mind, I want to

1) Walch and the Erlangeners: now first.

2) In the old editions: enhinder.

I will now give way to defiance and suffering less than I did before. And I will first speak of the images according to the way of the Law of Moses, then in the evangelical way. And first say that according to the Law of Moses no other image is forbidden than God's image, which one worships. But a crucifix or any other image of a saint is not forbidden to have. Now, you iconoclasts, defy and prove it otherwise.

26] After this, the first commandment, Exodus 20:3, says, "Thou shalt not have other gods before me." After this text follows immediately, and shows and expresses what he calls other gods, and says: "Thou shalt not make any image or likeness," Ex. 20, 4. This is spoken of the same gods 2c. And although our spirits dwell on the little word "make," and are always throbbing: To make, to make is another thing than to worship, yet they must let it be known that this commandment speaks in essence of nothing but God's glory. It must be made, of course, if it is to be worshipped, and unmade it is not to be worshipped. But it is not valid to pick out a word and insist on it; one must look at the opinion of the whole text as it is connected, then one sees that it speaks of God's images, which are not to be worshipped, and no one will prove otherwise from it. Therefore, in the same chapter, v. 23, it follows: "Thou shalt not make thee any gods of gold or silver," that such a making is certainly meant for the gods.

(27) For this saying, "Thou shalt have no gods," is the main saying, the measure and the goal, according to which all the words that follow are to be drawn, directed and measured; for it indicates and expresses the meaning of this commandment, namely, that there shall be no other gods. Therefore the word "make," "images," "serve," 2c. and what follows must be understood no further than that no gods and idolatry come of it. Just as the word: "I am your God" [Ex. 20, 2.] is the measure and goal of everything that may be said about worship. And it would be foolish of me to include under it something that does not concern godliness or worship, as building a house, plowing 2c. So also under the word "thou shalt not

The words "to have gods" can be drawn in no other way than as far as idolatry is concerned. But where images or pillars are made without idolatry, such making is not forbidden, because the main saying "you shall have no gods" remains intact.

If they do not want to let the "making" go to the images of God, as the text compels, then I also want to say that worship is not forbidden (because one clings so stiffly to the letter). For in the first commandment there is nothing about worship; so I would like to say: If you do none, let others do it; but worship is not forbidden to you. But if from other places they gloss making with worshipping, which is not in the text here, then I gloss from the same text making to the gods, as the text clearly says. Therefore we do not read any example that they were punished for images or altars without worshipping them; that also the bronze serpent of Moses remained [4 Mos. 21, 8] until Ezekia took it off only for the sake of worship [2 Kings 18, 4].

29. about this I have 3 Mos. 26, 1. a mighty saying: "I am your God, you shall not make for yourselves an idol nor an image, nor set up a mark nor a stone in your land that you worship." How now? Here, I think, he indicates enough to himself that it is a matter of worship, if he therefore bequeaths idols and painting stones, that they should not worship, without doubt, that where they do not worship, they may well set up and make, otherwise what would be the need of such an addition from worship? Therefore, in the first commandment, making must go to worship and no further. Thus also Deut. 4, 15. ff. the saying about worship is clear, since it refers to making images.

30 We also have examples of this in the Old Testament. For Joshua, Cap. 24, 26, 1) set up a painting stone under an oak tree as a witness 2) 2c., but it is forbidden to set up such stones, 3 Mos. 26, 1.

1) The Erlangen edition has reprinted "25" from Walch's old edition, plus, as usual, all of Walch's erroneous biblical citations in this writing, twenty-six in number. Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 885, note 2; vol. XIX, 240, note 2; Col. 617, note; Col. 676, note 2; Col. 768; Col. 820, note 1 2c.; vol. XXII, Introduction, p. 38 f.

2) Walch and the Erlangers: Signs.

were higher than the images. But because it was a stone of testimony and not for worship, it did not violate the commandment. Accordingly, Samuel, 1 Sam. 7, 12, set up a stone and called it a helper stone. This was also forbidden, as has been said, but because no worship but only remembrance was sought there, he did no sin.

031 But concerning all these things, Joshua 22:10, the children of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, made a great altar by Jordan; and all Israel were afraid, and sent messengers thither in earnest, as though an altar had been set up contrary to the commandment of God: for it was forbidden. But behold, how they apologized. The altar remained standing, because they heard that it was not for worship or sacrifice, but for a memorial. But if it had been wrong to make an altar, and if God's commandment was to be understood so rigidly as "to make," they should have burned the altar to powder; otherwise they would not have escaped the sin, as they pretended. Now making altars is forbidden as hard as making images. If one can make and erect altars and special stones, so that God's commandment nevertheless remains, because the worship remains, then also my iconoclasts will have to leave me a crucifix or Mary's image, yes, also an image of Abgot, even according to the strictest law of Moses, that I wear it or look at it, as far as I do not worship it, but have a memory.

32 But I wonder at these Jewish saints, who cling so stiffly to the law of Moses and rage against the images, how they do with florins and jewels, since images stand up? For I hear that they have many florins and jewels; so they coin St. Joachim into pennies in Jáchymov. It would be my advice to help the great saints from their sins and take away their gold and silver pennies and cups. For even if they are hostile to the images, it is to be feared that they are not yet so far removed from them, nor have they come into study and wonder and sprinkling, 1) that they could throw them away from themselves. Also, 2) perhaps

1) Here Luther mocks the mystical, often senseless jargon that Carlstadt and his followers used. Cf. Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 310, the notes.
2) "is" is missing in the Erlanger.

mankind is still so weak that even the living voice from heaven is not enough, but good strong fellows who otherwise would not have much to consume.

33) There is also another fault with these iconoclasts, 3) that they themselves fall without order and do not drive with proper force, as their prophets stand, shout and incite the mob and say: Hit, 4) hit, tear, bite, throw, break, stab, kick, throw, strike the idols in the mouth; if you see a crucifix, spit it in the face 2c. This means that Carlstadt has removed the images, yes, to make the rabble mad and foolish and secretly accustom them to rebellion, who then plump into the work, think that they are now great saints, become so proud and insolent that it is beyond measure; and if one looks at it in the light, it is a law work, done without spirit and faith, and yet makes a hope in the heart, as if they were something special before God through such work. This is then actually called work and free will taught.

34 We read in Moses, 2 Mos. 18, 21. ff., that he first appointed princes, officials and secular authorities before he gave the law, and teaches in many places: All things should be heard, judged and punished with justice, witnesses and in an orderly manner.

35) What else should the judges and overlords in the country do to us? My Carlstadt always skips this piece very finely, and what Moses teaches, he points to the disorderly mob, and teaches them to fall into it without any order, like swine. This is and is called a red, rebellious spirit, which despises the authorities, and freely goes about itself as if they were masters of the land and of the law. If one allows the mob to storm the churches without authority, one must also allow each one to lead and kill the adulterers, murderers, and the disobedient 2c. For God has given the same authority to the people of Israel to kill, as to destroy the images. I,

3) In the old editions: "with these iconoclasts"; Erlanger: "with this iconoclasts". Perhaps it should be read: "with these iconoclasts".

4) Erlanger: "ha". In the old editions: "Haw", i.e. "hau".

5) "us" is missing in the Erlanger.

What a fine being and regiment that would become! That is why I said that D. Carlstadt is not a murderous prophet; but he has a rebellious, murderous, red spirit with him, which would probably lead out if he had room.

36 Therefore we read in the Old Testament, where images or idols were destroyed, that not the mob but the authorities did the work. In the same way Jacob buried the idols of his servants [Gen. 35:4]. Thus Gideon broke the altar of Baal, when he was demanded by God to be the prince [Gen. 6:27]. So Jehu the king (not the mob) broke the Baal of Ahab [2 Kings 10:26 ff]. So did Ezechia with the brazen serpent [2 Kings 18:4]. Item, Josiah with the altars at Bethel [2 Kings 23:15]. It is clear that where God calls the community to do something and calls the people, he does not want it to be done by the mob without authority, but by the authority with the people, so that the dog does not learn to eat the leather on the straps, that is, to get used to the images to rot, even against the authority. One must not paint the devil over the door.

Now that we are among our rulers, lords and emperors, and must live by their laws outwardly instead of Mosiah's law, we shall be silent and humbly ask them to put away such images. Where they will not, we have nevertheless the word of God, that we may cast them out of the heart, until they also be put away outwardly with the fist by those who are due. But when these prophets hear such things, they must be called papist and hypocritical to the princes. But that they awaken the disorderly rabble and make them red, that is not called hypocritical. For it should not be called hypocritical before we teach the rabble to kill princes and lords. But whether I am papist and the princes hypocrites, let the pope and princes themselves be more honest witnesses to me than this lying spirit that speaks, that he knows well that it is known otherwise before all the world.

(38) Let this be said of images according to the strictness of the Law of Moses; not that I mean to defend images, as has been sufficiently said, but that murderous spirits are not to be allowed to commit sin.

and make consciences where there is none, and murder souls without need. For though imagery is an outwardly small thing, yet if by it, as by the law of God, the consciences are burdened with sins, it becomes the very highest. For it corrupts the faith, profanes Christ's blood, condemns the gospel, and nullifies all that Christ has purchased for us. That this abomination of Carlstadt is nothing less to disturb Christ's kingdom and good conscience than the papacy has been with its prohibition of food and marriage, and what else was without sin and free. For eating and drinking is also a small outward thing, but it murders the soul if one entangles the conscience with it.

39 From this now notice which of us teaches the most Christian 1). I want to have the consciences and souls free and clear of sins, which is a right spiritual evangelical preaching ministry; so I want to catch Carlstadt with laws and burden him with sins without any cause. And yet he does the same not with God's law, but with his own conceit and iniquity, that he is not only far from the gospel, but also not yet a Mosaic teacher, and yet always praises God's word, God's word; just as if it were God's word so soon that one can say God's word. As there is generally nothing behind those who make much boasting of God's word, as unfortunately our papal tyrants have also gone along with us so far.

(40) But to speak of the images evangelically, I say and state that no one is guilty of breaking God's images with his fist, but is all free and does not sin, whether he does not break them with his fist. But he is guilty of breaking with the word of God, that is, not with the law of Carlstadt, but with the gospel, so that he instructs and enlightens the consciences how it is idolatry to worship them or to rely on them, because one should rely on Christ alone. Then he let them go outwardly, God granting that they are broken, fall apart or remain standing,

1) Walch and the Erlanger: allerchristlichsten.

This is of equal importance to him and is none of his business, just as if the poison had been taken from the snake.

41 I say this once again to keep the consciences free from sacrilegious laws and invented sins, and not because I want to defend the 1) images or judge those who break them, especially those who break God's and worshipful images. For the memorial images or witness images, as the crucifixes and images of saints are, is proven above from 2) Moses, that they are to be tolerated, also in the law, and not only to be tolerated, but, because the memory and witness lasts, also praiseworthy and honest, like the painting stone of Joshua, 24, 27, and Samuel, 1 Sam. 7, 12.

42) As if the images to the oak, in the Grimmenthal, to the pear tree, and where such runnings are more to the images (which are then right idolatrous images, and the devil's hostel), were broken, destroyed, is praiseworthy and good. But that those who do not break them should sin, is taught too much and the Christians are driven too far, who do enough with it, that they fight and argue against it with the word of God.

043 And sayest thou, Yea, because they stand still, yet some are offended at them, and run? Answer, what can I do? I, who am a Christian, have no authority on earth. Set up a preacher to turn the people away, or make it be done in an orderly way, not with swarms and storms.

44 Let us go to the right reason and say that these teachers of sin and Mosaic prophets should not make us swear to Moses; we do not want to see or hear Moses. How do you like that, dear red spirits? And say further that all such Mosaic teachers deny the gospel, cast out Christ, and abrogate the whole New Testament. I speak now as a Christian and for the Christians. For Moses was given to the Jewish people alone, and is of no concern to us Gentiles and Christians. We have our Gospel and the New Testament;

If they prove from the 4) that images are to be destroyed, we will gladly follow them. But if they want to make Jews out of us through Moses, we will not suffer it.

How do you think? What do you want to become here? That it may be seen how these fools understand nothing in the Scriptures, neither Moses nor Christ, and neither seek nor find anything in them but their own dreams. And we lay the foundation here from St. Paul, 1 Tim. 1, 9: "To the righteous (as a Christian is) no law is given." And Peter, Apost. 15, 10.: "Why do you tempt God to lay upon the disciples burdens which neither we nor our fathers might bear? But believe me, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be saved in like manner as they also." With this saying (like Paul with his) St. Peter lifts the whole of Moses with all its laws from the Christians.

46 Yes, you say, that would be true of the ceremonies and judicial practices, that is, what Moses teaches about outward worship and outward government, but the Decalogue, that is, the Ten Commandments are not abrogated, in which there is nothing about ceremonies and judicial practices. I answer: I know very well that this is a common old distinction, but without understanding, because from the ten commandments flow and hang all the other commandments and the whole of Moses.

47 For this reason, that he would be God alone and have no other gods, 2c. he has instituted many ceremonies or services, and thus interpreted the first commandment by them and taught how to keep it. Item, because he wants parents to be obedient, not to suffer adultery, murder, thievery, false witness, he has given the Judicialia or outward rule, so that such commandments are understood and carried out.

48 Therefore it is not true that there are no ceremonies in the Ten Commandments, or no judicialia; they are and are all in them and belong in them. And in order to indicate this, God Himself has inserted two ceremonies with expressed words, namely,

1) "the" is missing in the Jena.

2) Walch and the Erlangeners: also from.

3) In the Wittenberg and the Jena: "so far"; in Walch and in the Erlanger: "too far".

4) Walch and the Erlangeners: the same.

the images and the Sabbath, and wants to prove that these two pieces are ceremonies, also in their own way abolished in the New Testament, so that one can see how D. Carlstadt in his book deals with the Sabbath 1) just as wisely as with the images. For St. Paul, Col. 2, 16. 17. speaks freely and brightly: "Let no one make you conscience about food and drink, or about one part of the days, namely the holidays, new moons or Sabbaths, which is the shadow of that which was in the future." Here, St. Paul does indeed cancel the Sabbath by name, and calls it the past shadow, because the body, which is Christ Himself, has come.

49 Gal. 4:10, 11: "Ye keep days, and moons, and feasts, and seasons: I fear yours, lest peradventure I have wrought upon you in vain." Here he calls lost work keeping days and feasts, among which is also the Sabbath. Isaiah also proclaimed this before, Isa. 66:23: "There shall be one Sabbath on another, and a new moon on another," that is, daily Sabbath in the New Testament, no difference of time.

50 And thanks must the pious Paul have with Isaiah, that they have delivered us so long before from the spirits of the wicked, we must otherwise sit on the Sabbath day, and grasp the head in the hand, and wait for the heavenly voice, as they jingle. Yes, if Carlstadt were to continue writing about the Sabbath, Sunday would still have to give way, and the Sabbath, that is, Saturday, would be celebrated; he would truly make us Jews of all things, that we would also have to circumcise ourselves 2c.

(51) For this is true, and no man can gainsay it, that whosoever keepeth or maketh it necessary to keep one law of Moses, must keep them all as necessary, as St. Paul, Gal. 5:3, concludes, saying, "Whosoever is circumcised is bound to keep the whole law." So also, whoever breaks images or celebrates the Sabbath (that is, whoever teaches them to be kept as necessary) must also be circumcised and keep the whole of Moses; which is also true-

In the course of time, they were urged to do, teach and keep the law, even if there was room for these spirits. But now, by the grace of God, they do just as St. Paul says in Gal. 6:13: "Those who want to circumcise you do not keep the law themselves, but seek only glory in your bodies. So the iconoclasts themselves do not keep the law. For without leaving the others all in line, they also do the storming without spirit, as if hastening work, so that they might lose Christ, the fulfillment of the law, and seek only to gain glory in us, 2) as if they had taught something fine and masterly.

52) But that the imagery in the first commandment is also a temporal ceremony, St. Paul concludes and says under other words 1 Cor. 8, 4: "We know that [an] idol is nothing in the world. Just as he says of circumcision 1 Cor. 7, 19: "Circumcision is nothing," that is, it is free and does not bind consciences, just as he himself speaks of freedom in the same place. In spite of both St. Paul and all the angels, however, that they call nothing or free what God gives so strictly, as the enthusiasts pretend. For God's commandment is not to be regarded as useless or as nothing, as Moses says in the 5th book, but life is valid.

53 He especially says: "In the world the idol is nothing" [1 Cor. 8, 4], that is, external. For the idols before God are no joke, as there are the idols in the heart, false righteousness, glory of works, unbelief and what more sits in the heart, in Christ and his unbelief 3) instead. As if he should say: the Jews shun the outward idols in the world and are full of idols in the heart before God, as he also says of them Rom. 2, 22: "Thou dost abhor idols, lind take God his glory." With which words he finely interprets the first commandment, which says, "Before me thou shalt have no other gods" [Ex. 20:2]. As if to say, Idols before thee, or before the world, are nothing; but before me, that is, in the heart, that thou shouldest worship them, or trust in them, that shall not be.

54 Because St. Paul to the Corinthians now speaks all these three pieces freely and for nothing.

2) "to us" is missing in the Jena.

3) Shouldn't it perhaps read "faith"?

1) The title of this book is "Von dem Sabbat und gebotenen Feiertagen," which probably belongs to the beginning of the year 1524, because it was printed for the second time in Strasbourg in May 1524. Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 381. 393 ff.

The fact that I want to have idols, the idolatrous house and idolatrous food, which are all three highly forbidden in the first commandment and which follow from it, is clear and powerful enough proof that imagery in the first commandment is a temporal ceremony, abolished in the New Testament. For if I may eat and drink things sacrificed to idols with a good conscience, and sit and live in the house of idols, as St. Paul teaches, I Cor. 8:7, 8, I may also tolerate the idol and let it be, as it counts for nothing and hinders my conscience and faith.

55 This was not taught by St. Paul alone, but also in the Old Testament the prophet Elisäns, 2 Kings 5, 18. 19., proved this with an excellent example, who also under Moses and against Moses (as our red spirits want to understand Moses) allowed Naaman, the prince of Syria, to worship the right God in the temple of Rimmon, the idol of Syria. If the first commandment of Carlstadt was to be kept strictly, then 1) neither Naaman should have done this, nor the prophet should have allowed it, because it is forbidden to go into an idol's house and to worship before an idol, even if he worships the right God. Since God so severely forbids the Jews, they are not to build an altar, an image or a place for His own service and worship without His command; He forbids much more severely that one serves and worships Him before other idols. From this it can be seen that even in the Old Testament the right idols do not harm, if one worships before them outwardly, if only the right God is worshipped with the heart; and our enthusiasts want to bind and catch us free Christians so hard that we should not tolerate any idol without sin.

56 If the iconoclasts do not want to show us mercy, we pray that they will be merciful to our Lord Jesus Christ and not spit at him and say to him, as they do to us, "Fie on you, you servant of idols. For the three evangelists Matthew, Marcus, and Lucas write that he took the coin from the Pharisees when the image of Caesar was in his hand.

and asked what the image was and told to give it to Caesar [Matth. 22, 19. 20. 21. Marc. 12, 15. 16. 17. Luc. 20, 22. 23. 24. 25.]. If all kinds of images were forbidden, the Jews should not have given him any, nor should they have brought any 3), much less should Christ have attacked it and left it unpunished, especially because it was the image of a Gentile. He must have sinned when he told Peter to take such an interest penny out of the fish's mouth and give it to him for his own use. There he must have created and made the same image himself on the penny and with the penny in the mouth of the fish. I also consider that the gold of the three kings, offered to Christ [Matth. 2, 11], was coined with images, according to all the customs of the country. Likewise also the two hundred pennies, Joh. 6, 7. when the disciples wanted to buy bread for themselves, even the money of all fathers and saints when they traded with it.

Now we do not desire anything more than to have a crucifix or an image of a saint to look at, to bear witness to, to remember, to sign, as the image of the same emperor was; should it not be as much without sin for us to have a crucifix or an image of Mary as it was for the Jews and Christ Himself to have the image of the pagan and dead emperor, the devil's member. Devil's member, image to have? Yes, the emperor had his image painted in his honor. But we seek neither to have nor to do honor in it, and yet we shall be so highly damned, since Christ remains undamned above such an abomination and shameful image.

(58) Do you want to speak here: You will not say that the first commandment is abolished, one must have a God? Item, one must not commit adultery, murder, steal? 2c. Answer: I have spoken of Mosiah's law as Mosiah's laws. For having a God is not Mosaic law alone, but also a natural law, as St. Paul says in Romans 1:20: that the Gentiles know of the Godhead that there is one God. This is also proven by the fact that they have raised up gods, and have

1) "so" is missing in the Jena.
2) Erlanger: for.

3) So the old editions. Erlanger: "gebraucht" which is perhaps the right reading.

This would have been impossible if they had not known or remembered anything about God, but God revealed it to them through works, Romans 1:19. Now that the Gentiles lacked the right God and worshipped idols in God's place, what wonder is there? The Jews also lacked and worshipped idols in the place of God, even though they had the Law of Moses; and still lack the Lord Christ, who have the Gospel of Christ.

59 Therefore this is not only the law of Moses: Thou shalt not murder, commit adultery, steal 2c., but also the natural law written in everyone's heart, as St. Paul teaches Rom. 2, 1. Also Christ Matth. 7, 12. himself includes all prophets and laws in this natural law: "What you want people to do to you, you also do to them; for this is the law and the prophets." So does St. Paul Rom. 13:9, when he includes all the commandments of Moses in love, which also naturally teaches the natural law: "Love thy neighbor as thyself." Otherwise, if it were not naturally written in the heart, one would have to teach and preach the law for a long time before the conscience would accept it; it must also find and feel it in itself, otherwise no one would make a conscience. Although the devil so blinds and possesses the hearts that they do not always feel such laws. Therefore, they must be written and preached, until God cooperates and enlightens them, so that they feel it in their hearts, as it is written in the Word.

(60) Now where the law of Moses and the natural law are one thing, the law remains and is not abolished externally, but spiritually through faith, which is nothing else than fulfilling the law, Rom. 3:28, which is not to be spoken of now, and has been spoken of enough elsewhere. Therefore, imagery and the Sabbath, and everything that Moses set above and beyond the natural law, because it does not have natural law, are free, separate and apart, and are given to the Jewish people alone. It is no different than when an emperor or king makes special laws and ordinances in his country.

The Jews have made a law, like the Saxon mirror in Saxony, and yet the common natural laws go through all countries and remain, such as honor parents, do not murder, do not commit adultery, serve God 2c. Therefore, let Moses be the Saxon seal of the Jews, and let us Gentiles not swear by it. Just as France does not respect the Sachsenspiegel, and yet in the natural law agrees well with him 2c.

(61) Why then is the Ten Commandments taught and kept? Answer: Because the natural laws are nowhere so finely and properly written as in Moses. 2) And I would that some more in worldly matters were taken from Moses, as the law of divorcement, of the year of jubilee, and of the year of manumission, of tithes, and the like, by which laws the world would be governed much better than now with the interest of selling and freeing. 3) As when one country takes examples from another country's laws, as the Romans took the twelve tables from the Greeks.

It is not necessary to celebrate the Sabbath or Sunday, nor is it necessary for the sake of Moses' commandment, but that nature also gives and teaches that it is sometimes necessary to rest for a day, so that man and cattle may rest; which natural cause Moses also sets in his Sabbath, so that he sets the Sabbath among men, as also Christ does Matth. 12, 1. ff. and Marc. 3:2 ff. among men. For if it is to be kept for the sake of rest alone, it is clear that whoever does not need rest may break the Sabbath and rest on another day for it, as nature allows; it is also to be kept for the sake of preaching and hearing God's word.

In addition to this, there are many better things in Moses, namely the prophecies and promises of Christ's future, as St. Paul says in Romans 3:21. There are also the creation of the world, where marriage came from, and many great examples of faith, love and all virtue. Again, examples

2) This sentence is missing in the Jenaer.

3) We have taken away the comma, which in the old editions is after "interest", because we are of the opinion that Luther is speaking here of the purchase of interest and of the freedom (of spiritual goods) from interest. "Free" in the meaning of "to make free" also occurs elsewhere in Luther.

1) Thus the Erlanger. Wittenberger,,: services to the gods; Jenaer: services to idols.

of unbelief and iniquity, from which one learns to know God's grace and wrath; all of which are written, not for the sake of the Jews alone, but for the sake of all Gentiles. For there are also many things written about unbelievers and Gentiles, so that all these things serve as an example and a lesson for all the world. But the law of Moses concerns only the Jews, without whom the Gentiles have willingly given themselves up and accepted, who are called fellow Jews. St. Paul says in Romans 9:4 that the law is given to the Jews, the testament, the promise; and Psalm 147:19 ff: "He declares his judgments to Jacob and his laws to Israel. He does not do this to any nation, nor does he declare his judgments to them" 2c.

I have also seen and heard the iconoclasts read from my Germanized Bible. So I also know that they have the same, read from it, as one can well sense from the words that they lead. Now there are many pictures in the same books, both of God, angels, men and animals, especially in the Revelation of John and in Moses and Joshua. So we kindly ask them to allow us to do what they themselves do, that we may also paint such pictures on the walls for the sake of memory and better understanding. Since they do as little harm on the walls as in the books. It is better to paint on the wall how God created the world, how Noah built the ark, and what more good histories are, than to paint any other worldly impudent thing: yes, if God would, I could persuade the lords and the rich to have the whole Bible painted inside and out on the houses before everyone's eyes, that would be a Christian work.

I know for certain that God wants us to hear and read His works, especially the passion of Christ. But if I should hear or remember it, it is impossible for me not to make images of it in my heart. For I will or will not, when I hear Christ, an image of a man hanging on the cross is formed in my heart, just as my face is naturally formed in the water when I look into it. Now it is not sin but good that I have Christ's image in my heart; why should it be sin to have Christ's image in my heart?

when I have it in my eyes? Since the heart is more 1) valid than the eyes, and should be less stained with sins than the eyes, as this is the right seat and dwelling place of God.

But I must stop, I should otherwise give cause to the iconoclasts, that they never read the Bible or burn it, and then also tear their own hearts out of their bodies, because they are so hostile to the images. I have only indicated this so that one can see what reason does when it wants to be wise and become a master in God's words and 2) works, and what the fame has behind it that D. Carlstadt boasts so highly that he has God's word, and for the sake of God's word he must suffer much. Yes, the devil must also suffer much for the sake of God's word: not that he keeps it right, but that he perverts it and strengthens his wickedness and lies with it, as D. 3) Carlstadt also does out of the same challenge.

And if I had time, I would atone for my lust for Satan and, before all the world, thrust the sayings that he takes from the Scriptures into Carlstadt's booklet and uses to help himself, back down his throat, so that he would be ashamed. For I have seized him finely, that I see God's miracle, how he can lead the devil in the fool's rope. But I have other things to do, and whoever does not want to be instructed by this reason, let him go and storm for the rest of his life; I am excused.

In the end, I must give an example of this matter, whether D. Carlstadt wanted to recognize himself a little and be ashamed that he teaches his disciples so finely. Since I was at Orlamünde and dealt with the images with the good people, and I all the sayings from Moses, so were brought forward, showed from the text that he

1) Thus the old edition of Walch and the Erlangen. Wittenberg and Jena: not" instead of "more".

2) Thus the old edition of Walch and the Erlanger. In the Wittenberg and Jena editions, "words and" is missing.

3) Here we have a proof (we have already expressed this as a conjecture several times) that the old edition of Walch also had an influence on the text design of the Erlangen edition. In the old editions, "D." is used throughout for "Doctor". Walch has sometimes "D.", sometimes "Dort.", sometimes (as here) "Doctor". The Erlangen edition has reprinted this exactly each time.

When I was talking about idols that are worshipped, one came forward who wanted to be the smartest in front of everyone and said to me: "Do you hear? I may call you You, if you are a Christian. I said, "Call me whatever you want; he would have preferred to beat me, too; he was so full of Carlstadt's spirit that the others could not keep him quiet. And he went on, and said, If then thou wilt not follow Moses, yet thou must suffer the gospel; thou hast thrust the gospel under the bench; no, no, it must come forth, not remain under the bench.

69 I said, "What does the gospel say? He said: Jesus since the Gospel, who 1) does not know where it is written, my brothers know it well, that the brood must nakedly remove the skin, it must be closed by the brood. So the images must all be broken off, so that we can be rid of the creatures and become pure. *Haec ille.*

What should I do? I had come among Carlstadt's disciples; I learned then that breaking pictures meant taking off the bride's shirt naked, and should stand in the gospel. Such words, and of the Gospel under the bench, he had heard from his master, that perhaps Carlstadt blamed me, I put the Gospel under the bench, and he was the man who pulled it out. Such vain honor brings the man into all misfortune, and has pushed him out of the light into such darkness that he lays such ground for storming images that the bride takes off her shirt; just as if they were thus rid of the creatures in the heart, that they break the images with raving. But how would it be if the bride and groom were so modest and kept their shirts and skirts on? Of course, it should not almost hinder them, if they would otherwise have pleasure together.

But that's how it goes when you bring the disorderly rabble into the game, so that they forget civic discipline and manners before the great abundance of the spirit, and no longer fear or honor anyone but themselves alone; D. Carlstadt is in the mood for that. These are all fine precursors to mobs and rebellion, that one fears neither violence nor authority. That is enough said about the pictures, and [I] mean,

It is proven strongly enough how D. Carlstadt does not understand Moses at all and sells his dreams under God's word, and respects orderly authorities less than the disorderly rabble. Whether this is conducive to obedience or rebellion, I will let everyone see for himself.

On the complaint of D. Carlstadt that he has been expelled from the land of Saxony. 2)

So far we have seen what D. Carlstadt has for a word of God, for which he exalts himself and makes himself a holy martyr. Now let us see the work of God for which he suffers and praises such great persecution. Although I would rather he had kept silent and not imposed such distress on me to stir his unwillingness. But because he attacks the princes of Saxony in such a way that he cannot leave even the rhyme they wear on their sleeves with all honors unsmirched, so precisely does the bitter resentment in his heart seek cause to disgrace people, I must, as much as I know of it, answer for M. G. Herren's honor. G. Herren's honor. For the princes of Saxony certainly deserve better for D. Carlstadt than that he should leave such thanks behind, as he well knows. Well then, let's go, it will be found.

First of all, I may well say that I have done nothing of Carlstadt with the Elector of Saxony, indeed, I have never spoken a word with the same prince all my life, nor have I ever heard him speak, nor have I ever seen his face, except once at Worms before the Emperor, when I was interrogated for the second time. It is true that I have often written through M. Spalatinum and urged, especially that the Alstavian spirit should be resisted. But I did nothing, so that I was also highly annoyed with the Elector, until the same spirit fled from him, undisputed. For this reason, Carlstadt should have been

2) In the two farewell letters, which Carlstadt addressed to the men and to the women at his departure from Orlamünde, he signed himself: "Andreas Bodenstein, Unverhört und unüberwunden, vertrieben durch Martinum Lutherum. (Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 447.) These letters are probably meant by the "Schmachbüchlein" in the following § 73; in § 86 it is spoken of as a "Schmachbrief".

1) d. i. white.

1) Prince, and to know the matter very well before he thus shouted him out into the world with a book of shame. Nor is it right, much less Christian, if it were true [that he was chased out by the C.F. 2)], to take revenge in such a way with blasphemy writing. One should first have humbly asked the cause and presented the right, and then kept silent and suffered. It would be too much for me, who should be and unfortunately am vain flesh. But the high spirit of Carlstadt cannot do wrong nor err, he is the right itself.

I have talked about it with my gracious young lord Duke Johann Friedrich (I confess that) and denounced Carlstadt's sacrilege and thirst. But because the spirit burns so bright and white, I will tell here the reasons, which even some of today's princes of Saxony do not realize, why it is dear to me that D. Carlstadt is out of the country, and as much as I am able to ask, he should not come back in, nor should he have to come out, where he would be in (he would then become another, God helping him). I will, if God wills, not hypocritical to any prince, but I will suffer much less that mobs and disobedience, to the contempt of worldly authorities, should be brought to justice.

75 And this is first my humble admonition and request to all princes, lords and authorities, as I have also written before against the Alstavian spirit, that they seriously threaten to forbid the country to preachers who do not teach in silence, but draw the mob to themselves, and behind the back of the authorities with their own fists and iniquities storm images or break churches, or to deal with them in such a way that they have to leave it. I do not want to have resisted the word of God with this, but rather to set a measure and goal for the sacrilegious zealots and Gothic spirits of their will to courage, which the secular authorities are entitled to do. Most of all, however, D. Carlstadt with his gang, as the obdurate one, does not want to

and still justifies and defends his redness in addition.

76) And the 3) is my reason and cause: We have heard above how D. Carlstadt and similar iconoclasts do not interpret Mosiah's commandment to the proper authorities, as it is due, but to the disorderly rabble. That is certainly not a right good spirit. For, as I have said, where the mob is to have power and right to execute a commandment of God in this way, they must be given room for it and allowed to execute all the commandments; so they must then kill murderers, punish adulterers, thieves, husks, each one who comes to it first, so that court, judgment, power and all authority may go down with it. And if, as they say, you leave a hand's breadth to a rogue, he will take a cubit's length. For why do the overlords sit there? why do they carry the sword, if the mob is to plump up and execute itself?

After this it shall be broken down, and they shall slay all the wicked. For so Moses commanded in Deut. 7, when he commanded the images to be broken, that they also should slay the people without all mercy, which had such images in the land of Canaan. For this killing is commanded as hard as the breaking of images, which commandment these evil spirits are so stubborn as to insist upon. But Moses commanded this to the people, who had Joshua as their ruler and much authority, and were an orderly people; not over all the wicked, but only over the heathen of Canaan, who had been handed over to death by God's judgment for the wicked, as the text clearly shows. For he took out the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, who were also ungodly. So this work of God was done by a proper authority of the people, and over those whom not men but God Himself publicly condemned and commanded to be put to death. 4)

78) But our murderous spirits, because they apply Mosiah's commandment to the mob, do not have God's judgment on the ungodly, but judge for themselves that the ungodly are ungodly, and

3) Walch and the Erlanger: this is.

4) Erlanger: had.

5) In the Wittenberg and Jena editions: "die". In the old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: "they". Did this come from the original print or from Walch into the Erlanger?

1) Thus the old edition of Walch and the Erlangen. Wittenberg and Jena: solchem.

2) The bracketed words are missing in the Wittenberg and Jena editions, but are found in Walch's old edition and in the Erlanger. Did they come from the original print or from Walch into the Erlanger?

worthy of death, so images have, they are urged by such That is why God wanted to have authority, so that things commandments to riot, to murder and kill, as to the work, would be 5) orderly in the world.

which God has commanded them. Take an example of 80 If it were true and I had to believe that D. Carlstadt the Alstavian spirit, which had already gotten to the did not have murder or rebellion in mind, I would have to people from the images, and publicly pretended sedition say that he has a rebellious and murderous spirit like the and murder against all authority. How could he do one in Alstât. Carlstadt does not have murder or sedition otherwise? He had to teach. For since he had asked the in mind, I must say that he has a seditious and murderous devil so far to be his godfather that the mob should storm spirit, like the one at Alstât, as long as he remains on the the images without proper force, as commanded by God, sacrilegious iconostasis 6) and draws the disorderly mob he had to go on and do the secondary commandment that to himself. I can see that he neither cuts nor stabs, but was attached to it, too, and murder the people by name. because he carries the murder knife and does not take it And if I were in the mind to storm images like them, I off, I do not trust him, he would lurk in time and place, would also have to go and murder the people, because and then do what I fear. But I mean the murder-knife, the the commandment is there and it pushes. Dear sirs, the false sense and understanding of the law of Moses, devil does not mean iconoclasm; he only wants to break which comes from the devil, by which the mob is aroused, a hole by causing bloodshed and murder in the world. becomes insolent and proud.

Yes, you say, D. Carlstadt does not want to murder, 81 But sayest thou, He will not be so stiffnecked; he that is evident from 1) your letter, which the Orlamündians will tell him, and cease from such doings? Who? D. wrote to the Alstâtians. Answer: I believed it too! the belief Carlstadt? Yes, he can say the words finely, and blow is over. I no longer ask what Carlstadt says or does; he is them out with writings, he will let himself be instructed, not missing the truth for the first time. I say of the spirit and will obey a better. If he is serious, then I am golden. that they have, that drives them, that it is not good and When has he ever yielded or obeyed anyone? How often has murder and rebellion in its spirit, even though it did D[ominus] Philipps 7) admonish him at Wittenberg stoops 2) and bends down, because it sees that it has no that he should not rave so with Moses, with the images, room, as I will prove hereafter. For (since God is for), if D. with the mass and confession! And when I came again Carlstadt would gain a large mob, as he intended to arm and preached against his iconoclasm and mass, why did himself at the Saale, and now the Biblia is read almost in he not desist and obey? Item, since D. Justus Jonas and German 3), and Mr. Omnes would begin 4) to hold this Mr. 8) Ditterich of Bila were acting between us, how finely commandment (to murder the wicked) in front of his nose, did he back away and let him be told? That he also invited where would he go? How was he going to resist? Even if me to the last judgment over the raving mass, which he he had never been willing to do so, he would have to had caused at that time (help God!) as if with a great Holy leave; they would revolt and cry out so harshly: God's Spirit, which he himself now condemns and changes.

word, God's word, God's word stands there, we must take 82) Item, at Jena in the inn, when we were talking it, so hard he now cries out against the images: God's about the matter, and he promised to defend his case in word, God's word. Dear, it is not to joke with Mr. Omnes: the strongest possible way, 9)

1) Walch and the Erlangeners: from.

2) deceives - ducks.

3) Erlanger: German almost.

4) In the old editions: "he Omnes begonte."

5) "it" is missing in the Erlanger.

6) In the old editions: "frevel Bildstürmen". In Walch and in the Erlanger: „Frevel Bildstürmen."

7) In the Wittenberg edition: "D. Philippus Melanchthons."

8) In the old editions: He.

9) In the old editions: wand. We are of the opinion that here it is said of Carlstadt's unsteady speech: "he wandt das Maul," but not of the throwing up or pulling of the mouth, which is expressed in the next paragraph: "he rüsselte das Maul." Therefore, "wand" is to be derived from "to turn," not from "to wriggle."

He opened his mouth and smote me with a clippine, saying, "I care nothing for you. If he respects me not, whom will he respect among us? Or what shall I then much reprove? I think he considers me to be one of the most learned men in Wittenberg, and yet he himself says under my nose, "There is nothing the matter with me," and pretends to want to be instructed.

Item, he writes freely in the countries now and then, and judges poor Wittenberg as nothing against him. And now, once again, we must be called papists and cousins of the end Christ. Item at Orlamünde, when Magister Wolfgangus Stein, princely preacher, asked D. Carlstadt in the most gentle and cleanest way that he should leave, he shut his mouth and gave him such an answer as if he were a prince in the country, and Magister Wolfgang was there as a princely envoy, whom he should have obeyed if he had commanded at once. But this is how one should honor the authorities; yes, if it were the rabble. There are many more of the pieces of his articulated mind.

I am telling you this 1) so that I can prove how vain false words are, that D. Carlstadt has taken it upon himself to learn, so that he only makes glimpses and good appearances to his obdurate mind, and disgraces both princes and me. Nor is it fine to preach and teach in divine matters and then first want to ask whether it is right. Either the teaching is wrong or the questioning is hypocrisy. But let him be in earnest, and let him desist from his raving. I have ever so cut out the imagery above that he may take hold of it as he pleases; let him still say, and let the heavenly prophets do it, that everything should be bad and forgotten, and I will do and leave with him everything I can; I want to have him as a friend, he wants; if he does not want it, then I must let God rule.

It is also of this nature that he offered to speak and they did not want to admit him. Dear God, how can a man speak so publicly against his conscience? If he should be denied disputes by me or by someone else, then both princes and

1) Thus the Jena. Wittenberg and Erlangen: these.

University have not been able to do so much with so much writing and demanding that he would come to Wittenberg and wait for his sermon, lection and disputation, as he was obliged and obligated to do? And add to this: where he would certainly be escorted. Just as if he were uncertain at Wittenberg, since his status and nature were such, and since they liked to have him; who would want to do [something] to him? It is all vain words to adorn oneself; unless his conscience had feared, as the wicked are wont to fear, since there is no fear that he had fallen for and encroached upon the sovereign's property and right at Orlamünde; although that would also have had no need.

If I were a prince, and a doctor? If I were a prince and a doctor were obliged to read and preach for my pay in my city or country, and he turned elsewhere without my knowledge and will, and encroached on my right and property with sacrilege, but I demanded that he do his duty through me and my university, but he would do what he pleased on my pay and property, But he would do what he pleased on my pay and on my property, and then write a letter to me and ask to be escorted to my city to dispute, since I had demanded it beforehand, and he was guilty, what should I answer, because he thought I was a fool? And if I did not answer, and he then sent out a letter of disgrace against me, as if I had not wanted to let him speak or interrogate him, what would I think? I would secretly think: There is a knave in the skin. Not that I am scolding D. Carlstadt as a knave, but that I am indicating what might occur to a sovereign in such a case as a human being.

But the man lacked nothing 2) except that he had princes who were too soft; princes should have been found, if he would have brought such pieces into their country with such sacrilege and thirst, which would have made his head jump over a cold blade together with his pack, and would perhaps hardly be right. That is why I wanted to advise D. Carlstadten to leave the princes unscathed and thank them that they have so graciously let him come from them, so that they will not finally be punished.

2) So the old edition of Walch and the Erlangen. Wittenberg and Jena: "hats nothing."

would be forced to act more sharply with him, according If a prince were to go out into the world and find such to his merit. people in his country, he should be the first to shun them

This is also the reason, not a small one, that he drags and put them to death, and he should sternly forbid them himself along with the heavenly prophets, to whom the to desist from such prophecies, or he would have to write Alstavian spirit has come, 1) as is known; from them he against them, as I have done against the Alstavian spirit. learns, to them he adheres, who creep secretly in the For since they are prepared and directed to strangle and country and crawl together at the river, where they murder, they can come from nowhere else but from the thought to nest. The impotent devil wants to go nowhere devil himself, even if they knew all art and writing. For but to our places, where we have previously made room the devil knows the Bible and the Scriptures as well as and safety through the gospel, and only wants to defile other arts.

and spoil our nest, like the cuckoo, playing with the (91) Is it not a plague that now and then the rabble warbler. The same prophets pretend that they talk with has become so proud and restless through such spirits, God, and God with them, and that they are called to before the princes have become aware of it, that as soon preach, and yet none of them is allowed to stand out and as they hear a preacher who teaches them to be quiet appear, but rather throw around secretly, and pour their and obedient to the authorities, they call him a fox-tailer poison in D. Carlstadt; he then did it with tongue and pen; and a hypocrite and point fingers at him. But those who but since he could not do it in Wittenberg, he went to the say, "Beat to death, give nothing to no one, and be free Saale. 2)

Christians, you are the right people," are called the right

(89) These prophets teach and hold that they should evangelical preachers, who take off the shirt of the bride reform Christendom and establish a new one in this way: in Orlamünde and the pants of the bridegroom in They must slay all princes and ungodly men, that they Naschhusen, who do not put the gospel under the bench, may become lords on earth, and live among the holy ones and 3) for the time being never learn what Christ is, or on earth. I myself and many others have heard this from what they should know of him.

them. This knows D. Carlstadt also knows that they are Because a prince would find D. Carlstadt in such a swarmers and murderous spirits, and that such way that he would stick to the mobs and murderous misfortune has been unleashed by them. Which should spirits, thereby making his subjects proud and restless, be warning enough for him, and yet he does not avoid and he would also want to justify and defend himself, them, and I am to believe that he does not want to cause should it not be time that he would say to him: If you are sedition or murder? Also, when I confessed it to him in the Hare, 4) then roll yourself out of my country, before I Jena and defended it, I said: Why should he not keep it have to speak to you differently? For what good can be with them, as they said right? Why does he not also stand hoped, if such prophets stay in the country, if the seed with us or with the papists, in which we are right? Or is already proves to be so powerful? He must not claim there nothing right with us or with the papists? No, against here that he was not warned before, that he did not these prophets he cannot preach nor write; against us he know, that love was spared him. Who should be able to must preach, write and rave.

warn him, since they acted so secretly until they spread

90 If D. Carlstadt had such a spirit, yes, he would be the poison that no one could know what they were an honest man. doing? But are they not sufficiently and publicly

admonished by

3) Thus Walch and the Erlangeners. Wittenberg and Jena: "Ieren".

4) i.e., you are like this: a figure of speech that is found more frequently in Luther.

1) Compare Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1822, No. 125: "After these [Marcus von Zwickau and Nicolaus Storchs came the pupil of both, Münzer."

2) Orlamünde is located not far from where the Orla flows into the Saale.

did Scripture 1) stand against the Alstätter spirit? How finely did they allow themselves to be led astray? Item, have they not known that I have judged these prophets with their spirit as the 2) devil's spirit? What good has it done, if they are only more hardened, and with cunning secretly set themselves against me?

Yes, why have they themselves spared love and acted so diligently against us in their hole behind our backs, written against us in several countries, and in the pulpit have no one but the Wittenbergs beaten to the meat rack, and have never yet shown us our error? The Wittenberg has done it, the spirit wants to eat it, otherwise all things in the world are bad. And we do this under our prince's protection, yes, under our name and space. But watch out, you evil and angry spirits, it is written that Wittenberg has grown too big for you, and God may send you to swallow it and strangle you. We know Satan, and even if we overslept something as men, you will not lead it out; for he who neither sleeps nor slumbers, who guards and watches over us [Ps. 121, 4], we rely on.

94 Carlstadt has brought this trouble and misfortune, I think, because he did his thing without being called, and deliberately let his calling 3) go. For he entered Orlamünde as a wolf, therefore it was not possible that he should start something good. He was, by princely endowment and pension, appointed an archidiacon at Wittenberg, who was to preach God's word, read and debate, so God called him there, and he also committed himself; as he did for a time with benefit and honor, and was held dear and worthy, he cannot say otherwise, and had more support from the Elector than many others, until the prophets of murder came and made the man wild and restless, so that he had to find something better.

1) This probably refers to the "Letter to the Princes of Saxony on the Rebellious Spirit" (Walch, old edition, vol. XVI, 8), which was written at the end of July 1524 (not on August 21).

2) So the old edition of Walch and the Erlangen, Wittenberg and Jena: "den".

3) d. i. "his profession," which both the Jena and Wittenberg editions offer in the marginal gloss.

and special wanted to teach, because in the Bible God teaches.

95 Then he set out of his own wrongdoing and went to Orlamünde behind the knowledge and will of both the prince and the university, and drove out the priest there, who had been placed there by princely order and the university's right, and took the parish by his own power. How do you feel about this little piece? Does it serve for quiet obedience to the authorities, or for insolent sedition among the mob? The spirit is kicking out as I speak of, for the very same spirit that swallows such a little strap might well eat a whole leather, if it gained room. Whoever dares to let a sovereign look on, and to encroach upon his property, law and order in a thuggish and unlawful manner, what should he do behind a sovereign, where he would find room? That is to say, the authorities are feared and honored; so the mob should also be taught both by word and deed that the priest is like the people, as Isaiah says [Cap. 24:2].

If the devil bursts, he will not deny that the princes of Saxony sit in secular authority decreed by God; land and people are subject to them. What kind of spirit is this, then, that despises such divine order, proceeds with sacrilege and violence, does it with the prince's property and right as if it were his own, and does not even look at the prince for it, or greet him for it, as if he were a block, and he himself were prince in the land? Shouldn't a good spirit fear God's order a little bit more, and because the estate, the parish and the land of the prince is, first humbly take a leave of absence, recite the duty and ask for favor to sit there?

Now, however, D. Carlstadt leaves his duty at Wittenberg behind the prince's back, deprives the university of the sermon and lecture, and what he owes to do from the princely endowment, and nevertheless keeps the pay or pension for himself, and appoints no one else in his place, and there at Orlamünde also takes the university's parish, expels those whom he had not appointed, nor had the right to appoint, much less dismiss. Dear, why that? That is why some think that he is all the more

and relied on the fact that the Elector is too soft and does not punish easily. But I think, besides the cause is also this, that the prophets sought space and hole all there at the Saale to spread their spirit and poison, so that they could not creep the length so in Wittenberg and mousing in the darkness.

He cannot claim here that he could not have kept his heresy in Wittenberg, because, praise God, the gospel there is pure and fine. And if it were not so, he would not be forced to be godless. If we have to be under the devil in the world and among his members, we must not become devils nor devil's members. So Carlstadt was especially free from all things, that he should only act the word of God, and let the other priests do what they wanted. And even if there were vain devils in Wittenberg, he should still not leave behind the prince without leave and favor, and nevertheless keep his pension, and in another place brazenly take hold of his property.

He may also not say that he went to Orlamünde out of mercy to teach the misguided sheep. For the same parish was provided with a Christian pastor, namely M. Conradus, 2) through the university, who knew and taught the gospel well. And even if it had been so, he should still have asked the authorities for it. For one should do no wrong for the sake of God, Rom. 3, 8. It was only to be done so that the evil spirit would find room and place to let out its poison, as I said, so that we would become special masters and no one would be equal to us.

If he did not seek money or poison, but only God's glory, why did he not seek other cities, 3) since he would not have found such a pension, and since it would have been more necessary to preach God's word, and would have been closer? Yes, but it was not convenient for the spirit and the belly. But if such an outrage happened because of God's inner call, then it is

1) Wittenberg and Erlanger: or.

2) Magister Conrad Glück. Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 349.

3) d. i. selected.

No need that he proves it with miraculous signs, because God does not break his old order with a new one, he does great signs. Therefore, no one can be believed who appeals to his spirit and inner feelings, and rages against God's usual order by heart, because he performs miraculous signs, as Deut. 18:22 Moses indicates.

101 But since he pretends, together with the Orlamündians, that he was chosen by them to be a pastor, and thus outwardly called, I answer: I do not care that they will have chosen him afterwards 4). I am talking about the created entrance. He had letters that those at Orlamünde had demanded him from Wittenberg, and had not run there himself. Rather, if that meant that I ran out of my duty and obedience into a city, and then stood so finely and persuaded the people that they chose me and expelled others, then I say that no principality is so great that I wanted to become prince in it and drive the present ones out. How easily has a people been called? That does not mean to call; it means to drive out mobs and sedition and to despise authority.

Nor did the people of Orlando have the right to choose a priest on someone else's salary, because it was the prince's duty and his order. Thus, the prince is not unchristian, as well as the university, who overlords them with ungodly priests. And because he would have ordered [an] ungodly person there, when he has not done so, they should nevertheless not encroach on their sovereign's right, property and authority, and choose pastors behind his back, and give away pensions (which are not theirs) to whom they wanted; much more should he accept it, and leave the prince unsought, but, as is due to subjects, have humbly complained and petitioned the prince and university and asked for a Christian pastor. If he had not wanted to, they would have done their best 5).

But now they gather behind the prince, elect priests, and let themselves be made priests, as they themselves desire, and stand as if they gave a damn.

4) "werden" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

5) Erlanger: dacht.

their natural hereditary lord and sovereign, whose property and right they freely seize and take for themselves, that both Carlstadt and Orlamünde deserved a good strong distemper, 1) as an example to the other troops, that they knew how they had lords and were not themselves lords in the country. But I will have forbidden and excused the good people of Orlamünde, as they were too weak for the mad spirit of D. Carlstadt, and overpolled with his humble gestures and big words (as he is wont to do), so that they might not have seen how they were doing against their own lord. But D. Carlstadt, as he is possessed with the spirit of the mob, I will have answered with this, as it is well to be felt from this little piece that he does not rest, because he clings to the poor rabble and destroys worldly authority.

104 Above that, all this would have been given to him in honor of the Gospel, if only he had not stubbornly refused to defend it. For when the university wrote out of princely order and demanded that he go to Wittenberg for his duty and office: "Yes, my Carlstadt should come! Then he incited the poor people to write so proudly and impudently against the university that [it] was too much. The university had to be called papist, and I don't know how, and nothing was evangelical, without what D. Carlstadt talked and did with the Orlamunders. Now tell me a pious reader: Have the princes of Saxony not borne patience enough with the great mischievous spirit? Yes, unfortunately too much. If they had been more diligent in practicing their sword, the rabble on the Saale would probably be quieter and more restrained today, and the spirit would not have taken root.

Since there was still no end to the game, but only with the head purde purde through, both princes and university considered nothing, I came to the Saale by princely order, and preached against such enthusiasm as best I could. There the devil received me, as I had long since deserved. 2) How

He snorted, hurried and wriggled there, as if Christ were there who wanted to cast him out, so that D. Carlstadt also took me by surprise over the table with such a gentle heart and clean words that I immediately felt the spirit speaking out of him, until I finally indicated to my gracious young lord, Duke John Frederick, that such a thing was not to be suffered at his mercy; for the work was there, one wanted to leave nothing to the mobs and the authorities. So far I am aware of this matter and no further.

And what shall I say? What the spirit does is neither serious nor true, and they themselves do not believe what they say, nor do they keep what they say; only that the devil seeks only to cause misfortune in the world. For D. Carlstadt, when he was last in Wittenberg, he willingly agreed to resign from the parish, because he saw that it could not be otherwise, and vowed there that he wanted to be employed in Wittenberg. If he had been sure that he was called to be a pastor, he should not have handed it over and let it go before he died, as he had fought and resisted until then. For one should not let go of a divine calling, as they boast here that they have the same fellowship as God.

107. But that was the opinion: he let himself think that his poison was now spread enough, and the misery was now deeply and strongly enough rooted, and the rabble was now attached to him, as it is unfortunately all too true; [so] he probably thought to remain pastor, even if princes and university were sorry; and such a seeming surrender of the parish should not hurt, because the rabble was so spoiled that no one should have it good who would come after him, and finally the princes would be able to leave him there, as one has also let oneself be heard publicly. The spirit does not think that God could see or defend against such cruel and clever plots, and thus wants to have made his redoubt before one should realize it. Now we men easily provide the redoubt; but the spirit has truly provided it also, and God is invented wiser than he is.

I had to do this expansive speech, although reluctantly, because the ugly spirit wanted so much to make itself beautiful with

1) Erlanger: Stauche.

2) So the Jena. Wittenberg and Erlangen: have.

of the princes of Saxony, from whom he has honor and property. I also think that if he had not fled so despondently and hurriedly, 1) but had had a good conscience to demand the things from the princes at that time, these and others, which I perhaps do not know, would have been reported to him. Above all, I think that the land is the property of the princes of Saxony, and not of Carlstadt, in which he is a guest and has nothing. If they now take from no one what is his, and yet do not want to know one in their country for a secret reason, I think they would not be obligated to tell anyone what moves them, nor to come to terms with him. For princes must conceal many things and keep them secret. If a householder does not have the right and the power to undress a guest or a servant, he would have to tell causes beforehand and to stand the law with him, then he would be a poor captive householder in his own estate, and the guest would be a householder himself.

This spirit does not consider this, and goes on, and attacks the princes with public disgrace, as if he 2) were sitting with them in joint fiefdoms, and would also be lord in the land of Saxony, and defies them with the right in their own property. What else could one answer such an impudent and thirsty head, but, as the father of the house says in the Gospel: "Friend, I do you no wrong; take what is yours and lift yourself up. Shall I not do in my goods what I would?" [Matth. 20, 13-15.] This mischievous rogue also wanted to know the cause and the right why the master of the house did with his goods according to his will. O fine spirit, how can you not know what you have in mind? You want to be master, and what you pretend and do should be called right. That is the sum of it.

What do you think now? Isn't it a fine new spiritual humility? Wear a gray skirt and felt hat, don't want to be called doctor, but rather brother Andres and dear neighbor, like another peasant, be subject to the judge at Orlamünde and obey like a bad citizen, and thus, with your own hea-

1) Thus the Wittenberg and the Jena. Erlanger: "flown"; from the original print or Walch's old edition?

2) Erlanger: sitting. - assembled - gesamt.

Do the special Christians want to be seen and praised for their chosen humility and submission, which God does not command, as if a Christian being were standing in such an outward jiggery-pokery, and yet striving and driving against the duty, honor, obedience, power and right of the sovereigns and secular authorities, which God has commanded? This is the high new art of God from the heavenly voice, which we in Wittenberg, who teach faith and love, cannot understand and know. This is the beautiful disenchantment, study, wonderment, boredom, and the same devil's alfenzerei.

From the fair.

With this, D. Carlstadt's books are responsible for one or three. Now let us take this from the mass before us, so that we come properly to the sacrament. For I do not know what he means by making so many books, even of the same thing, and might well bring them to one sheet, since he spoils ten; perhaps he likes to hear himself speak as much as the stork hears his rattle. For otherwise there is neither light nor form in his writing, and one would as soon break a path through hedges and bushes as read through his books. But it is a sign of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit can speak brightly, neatly and clearly; Satan mumbles and chews the words in his mouth, and throws the hundred into the thousand, so that it takes effort before one hears what he means.

112. D. Carlstadt had seen that we in Wittenberg had acted against the mass as a sacrifice and good work, both with writings and deeds in great earnest, admittedly the very first, and perhaps worried that we would gain honor from it, and thus sin in 3) the vain doctrine, and thought to advise us thus: How do I do that I make the Wittenbergers cry out that all their writings and deeds about the mass are not valid and are slandered, that they consider the mass a sacrifice and a good work, and that I alone am the hero who has brought this into the world, that the mass is not a sacrifice? I will do this: I will not respect what they say.

3) Thus the Jena. The remaining issues: an.

I will rebuke them for calling it a mass, which is called a sacrifice, and for taking away the sacrament, 1) as if they were offering it, so I can say afterwards that the Wittenbergers are all far wrong, and the poor bishop of Zwickau 2) with them.

Well, then, we must again be grateful to the blessing and ensure that the vain doctrine does not deceive even the rich country runner and the unappointed preacher Carlstadt, and give an answer from the name of the mass and the lifting up of the sacrament, that more shame than honor comes from it: not that it is necessary to answer for such bad childish and foolish work, but that one sees how no good spark of right understanding remains in D. Carlstadt. Carlstadt, so that everyone knows to beware of the mad spirit and not to trust his splendid words, since there is nothing behind them but vain false murderous tricks to confuse the conscience with all unnecessary jugglery.

First, that he reproaches us for the name, that 3) we call the sacrament a mass, and puts it upon us that we are Christ's executioners, murderers, and of more abominable words, and even worse than the Papists, because mass is called a sacrifice in Hebrew, and it shall not help us that we have argued and fought with such earnestness and driving that the mass is not a sacrifice. Now it is also a shameful, childish, womanish thing in the eyes of the world, if one is otherwise one in the matter, and yet quarrels over the words; which Paul reproves, and calls it xxxxxxxxxx, word warfare. and quarrelsome 2c. [1 Tim. 6, 4. 2 Tim. 2, 14.] But it is the devil, as I have said, who through Carlstadt's head would gladly load sin and abominable driving on the consciences in the things that are 4) free and without sin. Therefore he has no rest, because he corrupts good consciences and deadly souls, which nevertheless live, as Ezekiel says [Ezek. 13, 19].

115 To the other, if it were equally true,

1) namely in the elevation.

2) Nicolaus Hausmann.

3) Erlanger: da.

4) Erlanger: yes.

that mass would be called a sacrifice, and would be a good vein to D. Carlstadt, he should have warned and admonished us before publicly exposing us to such great vices before all the world. For it was ever to be hoped, because we deny and fight with the fact that the mass is not a sacrifice, we would also like to leave the name where we would be reported that we should make it a sacrifice. Where is the 5) brotherly love left in the high spirit? Is it not a sin among these saints to blaspheme their neighbor so highly and shamefully without any cause? But there you see how D. Carlstadt is afflicted with blindness, who neither respects nor recognizes such quite great sin, and wants to burden all the world with false, fictitious, great sins. That means, I think, to have the beam in one's eyes and to want to pull out the splinter from another [Matth. 7, 5. Luc. 6, 42].

I have never known, nor do I know yet, that Missa is called a sacrifice, and D. Carlstadt should forgive me that, although I do not know much Hebrew, I know more about it to saw and to judge than he does, have now also almost translated the entire Bible, and have not yet found that Missa is called a sacrifice, so that I think he must have found it written somewhere in the smoke hole, or have recently invented his own Hebrew language, as he can invent sin and laws and evil consciences, or perhaps the heavenly voice speaks so. It would be good, if one did not understand a language, to let himself be unacquainted for it, and to give honor to those who can, so that one might not say, "Behold, what a presumptuous ass this is! And especially if one wants to establish articles of faith, as Carlstadt does here, and therefore rages: "I dreamed that Missa in Hebrew means a sacrifice, therefore the Wittenbergers hash, execute, murder, scourge, crucify Christ, and are worse than Caiaphas, Judas, Herod, because they call it Mass. Drive along nicely, drive along nicely, 6) dear Rottengeist; if it were a carnival play, the farce would probably go.

In my Hebrew language, I find that Ma's hot interest or lap, which is given annually to the authorities, as Gen. 49, 15:

5) Wittenberg and Erlangen: hie.

6) In the old editions: already.

"Issachar became interest-bearing." And in the Kings books it is often written, how land and people became interest-bearing to the children of Israel; therefore Moses once, 5 Mos. 16, 10. calls Missa not the sacrifice, as D. Carlstadt dreams, but the first fruits, which sitz should bring to the priests on the day of Pentecost willingly, as a yearly interest, and there before the Lord by offering confess and thank that they had such fruits and land from the Lord, as he teaches them very fine 5 Mos. 26, 10. 13., just as also every interest man confesses by his interest that he has such money or property from the feudal lord. But sacrifice is not interest, nor was it commanded like interest. So one also had to slaughter and burn the sacrifice, so that missa and sacrifice rhyme together like fist and eye; although I had to translate it from necessity 5 Mos. 16, 10: voluntary sacrifice. But these spirits, who have the heavenly voice alone, pay no attention to my interpretation.

118. Thus the apostles and first Christians, when the Hebrew language was still common among them, called the bread and wine that they brought together for the sacrament, Missa Hebrew, in the Jewish way, after which one part was blessed for the sacrament and the other was distributed among the servants of the common and poor, which afterwards for a long time they also called Collecten from the same gathering, as the Historia Tripartita testifies, of which the word Collecta still remains in the Papist Mass, that Collecta and Missa are one thing, until the abomination came and made the sacrifice out of it. Therefore, the word Missa does not refer to the blessed Sacrament, which is performed between God and men, but only to the bread and wine, which is performed and brewed between people, not to give and sacrifice anything to God, but to divide among men.

119) Where are you now, dear spirit of the rotten and sin-mongers, with your Hebrew language? Tell me, why should I not call the Christian ministry a Collecta or Missa, as the apostles and first Christians did? Yes, say, where do you get the lies, that you blame us, we call the blessed bread and wine a mass, when mass equals

is called a sacrifice? The whole office is called a mass, and it is said: Under the mass, or in the mass, one blesses the bread and wine; item, in the mass one takes the sacrament. Who has ever heard say: I want to receive the mass, or have received the mass, when he receives the sacrament? I do not know if I have ever written or spoken it. But be it as it may, I know for certain that we in Wittenberg do not teach or say this way, although it would be without a doubt that the sacrament is or is called a mass, that this lying spirit certainly invents this on us, just as he calls Missa a sacrifice from his own dream, to prove his will to be brave.

120) But what if the apostles had called the sacrament itself Missa? I think they would have defended it before the 1) spirit of the mob, saying: "Just as the Jews had to bring their missa, that is, their firstfruits, to the priests, so that they would not give anything to God, but rather confess it and thank God that they and the whole country had this from His grace: This is what we do with the Sacrament or our Missa, and we keep it only for this reason, not to give or sacrifice anything to God, but to confess and give thanks to God, who has given us these things together with all the goods of the Kingdom of Heaven, just as Christ's words say: We should do it in remembrance of Him [1 Cor. 11:24, 25]. Hereby, I think, they would have finely shut the mouth of the spirit and led it to school, so that it would learn the Hebrew language and Moses in English, before it blasphemed and condemned that which it neither knows nor understands.

(121) I say this as if it were a matter of dispute that missa is a Hebrew word, on which I do not rely at all, for whether it is Hebrew or not, there is nothing to it; although it is almost similar to Hebrew. But what one wants to make an article of faith and rule the consciences with it, one must know much more certainly, because one knows that Missa is Hebrew, of which there is nothing in the Scriptures, without that everything must be a certain article of faith to this reckless red spirit, which only occurs to him or seems to him, and then quickly to 2) on

1) Erlanger: to apply for.

2) "to" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

the poor consciences, stormed and raged, made sin, since there is none, as all his teaching and spirit kind is. If he were a good spirit, he should first be sure of the matter and prove that Missa is Hebrew before he interprets it Hebrew; then also prove that it is called sacrifice; finally also prove that one should not call it Missa. He does none of these, only drools his own slobber; and we are to take all this for articles of faith.

But that 1) I paint the devil very well and prove how he does not lie like this from any cause, but all his actions are a 2) thing, if I equate that Missa is called a sacrifice, and we call not the office, but the sacrament a sacrifice (which does not happen, but the spirit of the mob denies both), then what would he be? Should we therefore be Christ's executioners and murderers, as the spirit of the mob spouts? Or should it follow that we consider the Sacrament a sacrifice? For if he himself confesses that we do not consider it to be a sacrifice, how can he lie so blatantly and say: we consider it to be a sacrifice at the same time? We cannot at the same time believe and confess two different repulsive things in one heart.

(123) Yes, I want to say further, because we publicly confess with heart, tongues, feathers and work that it is not a sacrifice, and besides, out of ignorance call it a mass, as if they did not know that mass means a sacrifice: should God no longer judge us according to the heart and all other signs, because He Himself says that He sees and judges according to the heart, not according to the appearance, Is. 11:3. 11, 3, because that he should condemn us for the sake of the appearance and name, as this devil does through D. Carlstadt, who blasphemes us so shamefully according to the outward appearance of an unconscious name, and will neither judge nor see according to the heart and all the fruits of it, which we prove by deed?

How many times does a mother call her daughter a little hurdle, both from anger and from love? How often does a father call a son: Jack,

you rogue, or if she were called the daughter Putana, and did not know that Putana was called a whore, but meant a virgin by it! If here D. Carlstadt's spirit listened, he should rebuke the mouth and drive out: O the mother and the father are of the. They murder, execute, strangle, break the noble virtue of virginity in their own child, they are as evil as no whore-keeper or murderer. For although they profess with the heart and other signs that the daughter is a pious virgin, but because they call her a little whore or putana by name, they do just as much as a whoremonger who keeps her to fornication. Dear, what would the mother say to such a judge? She would ask for God's sake that he be bound with chains, like a foolish, raging man. It is just such a thing that Carlstadt knows well that we are not serious if we call the sacrament a sacrifice, even though we do not, and yet he judges that we think it is a sacrifice, and blasphemes so unjustly. There you can see how he only seeks cause to blaspheme us, out of sheer spite.

(125) Envy and vain doctrine have made man so senseless and even obsessed him that he no longer sees how the heart gives the name to the work, and not the work to the heart. If the heart is right and good, the name be what it will, it does no harm. What good and right mind should there be in the head to do the Scriptures or divine things, who is so wrong-minded that he has also lost the common sense of human reason and does not know that everything should be judged according to the opinion and fruits of the heart, not according to the name or appearance, as all natural laws also teach? Believe such a teacher only if he wants to write about the sacrament in a right and Christian way, who looks at all things through a stained glass and judges according to his bitter and false heart. But if he knows it, and yet writes like this willfully, it is so much the worse than if one grasps at it clearly that he must be possessed, for a man who is in his right mind does not do so willfully.

How, if we still today feed, and did not call the sacrament Mass,

1) Erlanger and Walch: on that.

2) d. i. sought.

but in bright German a sacrifice, only to defy the Rottengeist? Do you also think whether we could preserve it before him? For we have it in mind that everything that we have done and will do in Wittenberg should be arranged by God's grace in such a way that the devil may challenge it with all infernal gates and evil spirits, but should not gain anything, as has happened so far. Well then, I now call the sacrament a sacrifice again; not because I consider it a sacrifice, but because the god of the 1) spirit of hell, the devil, wants to prevent me from calling it that: so I will do what he does not want and leave what he wants, and I will also say my cause and reason for it.

I will call St. Peter a sinful fisherman, as he calls himself in the Gospel, and say: St. Peter, the poor sinner, has converted the world with his Gospel [Apost. 2, 41, 42]; St. Paul, the persecutor of Christianity [Apost. 9, 4], is the teacher of the Gentiles [1 Cor. 15, 9]; the sinner Mary Magdalene, Luc. 7, 48, 2) has been saved, and the like. I write this because Carlstadt's spirit has cause to write more books, although he is not commanded to do so, and thunders at me and says: The Wittenberg preacher "of the high senses" desecrates God's grace and Christ's blood and the Holy Spirit, because he calls the saints sinners; for although he considers them holy with the heart, and otherwise cherishes them with the pen (according to his German speech), but because he calls them sinners, he also considers them so and makes them sinners, murders and executes Christ, and sheds his blood 2c. As the common preacher of deep senses is wont to rave.

(128) Yes, I will make it worse, I will call Jesus Christ, the Son of God, crucified and dead; so that the spirit of the wicked shall prove his art, and say, Christ is now in heaven, and is no longer crucified; because thou callest him so, thou crucifixest him, and art worse than the Jews, from whom he is crucified, whether thou with heart and pen, and with mind, and with heart and pen, and with mind, and with mind, and with mind, and with heart, and with pen, and with mind, and with mind.

1) Erlanger: this.

2) Thus the Jena; Wittenberg: "the sinner, of which S. Luc. Cap. 7. writes."

say differently. What do you think? This spirit should still well ward us off the length that we may no longer call a name of the previous stories. For if I cannot say of the mass how it was a sacrifice, and such an abominable thing it is, when I say, Here is a sacrifice of the papists, or, We received the sacrifice (hear, that was once a sacrifice), neither must we in the Gospel call Simon the leper, Peter a sinner, nor Paul the persecutor, nor Christ crucified; because all these things were, and were of the devil, and now are no more.

How often does it happen that an evil name remains for a thing when the evil is gone? Should the one who calls it by the evil name make it so evil? It could not be worse than that someone crucified and killed God's Son now; still, because it happened once, the evil name remains eternally and does no harm, because heart, courage and all works go differently than the name says. Should it not now also be held to one's credit whether he calls the sacrament a sacrifice out of habit, or out of the evil work of the papists, which they have practiced on it? Although we do not do it. Would I not call it a martyred, a crucified, a killed sacrament, as D. Carlstadt himself calls it? For all these things are included in the word "sacrifice"; should I therefore also martyred, crucified and killed and be like them, who do it with the deed, that I call [it] by the name?

130 Therefore, I ask the spirit of the mob and shove his own word down his throat. Say: Why do you call bread and wine a sacrament martyred, crucified, killed? Are ye not also the executioners and murderers of Christ, whether ye chirre with the pen otherwise? But do you say, "They do not mean it for that reason, but show what others do with it? He, dear squire, why could I not also call it a sacrifice of the opinion that others have made, prepared and called it so? Do you see that all the world and also the children see how one should not judge according to the name or appearance, but according to the heart and the deed? All this I want to have said for the sake of abundance, when

some who called it a sacrifice would be with us, so that I may show how nothing the spirit is able to do, that [it], if its dreams were true, nevertheless created nothing. But such a spirit, which has lost reason and truth, and deals only with external things, shall have such a theology of appearance and shadow.

It is a sin and a shame, as has been said, that we should waste so many words, time and paper on this child's play. But this fruit we have from it, that this spirit is stripped of its shell and brought into the light, so that everyone may see where D. Carlstadt is and what he has in mind, so that everyone may know to beware of him as of the devil. For this would be given to him as to a man, whether he taught something from name and appearance, and whether he let the reason in the heart and the deed of truth stand in the way and not be true. But that he so casts out the useless appearance, so drives it with high words, as if it were only because of that, in addition to blaspheming the inward, the right reason, which he himself confesses about us, and so horribly condemns, and gladly wants to bring to nothing, no one does that but the devil himself; for no honest pious man would do so. It would be all too easy for him, if he could bring it about, that he would disgrace the fine light of truth and grace of God, given to us in Wittenberg, only to the highest degree, and that he would persuade the people, that the right sun would have gone out through him in Orlamünde.

What do you think now? Who would have relied on D. Carlstadt's reason, how well should he stand with his Missa? who proves nothing that Missa is Hebrew, that [it] means a sacrifice, that one should not call it [so]; and even if he proves all this, nevertheless accomplishes nothing with it, except that he makes a mockery of himself and us. If the papists would only refrain from offering the mass, Lord God, how gladly I would allow them to call it whatever they wanted; I would not care about the name, because Carlstadt is completely and utterly interested in it, and the main part, the reason, is held in too low esteem.

The other part of the abolition of the sacrament is also of this kind; it must also be end-Christian and papist. Oh, who could advise man that he should do both predi

and writing, and do another work! Unfortunately, he is not good for it, he wants to make a new law and sin, and establish new articles of faith, whether God likes it or not, he cannot do anything else.

134. In the first place, we have taught from St. Paul the Christian freedom, that everything should be free, which God does not forbid with clear words in the New Testament, as there is, eating all kinds of things, drinking all kinds of things, clothing all kinds of things, place all kinds of things, person all kinds of things, giving all kinds of things, that we owe nothing at all to God, but to believe and to love [Rom. 14, 2. ff. 1 Cor. 8, 8-10.] Now tell me, where did Christ forbid to abolish the sacrament, or command to abolish it? Show me one little word, and I will yield. D. Carlstadt is still allowed to come out freely and say that Christ's prohibition, which he cannot prove, is also not true; and values sin as great as denying God. Is this not a miserable, pitiful blindness, to load souls with sins and murder, and to make law where there is none?

135. Tell me, my brother, what thinkest thou of the spirit that may impute to Christ, and say that he doeth that which he doeth not; yea, that he doeth that he doeth the contrary? For Christ does not deny it, and let it go free; this spirit denies it, and catches the conscience out of its own thirst and iniquity. Is this not blaspheming Christ? Is it not denying Christ? Is it not putting oneself in Christ's place and murdering souls under Christ's name, binding consciences, charging sins, making laws, and in short, dealing with souls as if he were their God? Such, all, and how it is to be counted more, he does, who makes laws and sin, since Christ wants to have freedom and no sin. Just as we have proved the pope to be the end of Christ because he breaks such freedom with laws, since Christ wants to have freedom; lind my spirit of the mob plunges just the same way, also wants to catch what Christ wants to have free.

But it has a different nose in this with the Rottengeist than with the pope; they both break the Christian freedom and are.

both are anti-Christian, but the pope does it by command, D. Carlstadt by prohibition; the pope means to do, D. Carlstadt means to let. As Christian freedom is broken by the two things, if one commands, forces 1) and urges to do, which is neither commanded nor forced by God; or if one forbids, resists and hinders to let, which is neither forbidden nor resisted by God. For my conscience is just as much trapped and seduced when it must refrain from doing something that is not necessary to refrain from as when it must do something that is not necessary to do; and Christian freedom perishes just as much when it must refrain from doing something that it is not necessary to refrain from as when it must do something that it is not necessary to do.

The pope breaks the liberty, so that he gives up the sacrament, and wants to have it for a right and a law, and whoever lets it sin. The spirit of the mob breaks it by beating a hasty retreat to abolish the sacrament, and wants to have it for a prohibition, right and law, and whoever does it shall sin. There Christ is driven out of both parts; one pushes him out in front, the other drives him out behind; one falls to the left side, the other to the right side, and none remains on the right free road. I am almost very surprised, however, and if I did not read it myself in D. Carlstadt's books, then all the world would not have persuaded me that he should not know such things; for in this I have considered him to be learned and understanding. O Lord God, what are we when you let fall? What do we do when you cut off your hand? What can we do when you never shine? Is this free will and its capacity, that so soon the learned becomes a child, the wise a fool, the wise a madman? How terrible you are in all your works and judgments!

Let us walk in the light, for we have it that the darkness may not seize us also, and let him know who is able to know. I will speak roughly of this. There are two things: to teach and to do; but I say again, let teaching and doing be separated from one another, as far as heaven and earth.

1) This and the next following "man" in the Wittenberg and in the Jena editions; both are missing in the Erlanger.

and earth. Teachings belong to God alone, who has the right and power to command, to forbid, to be master over the consciences. But doing and not doing belong to us, that we keep God's commandments and teachings. Wherever there is a doing or not doing that God has not taught, commanded or forbidden, one should let it be free 2) as God Himself has let it be free. But whoever goes beyond this, and teaches or forbids, falls into God's own office, burdens the conscience, makes sin and sorrow, and disturbs everything that God has freely and safely given, and in addition drives out the Holy Spirit with all His kingdom, work and word, so that all devils remain there.

Now, lifting the sacrament, wearing plates, putting on chasubles and albums 2c. is a doing, since God has neither commanded nor forbidden anything; therefore, it should be free, whoever desires to do and to leave it: God wants to have such freedom 2c. But because the Pope does not leave the doing free, but forces it with doctrine and commandment, he encroaches upon God's office and arrogantly sets himself up in God's place, as St. Paul proclaimed of him [2 Thess. 2:4], and makes sin, since God does not want sin, and thereby kills souls and binds consciences. But because D. Carlstadt does not give the letting freely, but forces with prohibition and doctrine, one should not cancel it 2c., he also interferes with God's office, puts himself in his place, and makes sin, since no sin can be nor should be, and thus kills the soul on this side, like the pope on the other side, both break, like the soul murderers, Christian freedom.

But we walk on the middle course, and say: There is neither commanding nor forbidding, neither to the right nor to the left, we are neither papal nor Carlstadtian, but free and Christian, that we abolish the sacrament, and do not abolish it as, where, when, how long we desire, as God has given us the freedom. Just as we are free to remain outside of marriage or to enter into marriage, to eat meat or not, to wear chasubles, and to be a Christian.

2) The old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: remain.

3) Thus in the old editions. Erlanger: "das Aufheben." In the marginal gloss of the Erlanger edition it is stated that "das" is an addition by Walch, as it is; nevertheless, "das" is placed after Walch in the text.

or not, .to have frocks and plates or not. Here we are eradicates what the gospel brings us. For Christ cannot masters and suffer no law, commandment, teaching or abide in the conscience that whores with strange doctrine prohibition. As we have also done both here in and the commandment of men; faith must perish. Wittenberg. For in the monastery we had mass without Therefore, everyone must make sure that D. Carlstadt has chasuble, without fuss, badly in the most simple way, as a spirit that is hostile to Christ and the gospel, to faith and Carlstadt Christ exemplifies. Again, in the parish we still to the whole kingdom of God, which he in turn wants to have chasuble, albums, and altar, and we lift them up as disturb with humanity and his own conceit, as you may we please. well grasp from this piece and will hear much later.

For this reason, my spirit should not fight against us But that he teaches us that Christ did not abolish it in Wittenbergers in this way: They abolish the sacrament, the Lord's Supper, we thank him kindly, though we knew therefore they sin against God; but thus: They teach and it otherwise also, and almost as well as he. We say here command that one must abolish the sacrament in case of of teaching, not of doing, and ask us to point out where mortal sin, therefore they sin against God; for this is what Christ is teaching or doing. We already know where he the papists do and teach. We, however, do not teach this leaves it or does not do it, because we believe that it is not way, and yet we do it freely as long as we feel like it. The necessary to do and leave everything that Christ has done doing does no harm, but the teaching is the devil. Again, and left undone; otherwise we would also have to go on in the monastery we leave it; but I do not teach it, as D. the sea and do all the miracles that he has done; again, Carlstadt does; the leaving does not harm 1), but the leave marriage in order, leave the secular government, teaching is the devil. Now notice from this which of the leave the fields and plowing, and everything that he has end Christians are cousins, we or D. Carlstadt. We do like left undone. For that which he would have us do and leave, the papists, but we do not suffer the teaching, he not only did and left, but also signified it with words, commandment and compulsion; we also let like the commanded and forbade what we should do and leave. Carlstadtians, but we do not suffer the prohibition. So the For even when he says, John 13:15, "I have given you an Pope and D. Carlstadt are right cousins in teaching, example, that you should do as I have done," he himself because they both teach, one the doing, the other the does not point to Lazarum, whom he raised from the dead, burdening. But we teach neither, and do both. but to the washing of feet.

Now, gentlemen, we are talking about small things, if Therefore we do not allow any example, not even of you look at the doing. For what is the abolition of the Christ Himself, let alone of other saints, unless God's word sacrament? But if you look at the doctrine, we are talking is with them, which tells us which one we should follow or about the very highest things. The spirit of the wicked is not follow. We do not want to be satisfied with works and too frivolous, and falls too boldly into the breach; he examples; indeed, we do not want to follow any example: regards the doctrine as small and the deeds as great, but we want to have the word, for the sake of which all works, once does not see the beam in his eye, and has so much examples and miracles are done. For he is so wise and so to do with the mote in our eye [Matth. 7, 5]. For with eloquent, and so careful, that he has made known to us in doctrine he attacks the consciences that Christ words all that he has commanded or forbidden. Now then, purchased with his blood, and kills the souls with all you riffraff, be confident, and show us where Christ has commandments and sins that God so dearly purchased, revealed with a bag. so that Christ's kingdom is destroyed and all good 2) is extinguished.

1) The words: "wie - nicht" are missing in the Wittenberg and Jena editions, but are in Walch's old edition and in the Erlangen edition.

2) "Good" is missing from Erlanger.

3) Walch and the Erlanger: Plow.

to abolish the Sacrament? Because you boast and rave that it is a prohibition of Christ: where is the prohibition? I respect the bride in Orlamünde in a shirt, or the groom 1) in pants in Naschhusen.

If this is to be true, that one should follow the example of Christ so rigidly and not the word alone, then it follows that we must keep this supper nowhere but in Jerusalem in the paved hall [Luc. 2:12, Marc. 14:15]. For if the outward ordinances 2) are to be so strict, the outward places and persons must also be kept strict, and it will come to pass that this supper was to be kept only by the disciples, to whom alone he commanded and administered it at that time, and St. Paul 1 Corinthians 11:17 ff. will become vain foolishness. Item, because we do not know, and the text does not give, whether it was red or plain wine, whether it was bread rolls or barley bread, we will have to leave the Lord's Supper in doubt until we are sure that we do not do any outward thing a hair's breadth differently than Christ exemplifies. 3. Yes, we will also eat the paschal lamb in Jewish beforehand. Since the text does not say whether Christ took it into his hands and presented it to each of us himself, we must wait until it is known, so that we do not lift it up or weave it differently from Christ. For wherever we do so, the spirit of the mob is there, crying out: We execute, murder, and crucify Christ. This is how good a lesson is here, and how much more blessedness is buried here than in Christ's wounds, blood, word and spirit.

Oh, the blindness and mad folly of such great celestial prophets, who boast of talking to God daily! Children should be ashamed to fool so grossly. I am thinking here of a prophecy that was said by D. Carlstadt when he first came into our teachings, which read thus: Yes, D. Carlstadt

will not stay on it for long, he is a fickle man, and never stayed on anything. I did not want to believe such a thing then; now I must grasp it. For he has completely fallen again from faith to work, and unfortunately to the work of man or reason, invented by himself. So then we say that in the sacrament we do everything that Christ commanded in words, saying, "Do this in remembrance of me," 1 Cor. 11:24. But what he did not forbid we do freely, as far as it pleases us, saying, "It is not to be commanded nor forbidden," just as he neither commanded nor forbade it.

(147) And though I had intended to do away with the abolition, yet I will not do it now, in defiance and opposition for a while longer of the spirit of enthusiasm, because it will have forbidden it, and held it as a sin, and driven us from freedom. For before I would give way to the soul-murdering spirit a hair's breadth or a moment to let our freedom (as Paul teaches [Gal. 5:1]), I would before tomorrow become such a strict monk, and keep all monasticism as firmly as I have ever done. It is no joke here with Christian freedom, which we want to have as pure and intact as our faith, even if an angel from heaven said otherwise. It has confessed too much to our dear, faithful Savior and Lord Jesus Christ; so it is also all too necessary for us, we may not give in to it if we lose our blessedness.

From this piece you should now notice and certainly test the spirit of D. Carlstadt, so that he deals with it, how he pulls us from the word and leads us to the works. For in order that he may do this more effectively, he holds up to you the works of Christ himself as a perfect pretense, as if you should be frightened by them and think, "Truly, who would not follow Christ? And meanwhile he conceals the word, because he has none to show for it. For after he has seen how we do not want to trust in the word and work of men, whether they are holy or old, and want to have Christ alone as our master, the prankster divides Christ into two parts, namely, how Christ once does and leaves some works without a word; and secondly, how Christ does and leaves some works without a word.

1) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer: "Brüt" and "Brütgam".

2) In the old editions: "die eusserliche Geberde", which Walch had correctly resolved with "die äußerlichen Geberden". The Erlanger gives the latter as a variant of Walch.

3) Erlanger: one.

times how he does and leaves works with the word, and is so mischievous that he presents Christ alone, how he does and leaves without a word, in which he is not to be followed, and is silent where Christ does and leaves with the word, in which we are to follow him.

Do you see the devil here? the one who deceived us before through the saints wants to deceive us here through Christ himself. Beware, where you do not hear God's word that calls you or bewitches you, do not go astray and turn back, even if Christ Himself does. Is it not said enough? It is said: "Your word is my lamp", Ps. 119, 105. The word, the word shall do it, do you not hear? Now if it be held against thee, how Christ hath done, say thou freshly thereupon, Well, hath he done it, hath he also taught it, and called it to be done? Item, if one reproaches you: If they reproach thee that Christ hath not done this thing, then say freshly, Hath he also forbidden it? And if they show thee not his word thereon, say, Do, let it be, it is no concern of mine; neither are they examples, they are works done for his own person. If they say, *Omnis Christi actio est nostra instructio*, let them say, but see what he means by *instructio*. A man has said it, which is as much as thyself. This is how it is in the world, as they say: He who cannot sing always wants to sing; he who cannot preach nor write wants to preach and write. But he who can, shuns and does not like to do it. Carlstadt, who herewith proves that he does not understand anything about Christ, just as he does not understand Moses above, must preach and write, since no one calls him or demands him, and since he is demanded, he does not do it. So he teaches Moses to understand that the disorderly rabble should rise up and punish public vices. But that he teaches Moses spiritually, how he reveals sin, and physically drives the rough rough people to works, he does and cannot, and makes him his own Moses. So here also he makes his own Christ, that we should follow his works without word. But how Christ is first our salvation, and then his works with the word our example, he cannot do, and knows as much of the New Testament as he does of the Old, and wants to know of the Sacrament and the

The same write, as if there was great need for his great, blind art, yes, ignorance.

151 For how is it possible that there should be a right understanding of Moses or of the law, as it teaches to recognize sin, Rom. 3:20, and as it drives the rude to works, Deut. 18:4, 5, where it is interpreted that the disorderly mob should rise up and take hold of the authority's office and overthrow all order and opinion of the law with it? So how is it possible that Christ should be rightly understood as given to us for life in faith, and his words and works for an example in love, who wants to go out with him, and who alone drives this, as we are to consider and follow Christ's work, unbidden and unbidden, as necessary examples? Then faith and love must perish with the whole gospel. And that is why they speak so scornfully of the doctrine of faith and love, as D. Carlstadt himself reproached me in Jena, just as if they knew much that is higher and better, and yet they do not say it, do not want to go into the day with it. By which piece alone one can prove that the devil speaks from them, because they ridicule the doctrine of faith and love, that is, Christ himself with his gospel.

After this, the man returns to his Hebrew language and argues against us in this way: "The Wittenbergers abolish the sacrament, therefore they consider it a sacrifice, because they are doing the work of the Law of Moses, in which there were two kinds of sacrifices, the heave offering and the sacrifice of peace offerings. Now he who annuls does a heave offering 2c. This comes first of all out of the art. Is this not blindness, what is blindness? Everything that is lifted up is called a sacrifice by this spirit, and argues a *particulari ad universalem*,¹) sic etc. *Una est elevatio in lege, quae est oblatio; ergo omnis elevatio est oblatio*. This sounds as if I were to say: One finds an elevation that is a sacrifice; therefore all elevations are a sacrifice. Or thus, a cow at Orlamünde is black; therefore all cows in the world are black. I have to listen to the new layman and farmer and talk peasantly. There

1) Walch and the Erlanger: *universale*.

Let us see what the plow of Naschhusen is capable of, of which he boasted at Jena that he should put to shame all the doctors in the world. When the maid picks up the mirror to look at it, she sacrifices it. If the farmer picks up the axe or flail to hew or thresh, he sacrifices the same. If the mother picks up the child and dances with it, she sacrifices it; therefore she does against Christ's commandment, henchens, murders, slaughters, crucifies Christ, and does all the evil that those who sacrifice Christ do; as the spirit of the swarm rages; for the plow of Nashhusen has said, He who picks up sacrifices.

Tell me, has this farmer not earned enough to have his plow wedged quite 1) well? But so shall God overthrow them that sit down and rise up against the knowledge of God and undertake their own. 2) Egypt must not be smitten with common darkness, but which may be seized [Ex. 10:21]. I think this means losing reason, senses and wit. The papists themselves were never so mad or of the opinion that they sacrificed the sacrament by lifting it up, although they otherwise consider it a sacrifice, but lift it up so that they show it to the people, to remind them of Christ's suffering 2c. Therefore also the priest does not speak a word, neither of the sacrifice nor of anything else, when he lifts it up; how should we then sacrifice it by lifting it up, who fight so hard that it is no sacrifice?

But it is the same fiddle on which he always fiddles, that the outward appearance is the main piece, according to which everything that heart, mouth, pen and hand confess should be judged and respected. Therefore it is of no use that we believe from the heart, confess with the mouth, testify with the pen, prove with the deed, as we do not consider the sacrament a sacrifice, because we still cancel it. So strong is the abrogation, and so much does it count, that it outweighs and condemns all such things. Is this not a peevish spirit, which thus gambles with outward appearances, contrary to the truth in the spirit? If you only consider the

1) recht" is missing in the Jena.

2) In Walch's old edition and in the Erlangen one: "one's own taking;" in the latter not from the original print, but from Walch.

If they let themselves be lifted up outwardly, they would be right, undressed, naked brides, God grant that they would keep it in their hearts as they wished.

But enough has been said above about such insistence on outward appearances; now it is only indicated that I also take the spirit out and let him see how he deals with vain folly, and can do nothing honest about the main points of Christian doctrine, and yet drives such folly so hard on the consciences with such pompous words, as if they were the main points, where all power lay. 3) So that everyone may beware of the spirit that always wants to go out and establish new articles of faith, where God knows nothing about them, and to introduce a new doctrine, which he is not commanded to do.

But I have said these things as if it were true and established that there is an abolition that is 4) a sacrifice, as this spirit is suggesting; for no man on earth calls abolition a sacrifice except this spirit, who invents such things and tries to interpret them for us, because he knew nothing else to write; nor will he ever indicate that 5) abolition means a sacrifice. He also forgets his own words when he says that "to sacrifice" 6) is as much as to slaughter, to kill, to execute, to murder, to burn 2c. But who would be so mad as to say that to lift up is as much as to slaughter, to kill, to murder, to burn? without this spirit, which perhaps also learns new German from his heavenly voice; nor does he rage against himself, and fights that he who lifts up sacrifices.

157) But that he draws from the Hebrew 7) the two words, Thnupha and Thrüma [Ex. 25, 3. 4 Mos. 18, 8. 11.], which are Webeopfer and Hebeopfer, or Hebe and Webe translated by me, that he does again to prove his excellent art in the Hebrew language, about which the world should be surprised that the plow at Nashhusen also knows Hebrew language, but not the common language,

3) In the outputs: anlege.

4) Walch and the Erlangeners: that.

5) Wittenberg and Erlangen: da.

6) Erlanger: the sacrifice.

7) In the old editions: testifies. Hereby Luther points to § 11 and § 12 of Carlstadt's writing: "Wider die alten und neuen papistischen Messen" (No. 2 in the appendix of this volume).

which everyone talks about, but which the Spirit teaches recently and still teaches daily from the heavenly voice.

For my Hebrew language teaches me that before offering anything according to the law, it must first be lifted up and woven, and therefore it must be lifted up and woven, so that one confesses and gives thanks to God, as for a gift that was not offered or given to God, but received from Him. Just as I said above about the name Missa. After that, it was first sacrificed and set on fire, if it was previously lifted up and woven, so that lifting up and weaving cannot be a sacrifice in the law, nor at any end.

Behold, this spirit understands the Law of Moses and the Hebrew so well, and yet is so thuggish and wicked that he builds his dreams on such articles of faith, and wants to entangle the consciences so highly that they shall be Christ's murderers, executioners, and killers if they lift them up. So the devil must always have a mouth full of blasphemy and disturb Christ.

160 Carlstadt fell out of the kingdom of Christ and was shipwrecked in the faith; therefore he also wants us out, straight into the works, and wants to make Galatians out of us. For behold, dear man, what gross blindness this is, that he thus contends, If any man circumcise himself, shall he not 1) be called a Jew? So, he who lifts up is called cheaply a sacrificer 2c. You poor wretched spirit, where did you read that he who circumcises himself is called a Jew? Did not Paul circumcise Timothy, since he was already baptized and a Christian? Apost. 16, 3. Does not St. Paul absolve circumcision? 1 Cor. 7, 19: "Circumcision is nothing, foreskin is also nothing", that is, one may be circumcised or not, have foreskin or not. And this spirit judges freshly and boldly against St. Paul's judgment: it is not free, but makes Jews. So he should say: whoever circumcises himself, as if he had to do it for the sake of the law and conscience, is a Jew; for circumcision does not make Jews, since one may well be a Jew.

Finds those who must have their skin cut off because of sickness or rotten flesh; should they therefore be called Jews?

161 But this makes a Jew, who has a conscience, as enforced by the law, he must circumcise himself. This Jewish sense and conscience makes a Jew, whether he could never circumcise himself outwardly or not. Thus the foreskin does not make a Gentile, but if he thinks in his conscience that he must have foreskin, he is a Gentile if he lets himself be circumcised a thousand times externally. Just as D. Carlstadt is actually a heathen and has lost Christ because he considers the foreskin necessary and circumcision condemned and does not leave it free as Christ wants it. There you can see clearly how this man is completely immersed in works and drowned in outward appearances, that he cannot give a unified judgment in spiritual matters of conscience. For it is impossible that there should be a spark of Christian understanding left in him, because he thinks that an outward work makes a Jew or a Christian, a Gentile or a Turk, and does not judge according to conscience, but according to appearance, which even sensible people do not do.

162 Thus he should also have said here: Whoever annuls the sacrament out of necessity of conscience, as if he had to annul it, would also be a Jew. But we do not do this, as he well knew. Therefore he was afraid that he would have to stand in disgrace, as if he had publicly lied against us, but he did not see that he would thereby gain much greater disgrace, that he would lie against God, and he forbids the work, as if he were condemned by God's prohibition, which God has not forbidden. Again, he who forces the sacrament not to be abrogated, as is necessary, is a heathen, as D. Carlstadt does, and here makes a necessary law about the consciences, which, however, only God has the right to do; but he who abrogates it or does not abrogate it, out of free conscience, as it is loved by him, is a Christian; which is done by faith, which alone makes Christians without all works.

Item 163: He should further say: Whoever takes away the sacrament with such a conscience and the opinion that he is sacrificing it, is a sacrificer and a pope. For where such a conscience

1) "not" is missing in the Jena.

If there is no conscience, one sacrifices, even if one never stops the sacrament or immediately sinks it into a deep well. But where there is no such conscience, no sacrifice is made, even if it were raised above all the heavens and all the world cried out: sacrifice, sacrifice; for everything is connected with the conscience; this swarming spirit knows nothing about it, or does not want to know.

I fear that this letter will be annoying for many to read, because it deals with such trickery. But how shall I do to him? This mad spirit forces me to do so. But still, as I said above, we have the fruit of this, that we may defend our Christian freedom and understand more clearly, and also recognize this false spirit and see how it is blind to all things and lacks understanding, according to which each one should know how to keep himself. For because he does not understand such small things, and thinks so highly of them, God interferes with his office, makes laws, sins and consciences where there are none, breaks Christian freedom, and draws consciences away from the understanding of grace to outward works and appearances, so that Christ is denied, his kingdom disturbed, the gospel profaned: who can hope that he will ever write or teach anything good? For surely it can be proved from these things that Christ's spirit is not there; then the devil must be there, and he is also; and every man must judge himself according to this.

I like the fact that the mass is held in German among the Germans, but that he also wants to make a nuisance of it, as if it had to be that way, that is once again too much. The spirit cannot do otherwise than always, always make laws, distress, conscience and sin. I have read in 1 Corinthians 14:27, 28 that he who speaks with tongues should be silent in the church, since no one understands anything 1). But one wants to skip that it says: *nisi interpretetur quis*, that is, speaking with tongues, St. Paul allows, if it is interpreted next to it, that one understands it; therefore he also gives there that they should not resist those who speak with tongues 2c. Now we do not give the sacrament to anyone, unless he understands the words in the sacrament, as is well known; that we therefore

1) Walch and the Erlangeners: "nothing from".

In this we do not do anything against St. Paul, because we do enough for his opinion. Whether we do not do enough for this spirit, which only looks at outward works and pays no attention to conscience or opinion, is not the issue; we give nothing to his new articles of faith.

166 I would like to have a German mass today, I also deal with it; but I would like it to have a proper German style. For that one interprets the Latin text and keeps the Latin tone or notes, I let happen; but it is not correct nor righteous. Both text and notes, accent, manner and gesture must come from the right mother tongue and voice, otherwise it is all an imitation, as the monkeys do. But now that the spirit of enthusiasm insists that it must be, and 2) wants to burden the conscience with law, work and sin, I will take my time and hurry less than before, only to defy the sin masters and soul murderers who compel us to works as commanded by God, which he does not give.

For he who goes to the sacrament with such understanding that he has the words in German or clearly in his heart: "Take and eat, this is my body," 2c. which he learns and remembers from the preceding sermons, and receives the sacrament thereupon and thereby, receives it rightly, and hears not vain tongues, but right understanding. Again, whoever does not grasp them in his heart and understand them, nor receive the sacrament, it does not help him if a thousand preachers stand around his ears and shout madly and foolishly with such words. But the mad spirit is all too concerned with the outward work and appearance that he always wants to make necessary from his own head and make it the article of faith, without God's command.

168) The fool does not understand the words of St. Paul when he writes about speaking in tongues 1 Cor. 14, 2-29. For St. Paul writes about the ministry of preaching among the congregation, where they are to listen and learn, and says: "Whoever starts there and wants to read, teach or preach, and yet speaks with tongues, that is, he speaks Latin in front of the Germans or any other unknown language, let him be silent.

2) but - again.

and preach to him alone. For no one hears it nor understands it, and no one can improve from it; or if he wants to speak with tongues, he should also translate it or otherwise interpret it so that the congregation understands it. Therefore, St. Paul does not use tongues in such a disturbing way, as this spirit of sin does, but does not forbid them, if the interpretation is done in addition.

Therefore, it is the custom in all countries to read the Gospel in Latin before the sermon, which is called St. Paul speaking with tongues in the congregation. But because the sermon goes on soon, and the tongue translates 1) and interprets, St. Paul does not reject nor condemn it; why should I condemn it or anyone? Yes, God would have it that such an order of St. Paul would happen everywhere enough, that nothing else would be preached after the Latin Gospel but the same interpretation. Now this zealot spirit wants to condemn everything that St. Paul allows and insists that it should not be condemned; to this end, he does not want to suffer any singing or Latin word, and he does not apply St. Paul's teaching on tongues to the preaching ministry alone, but to all outward appearances, since there is no power in it, as is his way.

170 Not that I want to refuse to use vain German in the mass, but I do not want to suffer that one forbids to read the Latin gospel without God's word out of one's own thirst and sacrilege, and makes sin where there is none, so that we do not get the spirit of the sect with its fanaticism to be master in God's stead. For we do not need to establish our cause or strengthen it against the papists with such illusions, otherwise we would stand before them with all our shame. It should all be certain and pure word of God, on which we build and fight against them, so that they may not raise anything honestly against it. For even if we now have the German mass, it will not be enough that the words in the sacrament are spoken in German; for they must be spoken before and before the sacrament is received, so that those who go must have it in their hearts and not in their ears. What lies

For if they do not hear them in the sacrament, if they have only heard and grasped them hard beforehand in the sermon, and confess them afterward, then one would want to shout the same words especially in the ears of everyone who goes to it, and bless the sacrament as many times as there are who take it.

I had intended to cover everything in one book, but I am in a hurry and it wants to become too big. Therefore, I must break off here in haste, and begin another 2) about the Sacrament; for I do not yet have all of its venomous books, as they boast. Do not let the time be long, I have written this in a short time; the other shall follow on its heels, God wills it. To Him be praise and glory forever, amen.

The second part

against the heavenly prophets, from the Sacrament.

I have no doubt that this discord of ours is a source of great joy and hope among the papists, as if it would put an end to our doings. Well, let us praise them and have good courage over us. I have said it many times and long ago: If what I have begun is from God, then no one shall stop it; if it is not from God, then someone else shall stop it; I certainly do not want to keep it. I cannot lose anything in it, because I have not put anything into it. But I know well that no one shall take it from me without God alone. And although I am also sorry for these annoyances, 3) I am nevertheless pleased that the devil comes to day and is disgraced by these his heavenly prophets, who have now long murmured and have never wanted to come forth until I have lured them out with a florin; it is well invested by God's grace and does not repent me.

2. there is no need, in God's name; I know and am sure who the master is here, who has not been lacking to me in many a strong fight; he will also be available to me in this fight.

2) This refers to the second part of this writing, which was written somewhat later.

3) Taken by us from Walch's old edition. In the editions: ist.

1) In Walch and in the Erlanger: verdeutsch.

not be lacking. Therefore only be fresh and undaunted to whom the gospel is given. We have a cheerful consolation and good courage, and fight against melancholy, stupid, despondent, afflicted spirits, who are afraid even of a rustling leaf, without fearing God, as is the way of the wicked (Ps. 36:2), and mastering His word and work. This means that he is hidden and cannot be seen or felt. But if he were a present, visible man, he should chase them out to the land with a straw.

For this is what this spirit did. First he crept to and from in the country, and 1) secretly threw himself about, seeking where he could find those who fell to him. Now, if he lets himself think that he has a following, he suddenly 2) bursts out and thinks that he has won, [so] that his defiance does not stand on God, who speaks with them, as they boast, but on the chance of the mob, and builds on flesh and blood. For whom God drives to speak, he lifts up freely in public, though he alone, and no one falls to him, as Jeremiah did [Jer. 2:2 ff]; as also I can boast that I have done. Therefore this is certainly the devil, who sneaks in secretly and maliciously, and excuses himself afterwards, that he was not strong enough in spirit at first. Yes, God's spirit does not excuse itself in this way; my devil, I know you well.

4) The right devil is not out yet either. For he still has something else in mind, which 3) I have long since smelled. That will also come out, if God wills. It is, praise God, so far away, that one may not be particularly allowed of me; there are enough people, who can answer such a spirit, without me, because I am alive, also having to be in the game. I also know well that D. Carlstadt has long since cooked this porridge in his heart and will never be able to prepare it. I also knew that he would not do much better than he has done, and that all his clever thoughts would be in vain. For no art, no wit, 4) no poetry against God [Proverbs 21:30] will help, he can do it with one word,

1) Erlanger: rambled.

2) Erlanger: cheerful.

3) Walch and Erlanger: that.

4) In the old issues: no jokes.

disgrace everything. He knows that human thoughts are vain.

(5) Therefore, if there is anyone who is so weak that he cannot bear the blow, and doubts the sacrament, let him be advised, and in the meantime remain without the sacrament, and otherwise practice the word of God, faith and love, letting those who are secure in conscience handle it. You are not condemned if you remain without the Sacrament. But let it be said to the papists, who rejoice in this astonishment, that they beware and not harden their hearts. For God has often acted foolishly and weakly, as if His word and deeds were to perish, in order to harden and blind the ungodly; and yet, by this very means, He has gone out in the strongest possible way, and those who harden and blind themselves to all His foolishness and weakness 5) have perished most horribly; as happened to the Jews through the cross of Christ [1 Cor. 1:18 ff.] and to the Gentiles through the suffering of the martyrs.

Because the devil throws one thing into another in such a disorderly and wild way, and his writing is like D. Carlstadt's head, in the most disorderly and clumsy way, that it is extremely annoying to read and difficult to remember, I will try to put his displeasure and poison in order, and deal with it piece by piece. And first I want to strike out the reason and opinion, to which all his raving turns, 6) so that the reader may have a light to look at and recognize this spirit through and through. But the opinion is this.

God, out of great kindness, has given us again the pure gospel, the precious treasure of our salvation. This gift must now be followed by faith and spirit in a good conscience, as He promises in Isa. 55:11 that His word shall not go forth in vain; and Rom. 10:17: "Faith comes by preaching."

8 The devil is hostile to this gospel and does not want to suffer it; and because he has not been able to resist it with force or sword, he now attacks it with cunning (as he has always done) and with false prophets. And I beg you, Christian reader, will you respond to this

5) Erlanger: obdurate and blinded.

6) lenden - to steer, to turn.

See, I will reveal to you, if God wills, the devil in these prophets, that you may seize him; it is for your benefit and not mine that I write. And the thing goes thus.

9 Therefore, when God has sent forth His holy gospel, He deals with us in two ways. Once outwardly, the other time inwardly. Outwardly he deals with us through the oral word of the Gospel and through the bodily signs, such as baptism and the sacrament. Inwardly he deals with us through the Holy Spirit and faith along with other gifts. But all this in such a way and in such an order that the outward parts should and must go first, and the inward parts afterwards and through the outward parts, so that he has decided not to give any man the inward parts without the outward parts; for he does not want to give anyone the Spirit or faith without the outward word and sign, which he has appointed for this purpose, as he says in Luc. 16, 29: "Let them hear Moses and the prophets. Therefore St. Paul may also call baptism a bath of new birth, in which God pours out the Holy Spirit abundantly, Titus 3:5, 6, 7, and the oral gospel a divine power that saves all who believe in it, Romans 1:16.

(10) Pay attention to this order, my brother, it will be entirely up to you. For even though this spirit of the order presents itself as if it thinks highly of God's word and spirit, and boasts of the excellent fervor of love and zeal for the truth and justice of God, it is nevertheless its opinion that it is turning this order around and setting up a perverse one out of its own iniquity, and is conducting the matter in such a way:

(11) First, what God ordains outwardly to the spirit inwardly, as has been said, oh how he scornfully and mockingly throws this to the wind and wants to enter the spirit first. Yea, saith he, should a handful of water make me clean from sins? The Spirit, the Spirit, the Spirit must do it within. Should bread and wine help me? Should breathing on the bread bring Christ into the Sacrament? No, no, you have to let Christ

The Wittenbergers know nothing about it, they steal the faith from the 2) letter; and the magnificent words much, that, who does not know the devil, would like to think they have five Holy Spirits with them.

But if you ask them, how do you get into the same high spirit? they do not point you to the outward gospel, but to the land of the sleeping monkeys, and say: Stand in boredom, as I have stood, and you too will experience it; there the heavenly voice will come, and God himself will speak to you. If you ask further about boredom, they know as much about it as D. Carlstadt does about Greek and Hebrew. Do you see there the devil, the enemy of divine order? How he opens your mouth with the words spirit, spirit, spirit, and yet at the same time outlines both bridges, footbridge and path, ladder and everything, through which the spirit is to come to you, namely, the outward orders of God in the bodily baptism, sign and oral word of God, and will teach thee, not how the Spirit shall come to thee, but how thou shalt come to the Spirit, that thou shalt learn to ride upon the clouds, and to ride upon the wind, saying not how, or when, or where, or what; but shalt know it thyself as they do.

Again, what God does not order outwardly, they 3) plumb out, as if they were nonsensical. And as they invent their own inward spirit, so they also establish their own outward order, since God has neither commanded nor forbidden. So that one should have no images, churches, altars, not call mass, not call sacraments or abolish them, not have chasubles, but wear gray skirts, rather call oneself neighbor, kill godless princes, suffer no injustice and do much of the outward humility and gestures, which they themselves invent and which God does not respect. Whoever does otherwise than they do is a two-faced pope, who executes and murders Christ, and must be a Christian scholar. But he who does so has already jumped into the spirit with boots and all, and is a spiritual scholar. O excellent

2) Erlanger: den.

3) In the old editions: loddern. The same stem is found in Lotterbube.

1) "the" is missing in the Wittenberg and Erlanger.

Saints! If you ask them who calls them such, they throw up their hands: Oh! my God tells me, the Spirit calls me; yes, all their dreams are the word of God. How thinkest thou of the fellows? Do you almost grasp who this spirit is?

14. further, what God ordains inwardly, as faith, is not valid, go to, and all outward words and scripture, which press on the inward faith, in an outward new way, make the old man dead, and invent all this disenchantment, study, wonder, boredom and more of the jiggery-pokery, since not one letter of it is written in the scripture. Therefore, my Carlstadt plods in like a sow that has now devoured the pearls, and like a dog that has devoured the sanctuary [Matth. 7, 6.], and tears up everything that Christ speaks and puts from inward faith to such outward, fictitious works, so even that he makes nothing else out of the supper of Christ and his remembrance, and out of the knowledge of Christ, but a human work, that with ardent heat and (as their foolish words read) with outstretched lust we should also thus kill ourselves. So that he makes a mist and clouds, that these bright words should not be seen, since Christ says: "My blood is shed for you for the remission of sins" [Matth. 26, 28. Marc. 14, 24. Luc. 22, 20.], which without doubt are grasped, obtained and kept by faith alone, and by no work, as we shall see when we now come to it.

(15) Now let this much be said to indicate that you know how these spirits are wont to do a perverse thing contrary to God's order; that which God orders from the inward faith and spirit, they make out to be a human work. Again, what God orders from the outward word and signs and works, they make out to be an inward spirit, and put the killing of the flesh first before faith, yes, before the word, thus (as is the devil's way) going out where God wants to go in, and in where God wants to go out. That I now call him a devil, no one should be surprised;

because I do not care about D. Carlstadt, I do not look at him, but at the one who has possessed him and speaks through him, as St. Paul speaks: "We do not fence with flesh and blood, but with spiritual wickedness in the air" 2c. [Eph. 6:12.]

(16) You then, my brother, hold fast to the order of God, namely, that the killing of the old man, in which one follows Christ's example, as Peter says [1 Pet. 2:21], should not be the first thing, as this devil does, but the last; so that no one should kill his flesh, bear the cross, and follow Christ's example, unless he is first a Christian and has Christ in his heart through faith, as an eternal treasure. But this is not obtained by works (as these prophets rave), but by hearing the gospel, so that the order is as follows: first, before all works and things, one hears the word of God, in which the Spirit punishes the sinner for sin, John 16:9. When sin is recognized, one hears about the grace of Christ. In the same word, the Spirit comes and gives faith where and to whom He wills. After that you go to the death and the cross and the works of love. Whoever proposes another order to you, do not doubt that it is the devil, as this Carlstadt spirit is, as you shall yet see.

Come on, let's get down to business.

First of all, dear children, how the spirit makes itself so useless over the word and name "sacrament"; there the sow has a shell on! It is a shame that one should speak of it. But nevertheless, because the spirit drives here so gloriously, Christ and the apostles did not call it so, he wanted to have a word from the Biblia. God gives names to his creatures; we humans are not to give names to divine things. Finally he becomes a Jew and calls it Sekerment, as the Jews mock us Christians, and call it Seker Theminit, that is, a false simile. Although the Hebrew language speaks of Naschhusen as Sekerment, as you see here, and makes Ment into a picture. 2) What is the purpose of this word splendor? For this,

2) In the "Gesprächbüchlein," No. 3 in the appendix to this volume.

that the mad rabble should shut their mouths and noses, and say: Traun, I mean yes, that is something, that is a man, he can do it, there is the spirit.

18 But in essence, this is the opinion, as I said above, that such outward names and appearances, of which God has neither commanded nor forbidden, should be the right head, since all power lies with it, as He also did with the name Mass and Lifting above. Whoever does not call it Sacrament has the Spirit and is holy. But he who calls it Sacrament is called black and white, and deceives people from God, and more of the abominable vices; in sum, he denies Christ. Is this not a grievous thing from the spirit of sacrilege, which makes such a great thing out of that which is nothing?

19 Now then, you murderer of souls and spirit of sin, we confess: God has not called it a sacrament, nor commanded it to be called a sacrament. But tell me again: Where did he forbid it? Whoa! but only a bag; if so? Who has given you the power to forbid what God does not forbid? How are you so wicked as to commit such a great sin, when God does not want any? Are you not the real murderer of souls, who sets himself over us in God's stead, and takes away our Christian freedom, and casts the consciences under him?

20 Yes, you do not call it, like Christ and the apostles. Why do you deny so grossly? We also call it the Lord's Supper, or the bread and cup of the Lord, since we read the apostle 1 Cor. 11:26, 27. So you should sue us, you mad spirit: you command it to be called a sacrament, and forbid it to be called the Lord's Supper. If thou couldst bring such things upon us, thy bitter venomous resentment would have been somewhat visited upon us. But since we neither command nor forbid it, but call it a sacrament with a free conscience, you are a denier and blasphemer of Christ, who, without command from God, forbid, condemn and disgrace such freedom, acquired and given to us by God, and make such a necessary, spiritual, great thing out of your outward name and appearance.

Should I not call my Lord Jesus Christ by one name?

which is not written in the Scriptures? What if I called him my heart's crown, my heart's delight, my ruby, as long as I did not feel guilty about it, as if I had to call him that and not something else? But where are these names in the Scriptures? Item, if we should speak of baptism and the Lord's Supper altogether, how would we do it? There is no name in Scripture that covers all the sacraments or signs. Here we would have to be silent, or not speak of them all, or these prophets would judge us as Christ deniers. Item, there are many articles of faith, many pieces of Christian doctrine, many chapters in the Bible. How shall we do to him? These names, "articles, pieces, chapters" are not in the Bible, so now we must not speak of articles of faith, pieces of doctrine, chapters of the Bible. Yes, how do they themselves want to do, the heavenly prophets, they lead the chapters from the Scriptures with names? Are they not also murderers of Christ according to their own judgment, that they give names to divine things, which are not written in the Scriptures?

(22) If fools were to juggle like this at carnival, it would be all right, but that such high spirits, such heavenly prophets, should fool so childishly in such serious matters, and want to make it as great as all Christian mainstays, that is never a good spirit. What light should be in the minds, since such palpable darkness is within? This is what I am saying, to expose the devil to you and to show you tangibly what I have said above. Therefore, only look at the devil, how he sets up external order, which God has not commanded, and makes spirit out of it, which he himself has invented, in turn, destroying and disgracing the Christian freedom, which we have 1) in spirit and conscience. Dear, let it not be a thing of herrings, forbidding where God does not forbid, breaking Christian freedom that Christ has tasted blood, loading the conscience with sins where there is none. He who does and may do this may also do all evil, yes, he already denies everything that God is, teaches and does, together with his Christ, so that it is no wonder whether he also has bad bread and wine in the sacrament.

1) "so we have" in the old edition Walch's and in the Erlanger.

and cause even more misfortune. What good should the sacrament, he himself confesses that he is moved by the devil do? preaching that has been said so far: Christ's natural body

23 Therefore listen, my brother, you know that by is as great, wide, thick and long in the sacrament as when Christian liberty, as by any article of faith, we are to leave he hung on the cross; and says he cannot believe it 2c. life and limb, and do all that is contrary to it, and leave all God forced him (like Caiphas [Joh. 11, 50.]) to speak of that is contrary to it, as St. Paul teaches in Galatians 5. himself, so that everyone would see that he did not get Since then this same Christian liberty suffers distress over his opinion from the Scriptures, but carried it in, and was this little word and name "sacrament," you are henceforth willing to run to the Scriptures with such delusion, and to guilty of defying and opposing these prophets of the devil bend, tear and torture them on such his conceit, and not by calling the Lord's Supper a sacrament; and wherever to break or judge his foolish mind according to God's word you are with them or come to them, you must call it a and Scriptures.

sacrament; not that it is necessary for your conscience, (26) Now it is true that such talk and conceit are gladly but that it is necessary to confess and maintain Christian heard by the rabble and by reason, and indeed it would liberty, 1) and not to allow the devil to make a be no need for them to boast of the heavenly voice and commandment, prohibition, sin or conscience, since God of so excellent a high spirit. There is no reason so small does not want any. But where thou sufferest such sin to that is not inclined to believe that there is bad bread and be made, there is no more Christ to take it away. For with wine, rather than that Christ's flesh and blood are hidden such a conscience one denies the true Christ, who takes there. One does not need a mind for this; it is easy for away all sin. Therefore you see how in these little things anyone to believe it. And the mad mob needs nothing there is no little driving, if one wants to get on the more here than that only one, who has a small reputation, conscience with it. should be so bold and preach it, then he already has

024 As if it were forbidden thee to eat flesh on a fish enough disciples. It would also have been easy for me to day, thou must eat it: but if it were commanded thee on a believe and preach that D. Carlstadt may not boast of flesh day, thou must not eat it. If you are forbidden to great intellect or art here.

marry, you must marry or pretend to marry. And so on, (27) But if our faith is to be treated in this way, that we where one wants to make commandment, prohibition, sin, first put our conceit into the Scriptures, and then direct good works, conscience, and driving, since God wants them according to our own mind, and look only at what is freedom and nothing, hunted or committed, you must hold plain to the common people and common conceit, then fast over such freedom, and always do the contradiction, no article of faith will remain. For there is no one in until you receive freedom. So Paul did not want to Scripture who is not placed above reason by God. And circumcise Titum, Gal. 2, 3, because they insisted on it this is precisely the cause that betrays Carlstadt's error, and wanted to make it necessary; and yet he circumcised that he speaks of faith and God's word in such a way that Timothy, Acts 16, 3. 16, 3, because he was not urged. So reason gladly and willingly accepts it, which otherwise you may call this a sacrament or not. But where these rebels against all God's words and articles of faith, and is prophets urge and forbid it, you must and shall call it a allowed to write such a 3) thing about himself as his most sacrament. noble reason. So I would also like to say: I cannot believe

25. on the other hand, since he now wants to prove that God's Son has become a man, and that the majesty, that Christ is not flesh and blood in the Sa-. so heavenly, has become a man.

1) In Walch and in the Erlangen edition: "not preserved".

2) Walch and the Erlanger: gemeinen.

3) i.e. as one of his most distinguished WÄLdL---

I did not understand the world and the earth, and I put should remember. As you 2) may well think that the them into the narrow body of a woman, and then I let drunkard Christ got so drunk in the evening that he myself be crucified. And then he wanted to tear down all drowned the disciples with the rest of his words.

the Scriptures and God's Word and interpret them (32) What do you think? Is this not a foolhardy spirit, according to my mind, as Manichaeus did. Now it is who so boldly reaches into God's words and forces out confessed first enough that he carried his conceit into the what pleases him? Now because these spirits boast that Scriptures and did not get it out, as he also cannot get it they want to say wedded words, they want to force it with out. He might well have kept silent about the reason. But bright sayings, it must be so; as he then in the same book God wanted it that way, that the cuckoo would have to 3) always drives his poor Gemser, and says: Show call out his own name.

After that he takes the scripture before him, before drive, so that one may not escape you 2c., so we also which his skin was afraid, and wants to charm it, so that need such his rule and say: Dear Spirit, you say two things it should not strike him, and says: "The verse" 2c. 1) But, here; the first: that this thing, "this is my body, given for because he mumbles so in the dark with fear, I will set you," is a special thing, and do not hang on the 4) other. his mind a little clearer. So he wants to say: Under the We pray thee, make us blind with eyes to see, and show words, where the evangelists describe the Lord's Supper, reason, show scripture, enforce it, compel us to confess namely:

Jesus took the bread, gave thanks, and brought and gave it to His disciples, saying, "Take, eat; this is My body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me," (D Cor. 11:24. Matth. 26:26).

29) Among these words, he says, the part "this is my body, given for you" is entirely its own part, and is not connected with the preceding "take, eat," but is a special speech and opinion added, since without it the speech would be complete.

30 Summa, D. Carlstadt wants to say so much with it, Christ could have left these words "this is my body, which is given for you" outside in the Lord's Supper, and the Lord's Supper would have been sufficiently instituted with these words:

Jesus took the bread, gave thanks, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, "Take it, eat. This do in remembrance of me.

(31) For that his body should be given for us is written in many other places. But he has added it to the abundance, to remind them of what they have been given.

reason, show scripture, you must force it, urge, fear and this. Oh yes! If so? For God's sake, show a word that clearly says or forces that this piece is a special one, then we will believe it. Won't you? Where is your spirit? Where is your God? Is he asleep? Or is he over the field? 5) Dear children, how silent and mute is the spirit here, which writes so many books, and yet does not show a word to the reason that this piece is a special piece!

33 Therefore, if the high spirit is silent and gives no indication, we ask for mercy. We must trust our eyes and ears, for we see and hear that this piece is not a special addition, as this spirit is doing, but it stands in the midst of other words, and hangs on it so hard that it could not hang on it any closer. For it follows without means the piece "Take and eat, this is my body," so that whoever hears them speak one after the other cannot think that it is another new piece. Therefore there must be a strong reason here

1) Thus the old editions have interpungirt. Walch and the Erlanger: "and speaks the verse" 2c. That the punctuation we have used is correct is clear from the "Gesprächbüchlein", "this verse: 'this is my body' 2c. is a fully adequate verse" 2c.

2) In the old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: "Wie magst du."

3) In the "Gesprächbüchlein," No. 3 in the appendix to this volume.

4) Erlanger: den.

5) d. i. Egg! look.

and mighty cause are given from the Scriptures, one shall prove that a new special piece is, and does not hang on the proceeding. These same causes and reasons we comfortingly assume and are certain that this spirit will arise when the devil becomes God.

34 For where it should be an addition, it should not stand in the middle of other words, nor be interspersed when he speaks of eating, but should be added afterwards, when the other speeches were all finished, so that the text would stand thus according to Carlstadt's opinion:

Receive and eat, this do in remembrance of me: for I say unto you, that here sitteth the Lender which is given for you.

This is how Christ would have spoken if he had wanted to have understood an addition and D. Carlstadt's opinion. For he is not as unspoken or as confused in head as D. Carlstadt, although D. Carlstadt thinks, as he plops one thing into another and brews without all order, that Christ also does so; but he should prove it first. For it is sufficiently proven that he himself has such a head and manner.

The other thing that the Spirit is to prove is that he says that this particular thing, "this is my body," was added for the purpose of reminding and teaching them what their memory should be based on. 2c. Well, that is out, the Spirit has said it; now where is the reason and cause that Christ therefore added this? Whoa! Peter von Naschhusen, show poor Gemser a little word, urge, force, compel him that he must confess it so. For Gemser hears well that you say it. But it is a great shame that your heart should fall away like this when you have to prove it. Where is it written? What scripture says it? that it is added to teach the memory? I know that Christ's death is to be commemorated, but that this piece is added for this reason I do not know, since the Lord's Supper is perfect without such a piece, and other oters show well enough why Christ is to be commemorated. If I had been with you, my Peter, I would have introduced you to another gem, which should have wedged the plow of such a spleen.

So now this matter stands: If D. Carlstadt is the man who has power to set articles of faith, and we must believe him, if he speaks without Scripture what he dreams, then his writing is right, so this piece is to be taken out, and has added and patched up a peculiar opinion to the whole complete text, like a shell on a Jacob's coat, and does not approach the Lord's Supper. But if he is not the man, then you see how the devil rides him, that he tears, sets, changes, interprets, tortures God's word according to his will, so that I myself believe that he is not serious, but has surrendered into the entrenchment, that he asks neither for God nor man. For how can a man do this without a special devil? That he wants to tear clear words out of both eyes and ears, without 1) speaking and setting all Scripture as he thinks fit, and to arrogate such conceit so high, as if nothing more constant had been heard on earth, that he also therefore blasphemes and reviles the repulsive, as if he were full of devils; as his little books show.

38 It reminds me of his tearing and torturing in God's words just as those, of which I read a book when I was a young master, who tore and tortured the Lord's Prayer thus: Our Father who art in heaven be sanctified, thy name come, thy kingdom come 2c. And was strangely and strangely divided, had also their cause thereupon. Item, as some Jews have done, Gen. 1, 27: God created man in His image male and female; He created them; and thought that God had made Adam in such a way that his one person would be both male and female. If it were to be torn and divided in this way, what a fine Bible we would make, especially if it were done in places where power lies, and articles of faith are established; in other places there would not be so much power in it.

39 Therefore this is our reason: Wherever the Scriptures give a foundation for believing, one should not depart from the words as they read, nor from the order as it is written,

1) Wittenberg and Erlangen: and without.

unless an expressed article of faith compels to interpret the words differently, or to order them. What else did the Bible want to become? When the Psalter says: God is my rock, Ps. 18, 3, here the word "rock" is written, which otherwise means a natural stone. But because faith teaches that God is not a natural stone, it forces me to interpret the word "rock" differently from its natural meaning. So also Matth. 16, 18.: "On this rock I will build my church."

(40) But since there is no article here that requires this piece to be separated and taken out, or that the 1) bread is not Christ's body, one should badly take the words as they sound, and not change them, and let the bread be Christ's body.

41 Yes, says my Peter Rülz, that [it] is a special piece proves that, because it begins with a large letter, namely: "This is my body" 2c. Item, there is a large dot in front of it 2c., where one is in the habit of starting new pieces. What do I hear? I had demanded reason and cause from the Scriptures; so you give me a dot and a capital letter. Is a dot and a capital letter holy scripture at Nashhusen by the plow? So I hear that once again you give me your conceit instead of divine scripture, and pay dirt for gold. Because you think that a dot and a large letter make something special and new, you want to persuade me to think so without writing. No, it is not a matter of opinion; Scripture, Scripture, Scripture, compel, urge, compel me with God's word that a dot and a capital letter always make a new thing. Where does a clear saying in the Scripture say: A dot and a capital letter make a special thing? Do you not hear, Peter? Peter, don't you hear?

Is not this a sin and shame of the spirit, that he would base such a great thing on such idle talk, who rages so horribly when he is not shown writing? How if my book had no point nor large letter, and your book had it both? So I hear well, our faith

would stand on the ink and pens, yes, on the good will of the scribes and printers; ei there it would stand fine! We say and want to have it in short, there should be dry, bright sayings and text, which force us with a clear mind, God gives, whether it is written with large or small letters, with dots or without dots. For if it were true among men that a dot and a capital letter make a new thing (as they do not), should my faith in the Holy Scriptures, without all sayings and words, stand only on an impotent dot and letter, which neither says nor sings anything? Then it would stand on a fur sleeve.

43) How, if in some books (for they are not all the same) a large letter and dot is put to remind that there is said a great thing, that the reader should remember and remember it the better? and not that something new is there. Something new starts there? How fine then would my faith stand on the doubt, which would have held that the point and letter would be there, that a new thing would begin! How often does one write the name of Christ with large letters through and through? How often does one draw a line underneath, or paint a hand, or otherwise make a special sign in a text, when nothing new begins? After all, dots and letters are a human thing and work, and it is even within man's power to make and set them as he pleases; and my D. Carlstadt wants to base divine faith and word on such a humanly impermanent thing?

44 Oh, what can I say? The spirit is truly not serious. One can see that it is a vain desire and does not care much about faith and God's word. Woe to faith, which one must support and seek help for and beg for, that it cannot find a word from the vast great Scriptures, when all articles are otherwise so abundantly and powerfully founded. And even if D. Carlstadt's opinion were right and true, I would not and could not believe it, because he uses dots and letters and does not come up with a word, and then does no more than say no to our bright, fine, orderly text. For I would have to think: Awe, it is a jugglery, and no reason there.

1) "that" is missing in the Jena.

Here I want to address all who accept D. Carlstadt's opinion, and say: D. Carlstadt's highest and some reason is that this piece "that is my body" 2c. is special and new beginning and addition as heard. Carlstadt's highest and most important reason is this, that this piece "this is my body" 2c. is a special and new beginning and addition, as has been heard. If he does not prove and maintain this, all his thing falls. He has no more; for everything that he subsequently says about his xxxxx and other things, all stands on the fact that this piece is a special new beginning; if this falls, and our reason remains that this piece hangs on the other, then Carlstadt helps neither nor Tatta, we have won. So such attachment forces and compels by force that the bread be Christ's body. For so the words read: "Take, eat, this is my body"; that forces by force, because it clings to each other, that that which he calls them to eat is his body. Carlstadt himself saw this well, so he took pains to divide and tear it apart, and yet found nothing but a dot and letters, which (as is known) are not in all books; and whether they are in all, nothing is certain whether they are there so that a new one begins, or for the sake of the reader's devotion. 1) And this is more plausible than that.

(46) But faith must be certain, and have for its foundation not dots or letters, but bright, dry sayings and whole, clear words from the Scriptures. Well, there you Carlstadters lie in a heap, as much as is yours. Your faith and art stands on an ohumächtigen, uncertain point and letter. On it the Belial dares his conscience and bliss, I do not. Therefore, dear sirs, my Carlstadters, you make many books; but look here, for God's sake, since you suffer need, and think that you prove this little piece "this is my body" to be a new beginning; there it all lies, there it burns, dear brothers, there it divides, there it tears, there it divides. Whether you write as many books as there is sand on the sea, if you do not help the cause here, you have lost. For (as I have said, and say again) the text is one upon another, "Receive, eat; this is my body". Let

1) i.e. to attract the reader's attention.

you hang the food on the body of Christ, it is contended that the bread is the body, and the body is that which they shall eat. You may not pass by. In spite of you all, and yet in spite.

Now tell me, what is to be thought of the spirit that can dare to do such an excellent thing without all scripture and word, only on a single point and letter? Is he not mad and foolish enough? Do you also think that he has a conscience? What should he not dare more, if he had room? What pious heart wants to provide something good or righteous to him? Well, I have done my part; he who wants to err about it always errs. And even though this is enough to answer all of Carlstadt's books, for since it remains that the host is Christ's body, it will probably learn for itself that he must confiscate the pipe, that he blasphemes us so shamefully and calls us dog-beaters, and pours over us with barrels full of disgraceful words. He has fought against us with his point and letter (which is his some wretched armor), as if one were running on a rock with a broken straw. And if he is right, why did he not remain full of his prophets.

48 But let us answer further, to establish the matter the stronger. And to the first, if he would say that I should also prove my belief that this piece "this is my body" is closest to it, because he denies it, and cannot prove his, that they are to be separated from each other, I answer: I let them stand together for this reason, that I find it so in the text, when one speaks, reads and hears it, that they all hang together, according to natural speech, and know no reason why I should or should separate such natural order and appendix of speech. I find it hanging together; but if it is to be divided, someone must prove it to me. That is probation enough for me. As soon as I let the Lord's Prayer stand thus: "Our Father, who art in heaven," 2c., I can no longer take it as a test, because the natural speech follows one another in this way, and I know of no other 2) reason why I should divide it thus: Our Father, who art in heaven

2) "other" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

sanctified 2c. But if it is to be divided, I will hear the cause and offer defiance.

49 So this is the natural speech: "Take, eat, this is my body," 2c. that it hangs on each other and follows, and knows no cause why it should be divided. For Carlstadt's point and letter create nothing; so he himself, and no one else, has no other. But afterwards we want to prove it also from clear writing, not with a dot or letter, for the sake of abundance, that [it] should and must hang on each other. Now let this probation be enough for a defiance against the Tenfel.

50. the third time he comes forth with his Greek language, and chokes on your word τούτο. For in Greek the words are thus: τούτο ἴστι τό σωμά μου. Which from the beginning of the Greek language should have been and still must be interpreted thus: "This is my body"; and Latin: Hoc est corpus meum. This is the Greek completely given, that not a hair is missing, as this must testify 1) all, who know Greek there; without Peter Rülz to Orlamünda, he has found something new there and pretends, one may not interpret it enough, but would be fair, one leaves the τούτο and says: τούτο is the body mine. 2) What shall I say? I would like to laugh at the monkey game, if it did not concern such serious matters. The donkey's head wants to master the Greek language, and does not yet know German or Latin properly, is silent about Greek and Hebrew, and appears so impudently before all the world, as if there were vain Peter Nützen from Naschhnsen here, who did not understand Greek.

Now, the only thing that matters to the spirit of the mob is that he excites and attracts the mad rabble, who otherwise have a desire for strange new things, and he should speak up here and say: "How is D. Carlstadt such an excellent man, who finds such things that are hidden from all the world, and yet wears a gray skirt and felt hat with great humility, and does not want to be called Doctor, but neighbor Endres; God and the Holy Spirit dwell here with

all feathers and eggs. For what falls to the lot of Carlstadt is not because they understand his reason, which is impossible. For he mumbles, breaks and strangles himself over the words, and can't speak out what he wants; God perhaps refuses him, or is otherwise not skilled. To speak German. I also know that no one can say what D. Carlstadt's reason is, if he were to eat all his books. But that is why they fall to him, that he pretends to great art and splendid words and confidently blasphemes, and shows how it is so foolish to reason that Christ's body should be in the sacrament. But in this way one must excite and ape the rabble. It does not matter much if he does not know the reason, but it does not hold.

52 Therefore, I must do two things: the first is to explain Carlstadt's reason and opinion more clearly; the second is to answer it. Now D. Carlstadt's dream of his τούτο thus holds. The German, Latin and Greek languages all three speak of all kinds of things in three different ways. Of some as of man-forms, and call it the, this, that. By some as of female formations, and call it the, this, that. By some as neither male nor female, and call it this, this, that. Thus one speaks: the sky, the moon, the star, the man, the boy, the dog. Item, the sun, the earth, the air, the city, the woman, the maid, the cow. Item, the water, the wood, the fire, the light, the horse, the pig. But the Hebrew language has no that, but vain the and the.

Now Carlstadt contends thus: Brod in Greek and Latin is a der, and not a das. For they say, the xxxxx, the panis, but we Germans say, the Brod. But body is a that in Greek and Latin; for they say, the xxxxx, the corpus; but we Germans say, the body. Because Christ speaks here: τούτο ἴστι τό.

σωμά μου, "this is my body", and does not say, "this is my body", he does not point to the "bread", which is a der in Greek, but to his "body", which is a das in Greek. Do you understand now what D. Carlstadt wants? This is his Greek

1) Walch and the Erlangers: show.

2) In the "conversation booklet".

τούτο, which in German means that. With this, as a new Greek, he wants to have won from the Greek language that Christ's body is not in the sacrament, because he does not say: this is my body, but, this is my body; because it is said in un-Greek about bread: this is my body.

No Greek has ever seen such art, which was born in the language from the time of Christ. But now it is invented at Orlamünde, perhaps in an old picture, since they stormed images, or have it from the heavenly voice. And the man, who has hardly seen the abece in Greek, does not give so much honor to those who were born and educated in it, nor to those who now know Greek deliciously in German and all countries, that they would also have felt and noticed it in so long a time; yet nothing easier would have been to feel and notice; for no child is in German, if someone speaks of a woman before him thus: the woman is beautiful, the man is pious, it would laugh and say, you are a dodderer or gypsy. And all Greece and all the world should not have felt the same in the Gospel, when Christ says, τούτο is my body; yet all the world knows that with the τούτο they pointed to bread, and still point today. If a Greek child hears that someone says: the άπρος, it should also laugh soon; and yet no one has laughed, since all the world has said of άπρος or bread: this is my body.

And this foolish spirit still wants to lead all Greeks to school. But, as I have said, man has lost his forehead, eyes, brain and heart, so that he is neither ashamed nor afraid, and may dare everything as it occurs to him. He knows indeed that he does not know Greek, and proves [it] also honestly, since he uses the Greek τούτο ιστι τό σωμά μου thus ver

interprets in Latin: istud panis est hoc corpus meum, and in German, ist der Leib mein, makes the article τό a pronoun, and puts panis drein 2c. But which German thus speaks, "This is the body mine"? Nor may he knowingly build his faith on such his ignorance, and all the world with him. If one may rely on his conscious and recognized ignorance, article of the

How much more could he do it on an uncertain delusion or doubt? Yes, what should not such an impudent spirit dare? My heart is frightened in my body at the thirst and iniquity of man in divine matters, who is so stupid, fugitive and despondent against men on earth.

56. now we want to say cause, why Christ τούτο, that, and not the, from the

Brod says. In the German tongue there is a kind of language that when we point to a thing that is in front of us, we call it a das, otherwise it is a der or die. As if I were to say: This is the man I am talking about, this is the virgin I mean, this is the woman who can, this is the maid who sang, this is the journeyman who told me, this is the city that did, this is the tower that lies on, this is the fish I brought. Here I refer to all Germans, whether I also speak German. It is ever the right mother tongue, and so speaks the common man in German lands.

(57) In the same way, the Greek language with its τούτο says of bread, when it points to it and says: this is my body, which is given for you; therefore I refer to all those who know Greek. But the Latin language cannot speak in this way, for it has no articles like the Greek and German. And especially it is said among my Saxons, who did and did, like the Greeks, that they almost agree with the Greek, τούτο ιστι τό σωμά μου, Tut es te Lif, Tut es te Fruwe, Tut es min Lif [this is the body, this is the woman, this is my body] Otherwise, where D. Carlstadt's dream should apply, one would also have to say that it would not be said in German, if I said: this is my body, which is given to me, because body is one in German tongue. For so we say: the body is great, and yet say: this is the body that pleases me 2c. So also: this is the body that is given for you. But D. Carlstadt shows herewith that he knows almost as much German as Greek.

58 So, if I wanted to speak in German in the sacrament, and had a roll or a bread roll.

host before me in my hand, which are both the same. I would say: this is the food, and not: this is the food; so also, of the same bread roll or host Christ says: this is my body 2c. Ask now why I cannot say: this is the man, and yet say: this is the man. I cannot say: the woman, the maid, the city, the journeyman; and yet I must say, this is the woman, this is the maid, this is the city, this is the journeyman. I know of no other cause than that there is and wants to have the kind of languages as God created them. So no Greek can say: this xxxx, and yet must say, this is the xxxx; so he also says: this is my body which is given for you.

> One more thing, dear Peter Rülz, let Gemser try whether he could pierce your ears. You say that your τούτο should point to the body of Christ, and not to the bread, since he says: τούτο, or this is my body.

Tell me, dear Peter, what does the other τούτο, which soon follows, point to? Since Lucas Cap. 22, 20. and Paul 1 Cor. 11, 25. say of the other part of the sacrament, thus: "Likewise (he) took the cup after they had supped, and said, τούτο or this cup is the new testament in my blood" 2c. Here the word τούτο is expressed, and in the text points to the cup which he presents, and not to the blood of Christ which sat there. For this is how it reads in Greek:

τούτο το ποτήριον η χαινὴ διαθήκη ἐστίν ἐ" τὸ αἷματί μου., "this cup is the new testament in my blood." Say on, so the Tuto yes should and must point to Christum, and yet points here in the text expressed to the cup, whether your faith considers or calls Christ's blood or Christum Himself a cup? Would it not be an opinion, so that all your things are vain new things, that you call his blood not a cup, but a bowl basket or spoon food?

60 Do you hear it, Mr. Peter? How do you sweat so much? Isn't it winter and hard and frozen? Would you like to have a sweat towel? Won't a big letter or a dot help here? Or doesn't the τούτο here want to be a das, and the cup a der? so that grammar would come to the rescue, because the spirit does not

can? For chalice in Greek is also a that, and not a the, τούτο ποτήριον.... Be

are you not the man who loves the straight truth? and, as you boast, you are stiff-necked against lies, but soft against the truth. Well then, be soft here and let it be said to you, give honor to the truth and confess that you did not look at the τούτο rightly, and that the man who came to you and tells you was not your heavenly Father, as you lie and blaspheme, but the wretched devil or his mother, that he showed you the one τούτο with the bread and let the other go with the cup.

61 What do you want to say against this, hui! all Carlstadters in one heap? Then you must be silent and punish your blasphemy and lying mouths, and as the publicly and irrefutably conquered confess that, just as the cup does not point to the sitting Christ, but to the cup and blood, which Christ gives to his disciples and calls them to drink, and says that it is a new testament in his blood, so you must also confess that the bread does not point to Christ's body, but to the bread, which he gives to them and calls them to eat. Do you have anything against this? Let me hear. Behold, thus God can catch the prudent in their own prudence. For these prophets thought that with the τούτο on the bread they would turn the whole world around, but did not see that the τούτο on the cup would instantly trample them into dirt, that they would no longer be allowed to kick.

Is this not a misfortune for the man? The evangelists put it there precisely so that they would certainly point to the bread and speak in the most simple way, and to ward off the error that Carlstadt is driving at it: and he takes it and pulls it to himself to strengthen such error with it. Tell me now, dear Peter Rülz, who has the sword by the edge, or who has it by the hilt? I mean, you are hit, and Gemser has thrust you with your own τούτο, so that you pretend to fence excellently. You should know which one of us has the spirit and knows the right art. If I should now also pay thee with blasphemous words, as thou didst not know the reverend Sacrament, the holy Body and

Blood of Christ, so gruesome and horrifyingly beautiful, where would I take words enough? For your sin and blasphemy is beyond measure.

But even if D. Carlstadt were to stand by all things with his *toúro*, and [it] were as he dreams, I have proven above that [it] would not help him, because he has not fought for it nor can he fight for it, that this piece "this is my body" is a special new thing, separated from the others, that my poor Rottengeist, where he wants to go out, is too far away from all bushes 1). For where the piece is not a special one, but clings to the other, then it tears away everything that D. Carlstadt does or does not do, cackles or cackles, and remains firm with all defiance that in the sacrament is Christ's body. But where this remains, the Holy Spirit has power to speak thus: the servant, the man, and it does not matter at all, does not hinder and does not help, whether he says: the bread or the bread; not that he does so here, but if he did so, that Carlstadt would gain nothing by it. Everything must be something higher than *roZulao* *Zramwatiao* are, which is to establish the faith. For also John in his Evangelio, Cap. 1, 4. ff., where he speaks of the light, and calls it a that, soon after he calls it a that, and speaks: The world did not know him, does not speak thus: The world did not know it; that D. Carlstadt is ridiculous in this, not only with his Greek art, but also that he wants to put articles of faith from grammar. If then my faith is to stand on the *donat* 2) or primer, then it stands truly badly.

How many new articles will we have to put if we want to master the Bible in all places according to the grammatical rules? How often does it speak *contra convenientiam numeri, generis, personae, etc.*? Yes, what language does not? We Germans have night for a die, and say, *die* Nacht. Nevertheless, we also sometimes make a das out of it and say: des Nachts; it is quiet at night and sleeps well. That my D. Carlstadt might have stayed at home with his grammar, and instead would have given us sayings and

He brought forth the text from the Scriptures, as was fitting, so that he would have overcome the fact that his *toúro* had to rhyme with Christ's person and not with bread. For he wants scripture from us, so we want it from him again. Well, hui! still fresh on, dear Peter, show but one little word from Scripture that *toúro* points to Christ's person, not to bread? If so? We don't believe anything in your grammar, the reason is too sandy and uncertain.

So now you see, my dear reader, how the matter stands over this *Tuto*. D. Carlstadt defies it only by saying no to it, that it does not point to bread, and that it is not bright and certain enough; he stands on it. This is an outright insolence against the natural way and sequence of language, and he wants to have it proven that it points to bread. Thus, although the nature of the speech assists us, we have, to top it all off, proved violently from the text that it must point to bread, because it points to the cup in the altered part; this shuts him up. So we now also step again on our No, and demand that he prove how the *Tuto* points to the body of Christ, as he says and puts. For he who says yes must prove his yes against him who says no. Come on, Defiance, Defiance, let him also bring a text for his yes, as we have brought for our yes. For that he says no to our yes, which does not suffer the manner of speech, and says yes to our no, is nothing; he shall punish our no with a bright saying from the text, and confirm his yes, just as we punished his no with a bright saying in the text, and confirmed our yes. If he puts us in defiance, he shall have won. But we pray that he may be merciful to us here, and not scorch our turnips.

But it goes as I said; the spirit is not serious in the great matter, the devil only drives his game and mockery out of it. Well, then, I will order D. Carlstadt with his Greek language to the Greek speakers, that they drive away the tickle from him, and I will punish him quite well, so that he does not pretend to speak Greek another time, because he could do it before. I will act against him with the Scriptures 3),

1) In the old editions: "püsschen", which is probably to be resolved with "bushes" i.e. hiding places, evasions.

2) "Donat" at that time the first textbook in Latin.

3) Walch and the Erlangeners: him.

and scripture set forth by him. If he does that, he shall be knighted. I hope, however, that we at least want to remain safe from him this Shrove Tuesday, but God will help us further. Let this be said of dear Tuto, on which the great heavenly prophets have so vehemently insisted.

67 Let us take the text before us and see how it would rhyme if this piece "this is my body" were a special one, and pointed to Christ's person, not to the bread. For since Christ takes the bread in his hand, gives thanks and breaks it, gives it to his disciples and says, "Take it and eat," and immediately says without any means, "This is my body," the nature and natural consequence of the words compels him to say of the bread that he took in his hand, and gave it, and commanded it to be eaten. The disciples could not have understood it any other way, nor could anyone else understand it who heard it from him. For their eyes had to look on his hands, how he takes the bread, breaks it, gives it and offers it; and their ears had to hear the words, which he speaks over the giving and in the giving. Now he speaks no other word in the giving, but these: "This is my body" 2c.

68 If it is not his body, which he presents and calls to be eaten, when he says, "Eat, this is my body," then he has deceived them and teased them with words. What would it be like if I gave a gray skirt to someone and said, "Take it, eat it, this is my skirt," and pointed the words to my garment that I had on? Wouldn't that be foolish and deceived, if I, after I had said: Take it, show it, followed it without any means and said: This is my mardern hood? Other words would have to fall in between, which would lead him from the gray skirt, which I handed him and told him to put on, to my hood; from these words it would be impossible for him to understand. So, what would it be like if I gave a man a piece of bread and said, "Take it and eat it," and in this offering and hot

eat quickly followed it and said: This is a pound of gold in my pocket?

(69) Truly there must not be a tuto or a tatta nor a dot nor a letter in between, which would start a different and new understanding, it is too powerful on each other. There must be expressed straight words in between, which distinguish it, namely: Take and eat, because I have, or there is still a pound of gold in my pocket. So also: Take away, eat, here I still have, or there is still a mardern Schaub. So Christ should also have said here 2) Take, eat, for I say to you that here sits my body, which is given for you; otherwise it would have been a mockery and sophistical. As if one handed another a drink and said, "Take this, drink; here I sit, Hans, with the red pants. Or thus: Take it, drink, the Turk has beaten the soldier [Sultan], or otherwise led in a strange joke, which did not rhyme at all with drinking. In the same way, when Christ says: "Take, eat, this is my body, given for you, if it is to be a new beginning.

(70) If he had not spoken this word immediately and just at the time of giving, but a little before or after, it would have seemed so. But now, as soon as he gives and offers and is called to eat, he says, "This is my body," no man of any language can understand otherwise than that it is his body which he gives and is called to eat; or else we must allow that no one can be sure what one is saying to another. For if this bright and dry speech is to be torn asunder, no one is to speak to anyone else, I will interpret it differently, or must see to it that he interprets it differently. What would have been Christ's need, that he should say such words just now over the offering, and when he is called to eat, if he had other time for it, and well knew that they would not understand it otherwise, but from the bread, which he presented to them and told them to eat?

Therefore, it is not true that Carlstadt says that he added it to teach them what the memory should stand on.

1) marten - covered with marten fur. - Schaub - a wide outer garment.

2) "hie" is missing in the Jena.

He says this by force from his own head, and can prove it neither with writing nor otherwise. This does not mean to teach, to break off the speech at the wrong time, treacherously and briefly, and to fall unawares and without warning on another thing, precisely in the presentation of another thing, since he does not speak of it; it means rather to obscure, to deceive and to deceive. Teaching must be simple, clear, and must show that which is taught, and not give or show another thing, and at the same time teach or name another thing. It is not his teaching if I show you white and teach you about black, or show you the devil and teach you about God. Jacks and villains, or mockers and jokers do so, who either want to seduce or cause a laughingstock 1). A pious man who is serious does not do so.

(72) Also, what need would it have been for Christ to point to Himself twice, once to the body, and the other time to the blood? It would have been enough for him to say: It is I, or: This is my body, of which the prophets said that it should be given for you, as D. Carlstadt wills. Now, however, it is all fit to eat and drink; put it both ways. He takes something hard that is similar to food, namely his body, and something soft that is similar to drink, namely his blood. What would he have needed? He would have taken just as much something else that was not so similar to food and drink. For, as I have said, he might well have said badly, "I am the man who was given for you; in it there would have been no form of edible or drinkable thing.

Now that he gives both in bread, which is like an edible thing, and in wine, which is like a drinkable thing, and does this at no time except at table under the food, and also at the very moment when he presents it and calls it to be eaten and drunk, no conscience can ever be sure that denies this. And I know for a fact that even D. Carlstadt's conscience itself is fidgety and uncertain here, as it cannot digest such punches, even if it were so obdurate and

1) Erlanger: Blaspheme.

blinded. For Christ might have taught it at another time, and not spared it until they ate and drank, and until he presented it, and commanded it to be eaten and drunk.

74. item, what does this mean? When he had given the bread and said, "This is my body," 2c. he begins again with the cup, and again gives the wine and says, "This is my blood. If this were a new beginning, when he says "this is my body," and wanted to teach what this 2) remembrance should stand on, he should not have thus divided it and separated it from one another, but should have attached body and blood to one another and thus said, "This is my body and my blood: This is my body and my blood, which is given and shed for you. Thus the teaching would have been his and just accomplished. But since he separates them, keeping one for the food and the other for the drink, and puts so many words between the two, namely, "He also took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink from it,'" it may well be understood that it is for the food and drink that the Lord is concerned, that he says, "This is my body, this is my blood.

(75) Yes, behold, how this spirit in his cleverness is deceived. He pretends that this piece, "This is my body, which is given for you," does not belong to the one that goes hard before it, namely, "Take, eat," but should be a new thing of its own for itself, and yet he confesses, must also confess, that this last piece, "This doeth for my remembrance," belongs to the first, as "Take, eat. Now is this not a wanton outrage, when in a speech three pieces follow one another and hang on one another, that someone may say: The first and last belong together, but the other and middle belongs to none, but is a special thing, and does this without reason of Scripture from his own head? How can reason suffer that the third or last should be attached to the first, and the other, which stands between the two, should belong to neither?

76. that would be just as if I had said in this speech [Matth. 7, 15.]: "Jesus said to his disciples: Beware of the false pro-

2) Erlanger: the.

phets who come to you in sheep's clothing," is to say that the middle part, "Beware of false prophets," does not belong to the first nor to the last part, but is a new thing of its own; so that this text should read: Jesus said to his disciples, who come to you in sheep's clothing, for you must beware of false prophets. An insolent man might say this, but no one is so foolish as to believe it. It is just this that this insolent spirit rages in this place, seeing that this piece "this is my body" 2c. follows the first without any means, so that there is also not an and in between, and in addition it is spoken between two pieces, which nevertheless belong together.

(77) But that D. Carlstadt here mends himself with a gloss, and says that so much is said, as if Christ would have said: Dear disciples, you have heard that the prophets proclaim of a body that is to be given for sin; so I tell you that this is the same body, 2c. I answer first, Who said it? Who told him to put such a gloss here? How can we be sure that this gloss and addition is right? Where is Scripture and reason here? Where does the text enforce this? Yes, where does it show it with a single syllable? Carlstadt says so; if this is enough, it is much more enough that I say otherwise, who have the clear text and nature of the language for myself. Was Christ not so wise as D. Carlstadt that he would have added this himself, because it was so highly necessary that such an opinion be understood here? Where are the high prophets here, who also do not call the Lord's Supper a sacrament, but want to have a name from the Bible? Item, they do not want to suffer the little word *enim*. Now you tell me, to add a little word or name (since there is no driving), they cry out for the very highest vice. But that they add such a big talk and gloss, which spoils it all, that is called indulgence. Do you see the devil there, who makes all trouble out of that which is nothing and free, and makes nothing out of the word of God, where all power lies? This is his way through and through.

78. dear god, when we are equally bright and

Although we have certain sayings of Scripture for us, there is still effort and work to keep us from the devil; and this lying spirit wants to lead us to his own words, so that we have no other remedy than to say: D. Carlstadt said it. Oh, how finely we should insist, that is, I mean, lead the people to Christ; yes, to the devil in the bottom of hell. But I will report his advice. He probably thought, the Schalksgeist, they will attack me with these bright sayings, what will I do? I will come before them and dull them with glosses. But he did not see, the mad fool, that making them dull and blunt with his own gloss without writing would do nothing, except that it would only become the sharper; for because one sees that he brings no writing for himself, and goes out alone with his own invented gloss, that he himself had to feel that the text was too powerful and too bright for him; that therefore his denial is probably as good as a twofold confession, and his patching is probably as bad as two cracks. It does not mend itself so, dear lying spirit, you must lead writing and text.

79) On the other hand, I would also like to hear a text from the prophets that proclaim a body and blood to be given for sin, as this lying spirit alfenzt. They say of the whole person that he should suffer, but not of the body and blood. Since here Christ clearly mentions body and blood and thus points to the prophets, as the spirit says, the word body and blood in the prophets should agree with Christ and be found in one place, so that he would remind the disciples rightly and they would understand him. Hui! you lying spirit, who does not suffer a word to be put to God's words, show us where the prophets say about a body or blood? Where did the disciples hear it in [a] few prophets? Seest thou, but once, that [it] is vain honor and fancied thing and addition with the Spirit? The whole Christ should suffer; but over the table he divideth it so, that he giveth the body to eat, and the blood to drink. Which division was not necessary nor could be in suffering. That is why the prophets also spoke of suffering, and

not said of this division or communion.

80) In the third place, if such a great addition is to be made, how is it to rhyme with what follows soon after, "This do in remembrance of me?" which is to rhyme with the meal, when he says, "Take, eat. Shall this leap back over so many words and long sermon, that it comes to, that to which it belongs? What language has such a way or manner of speaking that between two words that belong to each other, it throws in such a heap of words and such a sermon? Surely one must conclude that [it] is a wanton sacrilege. But, as it is said, he shall prove it; we will wait for that.

This is to answer the reasons and causes that D. Carlstadt gives for his dream from the Scriptures, which were three. The first, that a large letter stood there in some books, not in all. The other, that there was a dot. The third was the dear τοῦτο. O holy excellent reasons, which no one should lead 1) without such heavenly prophets who hear God's voice! The fourth is that he cannot bring for himself a single saying from Scripture. And this reason is the strongest of all, which will remain forever; I will not overthrow it, but help to strengthen it.

82) Furthermore, he teaches us what Mrs. Hulde, the natural reason, says about these things, just as if we did not know that reason is the devil's whore, and nothing can but blaspheme and defile everything that God speaks and does. But before we answer this arch-whore and bride of the devil, let us first prove our faith, and set forth not great letters, nor dots, nor Tuto Tato, but dry, bright sayings, which the devil shall not overthrow.

In the first place, no one can deny that the three evangelists, Matthew [Cap. 26, 26], Marcus [Cap. 14, 22], Lucas [Cap. 22, 19], and also Paul (1 Cor. 11, 24), since they write about the first part of the sacrament in unison, also say almost in the same words that Christ took the bread, gave it, and gave it.

and gave it to his disciples, saying, "Receive and give; this is my body, which is given for you." They were speaking of the same thing, that whatever the words of Matthew the Evangelist are understood to mean in this place, they must also be understood to mean the words of Marci, Luke and Paul the Evangelist. Is it not certain then? Despite who says otherwise. So it is certain that all four are of the opinion that Christ did not call the disciples here dancing or whistling, but eating, according to the words: "Take, effet, this is my body" 2c.

(84) Well, then, it must be irrefutably confessed that these four, writing of the other part of the sacrament, are of the same mind, and all four want to speak of the same thing in the same place. Defiance, which here could also say otherwise. So then, when Matthew says [Cap. 26, 28], "This is the blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins," it must be just the same, and as much as when Marcus says [Cap. 14, 24], "This is the blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many." Item, therefore also since Lucas [Cap. 22, 20.] and Paul [1 Cor. 11, 25.] say, "This is the cup, the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you," must be and want just the same, which Matthew and Marcus want by these words: "This is my blood shed for many." Who can always say or think otherwise here? Since Lucas and Paul, by the words, "This is the cup," do not point to the visible body, or to the visible blood of Christ, but to the visible cup, as the words forcefully and brightly stand, saying, "This is the cup," but Christ's body, or blood, is neither cup, nor pitcher, nor bowl, nor plate: we must also say that Matthew and Marcus speak of the same visible cup, and not of the visible blood of Christ, since they say, "This is my blood." So that the little word "that" in all the evangelists is nowhere intended to indicate or refer to anything other than that which Christ presents, namely the cup or drink, and which is called drink. Or we will have to say that the evangelists did not

The same thing was meant, nor was it written in the other part of the sacrament.

With this we have enough for this time that, as was said above, Carlstadt's acts and deeds are lost, and it remains firmly established that the evangelists and Paul do not speak of the visible blood of Christ, but of the cup or wine, since they say: "This is my blood of the new testament," item, "This is the cup, the new testament in my blood. But where we have received that in the sacrament the blood of Christ is true, as these words enforce, this must at the same time remain firm, that in the other part of the sacrament also the body of Christ is true. And so everything that D. Carlstadt says against this is laid low, and it is found that nothing is but his own dream, which he has quite carelessly wanted to drive into Scripture, and must be called *sta foris* [stay out].

(86) Now that he blasphemes with many mocking and scornful words, such as that Christ should be brought in bread and wine, whether he [Christ] should whistle us up if we will, and such like words of shameful blasphemy, it is evident that they are words of a reckless spirit or devil, which serve to excite the loose rabble and to provoke those who do not care much for faith and conscience. But where there are good hearts that ask about conscience and faith, they are truly not satisfied with such jokes and invectives and blasphemies. They want to have God's word, and so they say: What do I care about Carlstadt's dreams, mockeries or blasphemies? I see here dry, bright, powerful words of God that force me to confess that Christ is body and blood in the sacrament. So I should stop answering and mocking. How Christ is brought into the Sacrament or how we must be whistled up, I do not know, but I do know that God's word cannot lie, which says that Christ's body and blood are in the Sacrament.

I do not yet want to answer the sophistical and poor little bells that D. Carlstadt mends and laps about the chalice here. 1)

1) "läppen - to put on a rag.

Oh! it must bite badly, 2) what this text is supposed to break off. Carlstadt's words do not; they are Carlstadtian and nothing more. But after this I will show his sophistry. Now let it be enough that it is strongly proven how the evangelists and Paul, with the words "This is my body, this is my blood, this is the cup," do not point to the visible body and blood of Christ, as Carlstadt dreams, but to that which he presents to the disciples and calls them to eat and drink. We have conquered and won this little piece in such a way that neither Carlstadt nor all the devils with all their sophistry can overthrow it, that I know for sure. But it is the way of the spirit, as I have said. He has no interest in the outward word of God and signs; he attacks them freshly and does with them as he pleases, and then tells us his own trumpety, invented from his own head without any foundation in Scripture; this must be called the right spirit.

88) On top of these four great sayings, we have another, 1 Cor. 10:16, which reads: "The cup of libation which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" This is, I think, a saying, yes, a thunderbolt on D. Carlstadt's head and of all his rotten. The saying has also been the living medicine of my heart in my contestation over this Sacrament. And if we had no more sayings than this one, we could strengthen all consciences sufficiently with it, and strike all opponents mightily enough.... Oh how D. Carlstadt feared the spell, and began to build a great strong vault over himself against this thunderbolt. But when he reached for stone and lime, he seized cobweb and amen, 5) as we will hear when we come to the tender gloss of his witty and scriptless head.

89 But notice here, first of all, that Paul here neither did nor did not do great or great things.

2) So the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Walch and the Erlangeners: "hot".

3) Erlanger: still.

4) Erlanger: one.

5) So the Wittenbergers and Jenaers: "amen". Walch and the Erlangeners: "one". "Ainen" - little glasses, tips of the ears.

but brightly says: "The bread that we break". And especially he says: "That we break", not only that Christ broke in the Lord's Supper, so that herewith Carlstadt's lie lies in mud, since he pretends: if Christ had given his body and blood for food in the Lord's Supper, would it not follow that also the Christians afterwards or we may do it. To this we answer with this saying: "The bread we break"; we, we, we. Who are these we? I hope that D. Carlstadt will find another *roúto* in the Greek language that teaches us that "we" means as much as Christ himself alone, and will then boast to his Peter Rülz that the Greek language does not suffer otherwise.

90. note secondly that Paul speaks of the bread in the sacrament, which Christ broke, and afterwards the apostles also broke; which breaking is nothing else than making pieces or dividing, in the Hebrew way, Is. 58, 7: "Break the hungry your bread"; Klagl. 4:4: "The young [children] were eating bread, and no one was breaking it for them." 2c. Lest we be reproached here once more by the spirits of the wicked as Christ's betrayers, that we 1) do not bake or break with fingers, but take many particles and hosts. For this they call breaking, and are not satisfied with it, that it is otherwise made into pieces, let it be with hand, knife, or however it may be, as it is called broken in the Hebrew way. Also, do not forget that he does not call it the shape of bread, as the papists do, but fresh and bad bread; so that we know how not to sin on this side, if we call it bread and keep it according to St. Paul's way, which the papists make a heresy.

Notice for the third time that he says brightly and clearly, "The same bread which we break is the fellowship of the body of Christ. Do you hear, my dear brother? The bread that is broken or divided into pieces is the fellowship of the body of Christ; it is, it is, it is (he says) the fellowship of the body of Christ."

of the body of Christ. But what is the fellowship of the body of Christ? It cannot be otherwise than that those who take the broken bread, each his part, take in the same the body of Christ. That this fellowship is so much as to be partakers, that each one receives the common body of Christ with the other, as he says there [1 Cor. 1:17]: "We are all one body, partakers of one bread." Therefore, from time immemorial, it has been called communion, that is, fellowship.

(92) Here, D. Carl-, stadt, masterfully commits a crime, and would like to make this saying dull and dull beforehand, so that no one would notice how he is affected by it, and needs his spirit to be wrong, which makes everything that God sets outwardly and physically spiritual and inwardly, and again, what God wants to have inwardly and spiritually, that he makes outwardly and physically, as I have said above. So here he takes the word "fellowship" before him, and with it wants to enter into the spirit and make a spiritual fellowship out of it, and pretends that those of the body of Christ have fellowship who with outstretched desire consider the suffering of Christ and also suffer with it 2c. How then they have invented their new speech to such new understanding.

But if one asks: Where is the reason and the Scripture that prove such gloss; or where is the text that enforces it? then he points us to the smoke hole, or to the man who came to him and tells him. How could he do otherwise? The sentence was not to his liking, and yet he could not resist it. Therefore, before he left him like this, he thought, "It is better that I give him a nose as I can; if the Scripture will not help, then let my mad, mischievous head help, it is full of spirit, that is just enough for it, it tells me even more, namely, that the fellowship of the passion of Christ and the fellowship of the body and blood of Christ are one thing. Is it not his? Awe 4) Yes, quite. It is only a matter of one letter, that one changes the d into the b and the b into the d, then the word "suffering" becomes the word "body", and again. So you have

2) Walch and the Erlangeners: "sich nun".

3) Walch and the Erlangeners: "from the."

4) Cf. Mos. 10:10.

1) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. In the old edition of Walch and the Erlangen: "wir's".

it like the eel by the tail, must not lead any writing to it.

Oh, let the mad spirit depart. We answer his gloss thus: First, that the fellowship of Christ's suffering cannot be the fellowship of Christ's body and blood. For he that shall suffer with Christ, or be partaker of his suffering, must be fresh, spiritual, and believing. A sinful, carnal man cannot. But the unworthy also become partakers of the body of Christ, as St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 11:29: "He that eateth bread unworthily eateth judgment." Just as it happened to the traitor Judah in the Lord's Supper, who had fellowship with other disciples of the body and blood of Christ and was partaker [Matth. 26, 23. Luc. 22, 21]. For he received it, ate and drank with it, as well as the other disciples.

But that Carlstadt makes the fellowship of the body and blood of Christ a spiritual fellowship, and does not want it to be the reception of the body and blood in the bread and cup, I leave it to St. Paul, who says: "The bread that we break is the fellowship of the body of Christ" [1 Cor. 10:16]. Now the breaking of bread is a bodily external thing, no one can deny that. So they themselves say that an outward breaking or eating is nothing, one must eat Christ's body spiritually 2c. How then can the outward breaking and eating of bread be a spiritual communion, as D. Carlstadt says? Item, the unworthy and ungodly also break and eat bread, as Judas Iscariot and some Corinthians did, 1 Cor. 11. These have fellowship of the body of Christ and are partakers of it, as this saying forces that the breaking of bread is fellowship of the body of Christ. For this saying must be strictly obeyed, that where this bread is broken, there is the fellowship of the body of Christ.

96 Thus it is evident here that Paul is not speaking of the spiritual fellowship that only the saints have, as Carlstadt dreams of, but of a bodily fellowship that both saints and unholy have, just as the breaking of bread. That

one sees how D. Carlstadt's dream is a lie, who thus 'has perhaps' thought: I want to attack and torture the little word "community" alone, and do not want to see that it says before: "The bread that we break" 2c.; otherwise my gloss would not suffer. If I do not look at it, then there is no one who will look at it or hold it against the word "fellowship"; so I have won, it costs me no more than that I think: the people are all blind.

97 Why then does St. Paul not say badly, "The bread we break is the body of the Lord," but adds, "the fellowship of the body of the Lord? I answer: Why does he not also say badly: The bread is the body of the Lord, like the evangelists and himself, 1 Cor. 11, 24, but adds: "which we break" [1 Cor. 10,16.]? He undoubtedly added both because he wanted to speak as brightly and clearly as he always could and forcefully ward off Carlstadt's error. For he wanted to speak of the bread of the sacrament; he could not do that better than to speak of the broken bread. Item, he wanted to teach that each one received Christ's body in his piece; therefore he did not want to call it the body of Christ alone, as in a whole loaf, but the body that was divided into the community and given to all in common through the breaking of bread: that therefore this breaking of bread was not only the body of Christ, but the community of the body of Christ, that is, a body that was divided and received by all in the community. For with these words he sees in the midst of the breaking of bread, the dividing and receiving, how it is done when bread is broken and presented and received, and says: This broken bread is the fellowship of the body of Christ, that they all take in common and mine the one body of Christ and become partakers of it bodily.

So you see and notice how this evasive devil has no other remedy than the one that he does spiritually (as is his way) what God does bodily, and yet he shows nor gives any reason or cause for his doing so, but says it as one who would have power to change articles of the

faith according to his good pleasure. So" here the bodily fellowship of the body of Christ must be spiritual, as he will do afterwards also with the unworthy eating and drinking; item, with the discerning of the body of Christ, as we shall see. Only that thou mayest notice and know the devil, I will show him to thee.

(99) It is a good little thing of his, which I could almost do; if a saying were too powerful for me, which speaks of bodily doings, and struck me on the head, so that my brain wavered, I would lead and say, He hath not struck me, he speaks of: spiritual doings, and were then free, that I might not prove any reason for such an interpretation, it would be easy to be a celestial prophet. And if I were forced to show reason, I would have to stand there like butter on the sun, and leave a little sweat for it, and say: He would have me be like this and be right.

100 Therefore this saying of Paul stands like a rock, forcibly enforcing that all who break, eat and receive this bread receive the body of Christ and become partakers of it. And this cannot be spiritual, as it is said, it must be bodily. For one cannot become partakers of Christ's body in any other way than in the two ways, spiritually or bodily. Again, this bodily communion cannot be visible nor sensible; otherwise no bread would remain. Again, it cannot be vain bad bread; otherwise it would not be a bodily communion of the body of Christ, but of the bread. Therefore, since the bread is broken, the body of Christ must also be real and bodily, even though invisible. There it is said, "Let him who is an iron-eater bite a gash at him; I will watch.

In the third place we have the saying 1 Cor. 11, 27: "Whoever eats this bread unworthily or drinks the cup of the Lord is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. Here, however, the spirit of the mob comes along and makes spirit, as St. Paul puts body, and calls unworthy to eat, who does not have Christ's remembrance and knowledge of his body right 2c. Do you ever ask: Where is Scripture? Where is reason? Where does the text give that? it shows you its slobber, and proves nothing.

more than that such sayings have caused him the burnt sorrow and wanted to make them incapable beforehand. It is as if I wanted to persuade someone who is waving a sword at me to believe that it is a straw, so that he will not strike me. But trembling before death does not help. Thou fainting spirit, how long wilt thou suffer thyself to be defied, that thou bringest writing or text? Are you not ashamed that you allow yourself to be defied as long as you put your slobber, your lies, your dreams into writing?

(102) Now when Paul says here, "He who eats and drinks unworthily," 2c., this is not rightly spoken, but should have been said: He that remembereth or knoweth not the Lord unworthily 2c. That unworthy eating and drinking is unworthy knowledge and remembrance of the Lord. Unless D. Carlstadt's spirit was missing here. But who wants to believe that? You must think that St. Paul was drunk in the evening, and when he spoke of unworthy food and drink, he forgot it and got lost. For he should have spoken of unworthy memory. But D. Carlstadt got it right on the sober morning and has now brought St. Paul's words into his order; Peter Rülz and the bride at Orlamünde thank him for this.

103) Now that we also say 1) St. Paul puts the bread and the body of Christ together here, just as he did above when he said, "The bread that we break is the fellowship of the body of Christ" [1 Cor. 10:16]. Did not mean to say: The bread we break is the fellowship of the bread of the Lord, as it would have sounded to D. Carlstadt. Neither did he want to say, "Whoever eats this bread unworthily sins or is guilty of the bread of the Lord," as Carlstadt would have liked, but "sins against the body of the Lord"; so that he would receive in both places that the bread of the Lord is the body of the Lord. For if he had not wanted this, he would have had to say as above: Whoever eats this bread unworthily is guilty of the bread of the Lord. How does the sin in the body of the Lord come to the eating, if he is not in the eating or

1) "also" is missing in the Erlanger.

Bread? Or should have said: Whoever eats this bread unworthily sins against the Lord's Supper, or against God, or against the commandment, or against the order of the Lord.

Now the nature and manner of speech dictates that he who eats unworthily is guilty of that which he eats. Therefore, it is not enough that D. Carlstadt says no and therefore carries a gloss, but because there is a clear text, and nature and manner of speech give: "Whoever eats this bread unworthily is guilty of the Lord's body," that the body of the Lord is eaten in the bread, and sin is committed in eating and drinking, he must use very powerful sayings and text so that we believe him. For the text forcibly enforces that sin is committed in eating and drinking, because it says, "He who eats and drinks unworthily"; and yet it says that the same sin is committed in the body and blood of the Lord. This is a great thing, that in eating and drinking he hath offended the body and blood of Christ, and hath dealt foully with him.

For not remembering the Lord properly is a special sin of unworthy eating, of which St. Paul does not say here. All the words in the whole chapter there, where he punishes them for their unworthy eating, indicate that the sin occurred entirely in eating and drinking. For this reason St. Paul rebukes them and wants them not to think that it is bad bread or wine that they eat and drink, and thus think themselves unworthy, but that it is the body and blood of Christ, against which they sin with such unworthy food. Such, I say, is the nature and manner of speech, so that one may think it is a vainly desired, compelled, and wantonly devised thing, which Carlstadt suggests against it, on which neither conscience nor faith can rest.

(106) It is not true that the sin which St. Paul gives to eating is to be appropriated to the memory by one's own thirst, since St. Paul does not speak of it. For he does not say how they unworthily keep the Lord's memory, but how they unworthily eat and drink. For there is neither appearance nor reason that one should be guilty of the body of the Lord by eating unworthily, and of the blood of the Lord by drinking unworthily, if not the body in the food,

and the blood in the drinking. "What was the need that he should divide it into two parts, that in unworthy eating the body of the Lord should be offended, and in unworthy drinking the blood of the Lord should be offended?"

107 Why does he not say: Whoever eats this bread unworthily is guilty of the blood of the Lord; whoever drinks this cup unworthily is guilty of the body of the Lord? since one of the two would have been enough for D. Carlstadt's opinion to stand. Carlstadt's opinion. Yes, it would have been enough, because he would have said: Whoever eats and drinks unworthily is guilty of Christ, or of the death of Christ, because D. Carlstadt understands by the unworthy eating the sin that one does not honor and practice Christ's suffering and death properly 2c. Now, because Paul attributes the guilt of the blood to the unworthy drinking of the cup, and the guilt of the body to the unworthy eating of the bread, the natural light of speech forces that the body is in the eating, and the blood in the drinking, and that no one who has some appearance can raise a reason against this.

But summa summarum, it is the Spirit, as I have said above, that makes inward all that which God makes outward. Therefore he must do the same here, and draw the blame that St. Paul gives to bodily eating and drinking into spiritual eating and drinking. For when he slandered them for eating and drinking unworthily, because they did not recognize Christ's body inwardly, nor remember it rightly, it is understood that he draws the eating and drinking into the spirit, which Paul puts outside. For to eat spiritually is to know Christ's body rightly and to remember it. But do you see the devil with his great spirituality, without any reason, scripture, cause, or some evidence spun out of his own head?

In the fourth place St. Paul says again in the same place [1 Cor. 11, 28. 29.]: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment, because he discerneth not the body of Christ. Here comes Peter Rülz buteins 1) with his Tarantara da-.

1) Erlanger: about.

and becomes a Greek man again, and says: the word διαχρίνων, which is

The word "who discerns" also belongs to the memory, that one must spiritually discern the body of Christ sharply, and follow the suffering of Christ with unshaken desire and eagerness 2c. Everything that this spirit teaches here must go to the spiritual memory of Christ. The bulge can no longer sing any other song. And would God that he could do the same, and did not use it so for the pretense of spreading his poison!

Dear Peter, I beg you, put your glasses on your nose or blow a little, so that your head will be lighter and your brain will be cleaner. Look at the text with us. You say that discernment is a matter of memory, but Paul says that it is a matter of eating and drinking. For he saith not thus, He that keepeth the memory of the Lord unworthily deserveth judgment, because he distinguisheth not the body of the Lord: but thus, He that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment, because he distinguisheth not the body of the Lord." Do you hear it, Mr. Peter? In unworthy eating and drinking this discernment does not happen; therefore judgment is earned. Is this not clear enough? Doesn't the text make it clear?

I could still give D. Carlstadt two guilders, if he would only once in all this trade, not for my benefit but for his own, do one thing to the two, either that he led sayings out of the Scriptures, or enforced from the text that his thing was right. But now he does no more, for he catches a little word and smears his slobber on it, as it seems good 1) to him, and in the meantime does not see that next to the same little word there are other texts, which both smearers and slobbers 2) push, so that he turns all four upside down. As here, when he long scribbles and drools that the distinction belongs to the memory of the Lord, he does not see that the light text stands there, and says that it happens in unworthy eating and drinking. Just as above, when he wanted to make the fellowship of the body of the Lord spiritual, he saw that the body of the Lord was spiritual.

1) "good" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) Jenaer: Drool.

he did not that the bodily breaking of bread broke his neck.

It is like the ostrich, which is such a foolish bird, because it comes with its neck under a branch, it thinks it is covered; and the young children, when they hold their hands before their eyes and see no one, they think they are not seen either: so this spirit also does, seizes a little word so that it adorns itself, and leaves the whole text, which exposes it and disgraces it.

I do not know whether he lets himself think that there is no Biblia or that there are no more people on earth. And indeed he should not do it against me, who warned him faithfully at Jena, he should just see to it that he does, I would not miss his. But he understood my words as he understands the Biblia, and calls me a mad sophist, a sow in the blood, a two-faced papist, and much the like. But I meant that he should perceive the matter well and hit it right. I almost wanted to say: "Around again, mass of souls, the penny is worth the pound. But it is God's work that Pharaoh's heart is hardened and blinded to his truth and word, to the comfort of all believers and to the terror of all hopefuls.

114 So then, this distinction is to be made in eating and drinking, as above this trespass and sin, in the body of the Lord, that "he who eats and drinks unworthily eats judgment. Why is this? Therefore, saith Paul, "that he distinguish not the body of the Lord." Now tell me, how is one to distinguish in eating and drinking the body of the HER? The Greek word διαχρίνων, in Latin discernere, means that one has a difference and does not consider one like the other, but one more noble, better and more delicious than the other. That St. Paul thus means: He who eats and drinks unworthily deserves judgment or good punishment; for with his unworthy eating and drinking he does not, non discernit, distinguish the body of Christ, but keeps and goes on with the bread and wine of the Lord, as if it were otherwise bad bread and wine, if it were not.

3) Walch and the Erlangers: the.

is the body and blood of the Lord. For if he took it seriously for the Lord's body, he would not approach and eat a loaf of bread with such indignity as usual, but with fear and humility and honor, for he would have to shrink from the Lord's body.

If this opinion is not right, then give another and say what Christ's body is. For there is no more in the word than this, that Christ's body should be something better and more delicious and special than other things. This is enforced strongly enough by the nature of the language. Since St. Paul testified and wants to have such a distinction in eating and drinking the Lord's bread and cup, it is strong enough from the text that one should hold the body of Christ better and higher than the bread and cup. So it must follow that the body and blood of Christ is in the bread and cup, because those who eat the dish with unworthy food do not distinguish the body of Christ: Eat not distinguish the body of Christ, and [those^ who eat it worthily, rightly distinguish.

But D. Carlstadt is not to be blamed. For since his spirit has in mind, as I have said, that he wants to make spiritual what God wants to have bodily, he must also proceed with the distinction here, and set a spiritual distinction inwardly in the spirit before: the knowledge and memory, since God wants to have a bodily distinction between the bread and body of Christ. But that he should also show reason and cause, or enforce it from the text. Rather, let him not be sworn to; you see that he has other things to do. It is enough that such a man says it. If you do not believe him, then believe his gray skirt and felt hat, in which the Holy Spirit must be, as you may well grasp.

It reminds me of this high art of D. Carlstadt as well as of those who deal with allegories, which St. Jerome compares to the jugglers in Prologo, as if I wanted to make Christ out of Dietrich of Bern, and the devil out of the giant with whom he fights, and humility out of the dwarf, and death out of his prison: Death

Christ, or any other knightly play or history before me, as I practiced my thoughts all and played with it, as he did, who drew Ovidii Metamorphosin completely on Christ. Or, lest my spirits be angry that I compare their thing so to worldly fables, if I took St. George's legend and said that St. George was Christ, the virgin he redeemed was Christianity, the dragon in the sea was the devil, the horse was the humanity of Christ, the spear was the gospel 2c. Item, since St. Peter sank into the sea, and Christ helped him, I would like to say: The sea is the persecution and tribulation in the world, Peter is every Christian when he doubts, and Christ is the grace of God 2c.

118 All the art of these prophets is in such deeds, which they do diligently; and because they have found many other such interpretations in the Old Testament, they also find more of them every day, and teach much about the seven sprinklings, and fill their books with such art, just as if it were a delicious thing, and no one but they alone could interpret it, and yet they generally interpret such foolishly foolish things, that one might cringe at them, especially the sevenfold sprinkling. Nor do they think that such interpretations must be proven from Scripture, and that they are not valid unless they are expressed clearly elsewhere, as I have written in the sermon on the ten lepers 2). But they, if they have only invented it, it is enough, so it is, already proved.

119. Carlstadt also does. After he has learned this from his prophets and has a whimsical head by nature, which always looks for something strange, which no one knew before, he goes to and wants to play dice with St. Paul's words and make allegories, as he is used to in the Old Testament. That is why St. Paul has to tell him here about spiritual and not about bodily fellowship, about spiritual and not about 3) bodily difference, about spiritual and not about bodily difference.

2) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XII, 1444.

3) The words: "and not of bodily fellowship, of spiritual" are missing in the Wittenberg and Jena editions, and we have taken them from Walch's old edition.

1) Walch and the Erlangers: shows.

talk of bodily unworthiness in eating, of spiritual and not of bodily guilt in the body of the Lord. And the silly fainting devil thinks that he should not be seen. No, journeyman, you are seen, you have not painted yourself enough, you must use more and different paint.

120. Would you like to say: Well, if it is true that the sea means persecution, and Christ means the grace of God, and the sinking means weakness or despair, it is also true that God's grace helps in persecution. So it is neither wrong nor false to have spiritual fellowship, to spiritually distinguish the body of Christ, to spiritually eat unworthily, and to spiritually be indebted to the body of Christ; and such allegories or interpretations are all true and quite beautiful.

121 I answer, "I do not now dispute whether they are all false or not. But I do know that they are often missing and are just a dream, because they are presented without any reason of the Scriptures, just as the sprinkling of these prophets is nothing at all, as they make believe. I dispute that D. Carlstadt not only puts all this in this place without any foundation in Scripture and text, but also wants to forcibly dampen, deny, and disgrace the right written understanding by such high spiritual pretense, which the text naturally enforces and does not suffer from its jugglery. If he would let us keep it intact, I would let him allegorize and spiritually interpret, juggle and play until he got tired of it. As if someone would let me keep that Peter had gone and sunk on the sea according to the written meaning, I would not ask anything about how he interpreted it, so far that it would happen without harm to the faith.

So, if Carlstadt would leave the bodily fellowship of the body of Christ, the bodily separation, the bodily unworthiness in eating, the bodily guilt in the unworthy eating, I would let him do what he wanted. For St. Paul also says Rom. 12, 7: "The prophecies should be similar to faith", so that each one does not interpret what and how he desires, and then lead his conscience to it. For

This is actually quite an illusion, since a thing seems to happen and to be true, and yet there is nothing behind it. Just as this D. Carlstadt's spiritual interpretation of St. Paul by him and his followers seems to be a deliciously excellent thing. But if you look at it in the light and according to the text, it is quite a jugglery. For it is neither reason nor truth, but invented by himself and imposed on the text by force.

If such a spiritual jugglery is to apply, then I would like to teach D. Carlstadt and all his prophets for another three years. Carlstadt and all his prophets for three more years; I am almost trained in this, since I first began to learn the Bible ten years ago, before I hit the right ground. I also wanted to say easily, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth", Gen. 1, 1.: "Heaven", that is, the angels and spiritual creatures; "earth", that is, the bodily creatures; don't you think it would be rightly said? Yes, but where is the text in the meantime? How shall I prove that in this place heaven and earth are not called the natural heaven and earth, as the languages are? Dear, the natural language is Madam Empress, it transcends all subtle, pointed, sophisticated poetry; one must not depart from it, unless a manifest article of faith compels; otherwise no letter would remain in Scripture before the spiritual jugglers.

In this way also the great teacher Origen was deceived, and he deceived St. Jerome and many others with him, so that before times his books were cheaply forbidden and condemned because of such spiritual jiggery-pokery. For it is dangerous to play with God's words in such a way as to govern conscience and faith. Therefore, it should be bright and certain, and everything should have a firm, secure, good reason, on which one may comfortably rely.

These are the main sayings in this article, so that by God's grace we may do enough for all good consciences to strengthen their faith. But if we do not convert the stubborn Carlstadters with this, we have won two things against them. The first is that they do not prove their case with Scripture,

nor force from the text, but lead vain own conceits and thoughts, so that they subjected themselves to darken the bright sayings, but nevertheless have failed. For that he says no to our opinion, we do not demand reason, but shall show reason, as we then do. But that he should say something else and show no reason, oh that is shameful of such a high spirit.

The other, that everything they bring up against us does not smear us, nor does it hold the sting; and in the end we also offer them defiance, that they still do their best; we do not want to be man enough for them with any other than these sayings, both on all their past, present and future art and wisdom, they should not take them from us like this. For Carlstadt's certain defiance lies in the fact that everything that the evangelists and apostles draw on food and drink with clear sayings, he draws on the memory of the Lord with his own conceit without any reason. Another one who can do it better.

If Carlstadt's rage of all things existed and falsely overcame our faith of all things (as it is impossible), what would he have accomplished? His faith would therefore not be right nor certain. For he proves nothing, but says it only therefore, as one says a fairy tale, leading neither reason nor scripture nor cause, so that no conscience can stoop to it 1) or rely on it, unless it wanted to rely on D. Carlstadt's louder words. So that whoever follows D. Carlstadt's opinion must sit down between two chairs and hover between heaven and earth, and keep nothing at all of the sacrament. For he leaves our faith and cannot take hold of it, unless he has some reason or saying for himself. And this is also what I have always said, that the devil's final opinion is to abolish the whole sacrament and all outward order of God, so that one only gapes at the spirit inwardly with the heart, as the 2) prophets teach.

128 So now (I think) everyone sees

1) d. i. support.

2) All other editions have "die", yet the Erlangen one has adopted "diese" from Walch's old edition.

well, that D. Carlstadt's spirit is the one that wants to ape people with the word "spiritual" and intends to make everything spiritual that God wants to have bodily, so that he makes a great appearance and prestige of his poison. But if he also set a reason for it, and did not just say, "This is how it is," but proved that it should and must be this way from and in the text, then it would be one of his spirits. But now he alone says his own, we may say, Thou deniest, dear spirit. "For all men are liars" [Ps. 116,11. The pope also lied like this, but his spirit acted more, that he made the spiritual bodily, as he made the spiritual Christianity a bodily external community, this red spirit again deals most with it, that he makes spiritual, what God makes bodily and external. Therefore, we go between the two and do nothing either spiritually or physically, but keep spiritually what God makes spiritually, and physically what He makes physically.

Whether some remain and persist in such error and the Sacrament of Carlstadt, or still fall into it, what would it be then? yes, if all the world were to fall away from our opinion. What must we do with the gospel, since there is more power in it? Does not the whole world fall away from it and fight against it? How few are they who are rightly attached to it? So do not be mistaken whether few act or believe the sacrament rightly. Let go what goes, see where you stay. It is no wonder that many err. It is a wonder that there are some who do not err, however few there are. Christ himself says: "Do you think that the Son of Man will find faith when he comes? [But whoever is mistaken here is mistaken through no fault of mine, for I have faithfully enough taught and taught.

By Mrs. Hulda, -the wise reason of D. Carlstadt in this Sacrament.

Now that we have laid the foundation from Scripture and proven our faith, and have laid Carlstadt's foundation, let us now see how he speaks of this matter, since he begins to consult reason, which first of all tells him the right reason. For D. Carlstadt has now become much more foolish than the papists have ever been. The Papists

have always made a point of using sayings from the Scriptures, even though they have dealt with them incorrectly. But D. Carlstadt has only Tuto and Tatto, point and letters, and own gloss from his head, not a single saying of the Scripture. Thus the papists profess that in the Sacrament not reason but God's word is to be followed. But D. Carlstadt picks up and brings together everything that reason can show, teach, judge in this; are these not joyful prophets and heavenly spirits to me?

The first part of this highly praised reason is that it concludes: Where in the Sacrament Christ's body and blood would be, it must follow that the bread would be crucified and given for us, and not Christ Himself, because the text speaks, "This is my body given for you." What words, then, does Frau Hulda interpret to be said as much as: The bread is given for you. Item, be also as much as: My body will not be given for you before it has become bread 2c. What do you think about prudence? Defy! and say now that these are not heavenly prophets. Ask now where they have learned such grammar, or for what reason they interpret Christ's word in this way, and you may hear the heavenly voice.

132 Let us continue. It is pure evil, since the devil is involved. Tell me, Mrs. Hulda, you who are otherwise so pure that you do not suffer a word of addition or interruption from us in God's word, how then are you so impolite here, and add so many words, and say: My body is not given for you before, it has become bread? Item, why do you break off in the other part and say: The bread is given for you? Show me, which language has the kind, that it understands this piece "this is my body, which is given for you" thus or expresses: The bread is given for you; or thus: My body is not given for you before it became bread? How, if all languages understand this piece not differently than thus: "This is my body, which is given for you" 2c. ? There is no other body, which is given for you, but this, which I give you here in the bread 1).

1) Walch and the Erlangers: "in death".

to eat. It does not follow that he will be eaten and crucified at the same time, but the one who is eaten at this time will be given to you afterward, when he is not eaten.

I will take John the Baptist as an example, when he points to Christ and says: "Behold, this is the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" [John 1:29]. Listen here, red spirit, John says that Christ carries or takes away the sin of the world, and yet he is not yet on the cross. Dearly beloved, go and say, From this it follows that Christ is not crucified for us. For the words are, that Christ did not bear the sin of the world before John pointed to him and called him the Lamb of God, and that no other Christ was crucified for us, nor at any other time or place than when John pointed to him at the Jordan. For there he bears sin before he is crucified, just as here he is given for us in the bread.

Item, Joh. 10, 12, Christ says: "I am a good shepherd, and I lay down my life for my sheep. Let us learn from you that because Christ here points to Himself as laying down His life for us, it must follow that it was at the same hour in the Jewish school that He spoke the words to Himself and about Himself, and not on the cross, that He was not crucified for us afterwards. For the words *do not indicate otherwise, when he speaks v. 15, "I lay down my life." Say not, I will lay down my life; as he saith here, He that is given for you, and saith not, He that is given for you. Item, so also this must be understood, when he says there, "I give them eternal life;" says not, I will give them. Item, when he says Joh. 17, 19.: I sanctify myself for them; does not say: I will sanctify myself for them. Oh, be ashamed in your heart, you great rude asses, who pretend such great art and prophecy, and let such things go out into the world, that they are taken hold of, that ye will not for great wickedness, or for great ignorance cannot rightly speak, nor understand to speak.

2) "not" is missing in the Erlanger.

135) But if the devil stands so firmly on the word, "which is given," as at present, and does not say, "which shall be given for you in the future," we thrust his own words into his mouth, saying, If these words, "this is my body," 2c. point to Christ's sitting body, it follows that Christ was not crucified for us. For the words refer to the seated Christ, who is not crucified for us; for he could not hang on the cross and at the same time sit in the Lord's Supper. So he would not have to be given for us before, because if he sat there and pointed to himself. Does not this mean that he was shamed in wisdom?

136. Now if Christ can sit with you heavenly prophets and say of him, "He will be given for you," and you must interpret the word "will be given" to mean, "He who is to be given for you," or, "He who is decreed and ordained to be given for you," and must tune another time to his sitting and showing, and another time to his crucifixion and surrender: We beseech you also that ye forbid his body to be in the bread now, and not to be in the bread afterward at the cross; that we may also say over the bread, This is my body which is given for you; that is, which is to be given for you, or is already decreed and determined to be given, as if it were already given.

Where are you now, Mrs. Hulda, with your wisdom? Yes, where is the testimony in your inwardness, that you are not allowed the outward testimony for yourselves? This is what I say, my dear reader, so that you may not be able to ignore the wretched devil who is exploiting himself in D. Carlstadt for a spirit. For in this first piece of reason Peter Rülz praises his spirit almost highly, and speaks excellently of the matter in the way of the heavenly prophets, which is, as I said, that they do not first come to the spirit through the outward word, but first from the spirit to the outward word, and then they quote Christ's saying John 15:26, 27: "The Spirit of truth shall bear witness, and ye also shall bear witness," just as if the apostles had received the spirit without the outward word of Christ. Therefore Peter Rülz boasts that he has had his fill of the

The inward testimony; the outward he accepts for the others, to teach them and to punish them.

You hear their theology, that others should learn it outwardly by their word, which they call an outward testimony; but they themselves are better and higher than the apostles, and want to learn it without outward words and without means inwardly in the spirit, which was not given to the apostles, but to the only Son of Jesus Christ alone. There you see the devil, as I told you above, that he does not respect the outward word and does not want to have it as a prelude to the spirit. Beware of this, and be sure that these prophets are full of devils, as you see here in the first part of their reason, and will see much more. Such a high spirit, which is above the apostles' measure, shall indeed show greater signs. But as they prove their doctrine and outward testimony by writing, so they prove their spirit and inward testimony by signs; one devil is like another.

139 But if D. Carlstadt and his mob could abandon their sophistry and reasoning, because they so harshly dispute that Christ says about the bread, "this is my body," and do not want to or cannot understand how bread can be the body, and do one thing to the two, either give God the honor and let his words be right and true, although they do not understand how it happens that they are right and true, let them suffice and believe it, because they hear that God speaks and wants so; Or, if they wished to be wise, they would do so according to the custom of the Scriptures and the simple manner of speech, and leave their subtle and pointed thoughts in place.

For if one looks at the simple kind of language, one can say of a fiery iron: This is fire, or thus: The iron that lies there is fire. Now if a quarrelsome sophist, to prove his pointed cleverness, woke up and wanted to fight against all the world that iron and fire are two different things, and that it could never be true that iron is fire, tell me whether he would not be a nonsensical fool who wanted to lead people away from the simple way of speaking to his pointed, sharp, sophistical way? since the simple language no longer wants anything.

with the saying "iron is fire", because it wants to interpret how iron and fire are in each other, that where iron is, there is also fire. And no one is so great that he needs the great sophistical wisdom, as wood is not stone, fire is not iron, water is not earth.

Just as iron is fire, and fire is iron, according to simple language, and these two things are one in the same and the same thing, but each keeps its own essence, so they could easily have humbled themselves and abandoned their pointed cleverness, and with Christ and all the world, in a simple and bad way of language, said of the bread, "This is my body. Since this is so much to say that bread and body are one thing or with each other, like fire and iron, and yet no one is so foolish as to say that body and bread are not two different beings.

Just as we also say of the man Christ: He is God, and again: God is man, and yet no one is so great who does not know that Godhead and humanity are two different natures, neither of which is changed into the other, but the simple speech wants to say and interpret so much, that in Christ there is Godhead and humanity in each other as one thing, that where man is, there also God is bodily, as Paul says Col. 2, 9: "Behold, they could easily have done away with the simple manner of languages, 1) which, by their pointed and solicited sharpness of reason, give them and others so much useless trouble and labor.

And you shall see, because they go on the way that they will not honor God's word with faith, or accept it according to simple language, but measure and master it with sophistical reason and subtle subtleties, they will even come to deny that Christ is not God. For by reason it is as foolish to say that man is God as that bread is body. And because they deny one, they will also deny the other very soon and freshly. This is also what the devil, who has led them out of the Scriptures into their reason, seeks, that he may bring old 2) heresy

1) i.e., to bring in the right direction.

2) Thus the Wittenberg and Jena. Walch and the Erlangen: all old.

bring them in again. For you shall see how wise reason will be, especially in the mad mob, and shake your head and say: Yes, Godhead and mankind are two different things, immeasurably separated from each other, as an eternal from a temporal; how then can one be the other, or someone say: Man is God? So you would also have to say: temporal is eternal, mortal is immortal, and the like, as they say here in D. Carlstadt's head against the sacrament, then she will have met it.

Or, if they do not like this kind of language, they should follow the way of the Scriptures, which in common usage has the figure called synecdoche, that is, when it calls a whole and yet only means a part, as it does when it calls the Israelite people a possession and a special people of God [Ex 19:5], yet the greater part underneath was always the devil's, and the wavier part God's. As Paul also calls the Galatians, Corinthians and other cities God's community [1 Cor. 1, 2. Gal. 1, 2.], yet the lesser part are rightly God's children. Yes, 1 Cor. 10,17. He calls all those one bread and one body, who partake of one cup, yet many of them took the cup unworthily, as he himself says.

145 So these sophistical and pointed men of wisdom might in this place also have pointed the whole piece, as bread and body, which Christ speaks of, to the body alone, when he says, "This is my body," not considering the bread. Not that bread should not be there, but that the body is so important in the speech that he speaks of it as if the body were there, and everything that is there, whether bread or paint, is nothing but the body. Just as if a mother pointed to the cradle where her child was lying inside and said, "This is my child," and a sophist scoffed at her and said, "How? Don't you think she would take him for a fool or a joker? as he would not want to understand the language, since she points both to the cradle and the child, and yet the child primarily means, as if there were no cradle.

146. item, St. Paul Rom. 1, 16. calls the oral gospel "a power GOT-.

tes". Let a clever sophist come here, who knows how to but says, "Take, eat; this is my body" [1 Cor. 11:24]. Here distinguish God's power (as it is eternal) from the oral he tells me to take his body and eat it, not bread. But this sound of the voice, which passes away in a moment. He spirit has all power to set, change, add and subtract as will prove his art, and also produce a Tuto or Tatto, and he pleases, how can he err?

conclude thus: A bodily voice cannot be God's power, so To strengthen this little piece of reason, he blames the St. Paul must lie that he calls such an oral, bodily word pope for many great and terrible things. The first one, that God's power. Item, St. Peter would also have to suffer the he steals God's honor, because he says to us in the form same, because he speaks 1 Pet. 1, 23. 25.: "The word of of bread: "My God, have mercy on me. The second, that God remains forever", as also Isaiah says [Is. 40, 8.], and he contradicts the truth by teaching that we should yet interprets the same word that is preached among us. remember the bread, and makes us forget the body of How is it 1) true here that an eternal thing is a perishable Christ. The third, that he should destroy Paul's doctrine thing? by exalting the bread so high that we forget the

A sophist cannot believe it; but he who knows the remembrance of the Lord. The fourth, that he makes common usage of the Scriptures is not at all mistaken, and foolish men by teaching us to eat bread honestly, though it is quite easy for him to understand. For it is the figure of we never remember Christ. The fifth, that he makes the synecdoche that governs all things, which rules Christ's suffering useless, because he teaches that Christ powerfully not only in the Scriptures but in all languages. forgave sin in the form of bread and redeemed us; for Therefore, you see that this evil spirit cannot yet speak or then he would have died on the cross in vain. There you understand the mother tongue, and D. Carlstadt, who have it, Pabst, run after me more, I mean, you are troffen. pretends to great art in Greek and Hebrew, would be well These five pieces he has so chaotically spit into one worthy of being led back to his mother with his prophets, another that it has become sour to me to bring them into or to a German school, so that he could first learn to speak such order.

What should I do? If I answer here, then I am papist.

The other part of the high reason is that Carlstadt goes But D. Carlstadt has thought: "Pabst's abomination has along as if he had contended that there is nothing but been brought to light by others before me; now I would bread and wine in the sacrament, and says: Where Christ also like to become a knight in the dead Hector. But if I commanded to receive his body, who said: Take bread and am to write what others have written and produce nothing eat? That is why the Hutzelprediger (O beautiful German) new, it is a shame for me, as such a great heavenly should have preached how to eat the bread of the Lord prophet. Well, I will write to him, and shall I write vain lies worthily, as Paul preaches. If I now ask these high spirits about him. It is true that the pope has caused me much again: Where is it then that Christ says: Take the bread more suffering with his own than [D. Carlstadt], and still and eat? Then they will perhaps show me the testimony in does daily. Yes, they have so far held D. Carlstadt in the their inwardness; the Kielkrob believes this, 2) I do not. I highest contempt. Nevertheless, I do not want to be so do not know anywhere that Christ calls us the bread. foolish that I should attack the pope with it, knowing myself that [it] would be falsehood in public. The pope and his followers do not care that I have attacked them with

1) Jenaer: is.

2) About "Kielkropf" compare Luther's Table Talks, Cap. 24, §§ 95 and 96, Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XXII, 756 ff. - This reading "Kilkrob" is public truth and clear scripture; what should they care that found in the Wittenberg. In the Jena one, probably by a misprint, D. Carlstadt attacks them with tangible lies that he himself "Kolkrib." In Walch and in the Erlangen edition: "Kolkryb". * I

knows?

151 For the life of the pope and his own, be it as it may, we are now talking about his teaching, *non de moribus, sed dogmatibus papae*. Here, I say, D. Carlstadt is not mistaken, but his conscience knows that he is obviously lying about the pope. For he has also been a sophist, and has learned and taught both the theology of the high schools and that of the pope. Now nowhere does the Pope teach that one should say to the figure of bread: My God, be merciful to me, as all the world knows. Nowhere does he teach that one should remember the bread and forget the body of Christ. Nowhere does he teach that the form of bread should be so highly esteemed that the remembrance of the Lord should be forgotten. Nowhere does he teach that the bread should be eaten honestly, so that Christ is never remembered. He does not make Christ's suffering useless by teaching that Christ in the form of the bread forgives sin and saves us; indeed, he does not teach this. D. Carlstadt directs such five pieces against his own conscience to the pope, which he knows himself and all the world.

152 Therefore, since he wanted to blame the pope for stealing God's glory, contradicting the truth. He should show other pieces and causes, since he wanted to blame the pope for destroying the teachings of St. Paul, for making nonsensical people, and for making the suffering of Christ useless. For such pieces rather prove that D. Carlstadt has a lying evil spirit, which robs people of their honor publicly, contradicts his own conscience, and as a nonsensical fool makes himself sinful and a disgrace before all the world. What a spirit of his should this be to me, who wants to cast out the devil with the devil, yes, desecrate the public truth with public lies!

What might D. Carlstadt have sought in these impudent lies? I consider two: the first, that the rabble should think: O! it is nothing that Luther or others have done to the pope? They are all pretending to him; here is the man, D. Carlstadt will do it, he knows how to put the pope in the right mood. What do you think, dear Endres, and dear Gevatter Peter? The other thing, that he will wrap Luther up with the pope and his

1) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: nehber.

I am not going to tell you that Luther teaches exactly what the pope teaches; yes, he is a two-faced pope, as he also calls me. The devil of D. Carlstadt does not do this, that he is the enemy of the devil of the pope, from whom he is sent to D. Carlstadt to teach the pope the same things that the pope teaches. Carlstadt to cunningly help up the papacy again, but that he nullifies everything that God has worked through us in the Gospel up to now and saved so many souls, that gets sour in the devil's nose.

Now then, my reader, know again, because D. Carlstadt's spirit is so insolent and impudent that he lies to the people in public against his own conscience in such a great and worthy cause, since all error and doubt (let us be silent, public lies) are to be avoided like poison, that such a spirit is no other than an evil angry devil, who is not at all serious about doing this thing, but through D. Carlstadt's envious grudge would like to take revenge on us and destroy our gospel. Carlstadt's envious resentment, he would like to take revenge on us and destroy our gospel. For we do not teach to worship, fear or honestly hold the form of bread, nor to forget the death of the Lord, but we honor the body and blood of Christ in the bread, as he himself well knows, and also fights against us in this whole book, so that we do not think it is vain bread or the form of bread, and yet we are guilty of honoring vain bread, as one who is senseless and speaks against himself.

Therefore, we may more reasonably say that D. Carlstadt robs God of His honor, contradicts the truth. He devastates St. Paul's doctrine and makes Christ's suffering useless, because he denies against the clear, powerful text that the body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament, and therefore carries glosses out of his head, since there is neither reason, cause, nor scripture, and in the end he cannot prove anything, except that he lets out good, fat, strong lies, and speaks as a nonsensical man against himself. See, there you have the other piece of his dear reason, how it knows how to adorn itself in divine things. But how this is true, that Christ forgives us our sins in the sacrament, we want to save from that, because he makes himself quite useless about it.

156. the third piece of Mrs. Hulden, öamit she proves that Christ's body is not in the

Sacrament is this, because Christ says, "His flesh is of no use", Joh. 6, 63. Item: "It is of use to you that I go away; if I do not go away, the Comforter will not come" [Joh. 16, 7.]. Where did Christ command his body to be received? Which question he often indicates with his *τούτο*, as certain that he had won. So again we answer, as to him that lost with all shame, that Christ commanded us to receive his body, saying, "Receive, eat; this is my body." Let this be said once, as much as a thousand times, in answer to such a question. For the *τούτο* and great letter and dot have lost the banner, as we have proved above.

But is it not his art and a mighty conclusion: The flesh is of no use, therefore one does not receive the body of Christ in the sacrament? Rhyme Bundschuch. Why not just as well? Carlstadt is no longer at Orlamünde, therefore Christ's body is not in the sacrament; since one thing follows another. What should this do to or hinder the sacrament, that Christ's flesh is of no use? What use is it that he sits there in the Lord's Supper, and that Tuto points to him according to her dream? Dear, let me use your art, you spirits: Christ's flesh is no good; therefore he does not sit at the table, and the Tuto does not point to him. Is it not so strong as your consequence? Tell me, where is Christ's flesh useful? On the cross? In heaven? In the womb? Where then? So I hear that he must be nowhere, because he is nowhere useful. For if this follows: Christ's flesh is of no use, therefore it is not in the sacrament; so it also follows that he is 1) nowhere. For that it is of use is as much of the Spirit when it is on the cross or in heaven as when it is in the sacrament. What do you think? These are heavenly prophets; so one should attack the sacrament if one wants to overthrow it.

(158) Further, tell me: Your sacrament, bread and wine, what is it good for? If it is not useful, it is not in the Lord's Supper, nor does anyone receive it. For what is of no use is not there, as you yourselves say,

that Christ's body may not be there, because his flesh is of no use. Where then is the Lord's Supper? For of course none will ever be nor become so holy as to be of use, because Christ's flesh is not of use, which is the most holy. Is this not raving and raving. Dear, what then is raving and raving? I will be silent, that the blind impudent spirit masters and perverts Christ's word. For Christ does not say, "My flesh is of no use," but rather, "Flesh is of no use" [John 6:63]. But of His flesh He says: "My flesh is meat" [Joh. 6, 55].

159 There is much another thing: flesh, and Christ flesh. Item, another thing: Christ flesh is of no use, and Christ flesh is of no use to you or me. This I must further strike out, to prove that these spirits, who despise God's outward word, understand nothing rightly in Scripture. "God is good" [Luc. 18, 19], and everything that he has created is also good, Gen. 1, 4. 10. 12. 18. 21. 25. 31. But what is good is also useful. But to an ungodly man nothing is good or useful, nothing is pure or wholesome, but everything is harmful, evil, unclean and damning, even to God Himself, not because of God or the creatures, but because of his unbelief, which misuses it all.

160 Therefore it should not be said that Christ's flesh is of no use; but flesh is of no use, as Paul says, "Flesh and blood possess not the kingdom of heaven," [1 Cor. 15:50] that "flesh" here is carnal mind, will, understanding, and conceit, as Paul says, Rom. 8:6, "To be carnally minded is death." So when Christ, John 6:55, speaks of His flesh as being the right food, He punishes the mind of the Jews who understood it carnally, saying that such words are spirit and life, but that flesh is not useful, that is, to understand such spiritual words carnally is nothing but death.

161 Yes, they say, the bread of the Lord and the cup are good, if one eats and drinks worthily; which is done in the knowledge of Christ, that one may know and taste him heartily and fervently. Dear, what shall we say? Your bread and wine is good if you eat it with a fervent knowledge of Christ.

and tastes? Why is not also our sacrament useful, if one eats and receives it with right faith? Or is Christ's body and blood not as powerful, if it is partaken of with right faith in the sacrament, as your impotent bread and wine? Or is right faith not so much as fervent knowledge of Christ? But tell me, you lying spirit, when or where have we taught that the Sacrament (although it is always beneficial, healing and good in itself) is beneficial to someone who takes it in faith, through the words of God that are in it?

162 There are real devils' little tricks that D. Carlstadt uses. First, he uses splendid, splendid words (heartfelt, ardent, savour, knowledge of Christ), so that one should think that he is serious, for he saw that bread and wine are too bad things, therefore he must blow them out with such additions, and yet he does not show how or how one should get there. Secondly, he does not need the word "faith," so that he may be seen as teaching much higher and different things than we do, and as if right faith were nothing compared to fervent knowledge, and yet he knows just as much what the knowledge of Christ is as what faith or a good conscience is. Third, he stabs us viciously and wants to make us out as if we were receiving the sacrament badly without word and faith, when he knows otherwise, and again he lies poisonously and wantonly. Now I have said above: Acting with public lies in these great matters is not the work of a good spirit, but of a vengeful devil, since D. Carlstadt is also possessed.

After that he comes to the word *sacramentaliter* and says that Christ flesh sacramental is of no use, as little as he is of natural use, because in it one can see neither death nor resurrection 2c. And boasts here that he has struck the ear of the pope with the piece, so that his whole face is blackened, both with new and old papists. Boast, Rüplin, your father was a cabbage worm. I do not yet know 1) whether the spirit is acting wantonly, as if it were nonsensical and mad, or whether God is plaguing it so horribly.

He says a bare, naked, impotent word therefore in his head without any reason, that Christ's body sacramentally is of no use 2c. And with such a word he wants to strike the pope and all of us. Yes, if it were the pagans Priapus, he would perhaps leave a forz before such an excellent terror.

I said above that it is not right, but blasphemous to God, to say that Christ's body is not useful, as this mad spirit rages. He is always useful where he is, even if he is not useful to me because of my unbelief. The sun always shines, even if the blind do not see it; and the word of God is always healing, even if it is a poison to the wicked and a "stench of death unto death" [2 Cor. 2:16. And Christ's body is always in the sacrament, whether it is not in these mad, blind spirits, who have not yet learned so much from their high heavenly spirit that they would know how flesh and Christ's flesh are not one flesh, but one is a flesh of life, the other a flesh of death, and what do such prophets care about life and death? If only they had the honor of being holy spirits, that would be enough.

But that he says that in the sacrament one may not see the death and resurrection of Christ, therefore Christ is of no use there: Dear, is it true? Or high prophets! But tell me again, how does one see the death and resurrection in Christ's body, who sits there in the Lord's Supper, to whom the *toúto* points? Is it painted on his forehead? Not? Well, then he is of no use to you. How the spirit is so proud in all his words! He cannot say anything that will not hit him on the head again, so that he not only turns black, but also has to stagger like a drunken man. If the words of Christ show us and teach us to recognize his death and resurrection in the seated Christ, why should they not also do so in the body and blood in the sacrament? For it is not the body of Christ, whether sitting at the table or in the bread, but the words when he says, "This is given for you," that teach us the death and resurrection of Christ.

2) Wittenberger and Jenaer: *baumeln*; Erlanger: *dümmeln*.

1) "yet" is missing in the Erlanger.

But if their knowledge and remembrance of Christ were vain heat, vain heart, vain heat, vain fire, so that even the spirits of the wicked would melt away, and their spirits would be puffed up with a thousand times more splendid words, what would happen then? What would be gained from it? Nothing, but new monks and hypocrites, who with great devotion and earnestness would oppose bread and wine (if they could), as the stupid consciences have so far opposed the sacrament. Such fear and distress would arise over this knowledge and remembrance as has arisen up to now over the desire to receive Christ's body worthily. For the knowledge they give does not do it; the devil also knows almost well and recognizes that Christ's body is given for us, and yet helps him nothing.

The knowledge helps, if I do not doubt, but hold with right faith that Christ is the body and blood given for me, for me, for me (I say) to blot out my sins, as the words in the sacrament read: "This is the body that is given for you" [Luc. 22, 19.]. Through this knowledge a happy, free and sure conscience is formed. This is what Isa. 53, 11. means: "By his own knowledge he will justify many." Carlstadt's spirit is as hostile to this teaching as to death, and would like to destroy it, and therefore pretends to have a fervent, heartfelt, earnest knowledge of the body of Christ, as if it were his earnestness, and yet leaves it there, does not think that one sees how he makes a pure commandment and law out of the words of Christ, which does no more than command us to remember and know him. And in addition the knowledge makes nothing else than a work, which we do, and because nothing but bread and wine is to be received there. But more of this later.

But I will tell you the spirit. With such splendid words he wants to avoid the clamor, so that one should not say that he destroys the sacrament because he makes bad bread and wine; therefore, he boasts and makes up such great words, so that one should think that he wants to lift up the sacrament. But in fact this is the devil's opinion, that he even pushes it to the ground, and

The first thing is to make a good collation, where people sit down and eat and drink, and throw jars and pitchers against the walls, and scuffle and beat each other over them. For if one has not been able to maintain fear until now, believing that Christ's true body is there, what fear will remain if one believes to be bad bread and wine? Let us become like good companions, feasting and tempering, so that the dear heath waits. 1)

So you see the devil clearly, who makes that which Christ promises a commandment, and instead of faith performs a work, as I said about him above. For all the spittle that D. Carlstadt throws out about the knowledge of the body of Christ in this matter is fouled by the fact that he has directed his *τὸῦτο* to the seated body of Christ, from his own head, as we have heard. For with the Tuto, he thinks, we are commanded nothing else than to practice the knowledge of Christ in this sacrament, although Christ does not speak a word of such knowledge, commandment, or work there; nor can he put 2) any reason, Scripture, or cause, apart from his lost Tuto and his conceit, whom he believes who wants to believe the devil. And for this purpose he makes such a knowledge a pure work, so that he disturbs both the faith and the promise of Christ.

From which you may conclude that D. Carlstadt's theology is no higher than that it teaches how we should follow Christ. Carlstadt's theology is no higher than that it teaches how we should follow Christ, and makes of Christ only an example and master, from which nothing but works are learned. But he does not know and does not teach how Christ is our treasure and God's gift, from which follows faith, which is the highest thing, and he thinks to obscure and darken everything with these words: "ardent knowledge, ardent memory" and the like. And so, again, faith falls finely on the works, so that his teaching and art, as I have long since well noticed, finally wants to return to the point that

1) Thus the Jena edition. Wittenberger: wacht. Walch and the Erlanger: wagt. In Low Germany the saying is still now: "saufen, dass die Haide wackelt." We find the same root again in English: to vuA, to move back and forth.

2) "cans" - may delß.

free will is something in God's things and good works.

To this the foolish spirit is so ignorant of the Scriptures that he understands the word "remembrance," when Christ says, "This is for my remembrance," in no other way than, like the Sophists, from the inner thoughts in the heart, as one remembers someone; for this spirit must inwardly and spiritually do what God wants outwardly, so that nothing else comes of it. But this is even worse and greater, that he gives such a memory the power to justify, like faith, and leads to such a reason. For it is written (says he), that they have done this in remembrance of me. What do you think? It is written, they have done it in remembrance of me; therefore such remembrance makes them righteous. There you grasp how finely D. Carlstadt understands the Lord's Supper, his memorial, 1) and justification, namely, that the devil has only his game and mockery in this matter.

172. but know and keep that the memory of Christ is an outward memory, when one speaks of someone and says, according to the Scriptures, Ps. 16:4, "I will not remember their name in my mouth"; item Ps. 9:7, "Their memory is gone with them"; item Ps. 83:5, "That the name of Israel may be remembered no more"; item Ps. 112:6, "The righteous has an everlasting memory". 83:5: "That the name of Israel be remembered no more"; item, Ps. 112:6: "The righteous have an everlasting remembrance"; that Christ, therefore, by the word "do this in remembrance of me," means as much as Paul does by "ye shall proclaim the death of the Lord" 2c. [1 Cor. 11, 26.]; that Christ wants us to preach about Him when we partake of the Sacrament, and to tell the Gospel to strengthen the faith, not to sit and play with thoughts in our hearts, and to make a good work out of such remembrance, as D. Carlstadt dreams. O that the prophets studied before, before they left out books.

173 From this you well realize that such memory does not justify, but they must be

first be justified, who shall preach, proclaim, and do the outward remembrance of the Lord, as it is written, Rom. 10:10, "With the heart one believeth, and is justified; but with the mouth confession, and salvation." But justification, which Carlstadt also brings from knowledge, is also nothing, and beware of it, for he will lie to you and deceive you. For he does not make such knowledge spiritual, as it should be. For Isaiah speaks (Cap. 53, 11.) of the spirit and spiritual knowledge, which the Holy Spirit works in us, and not we ourselves. Which is, if I know, am certain, and do not doubt, Christ is given for me. But Carlstadt makes of it a human, carnal devotion, and a fervent work in the heart; but not above knowing and knowing how Christ was given for us; which the devil and the hypocrites also can do. *Scientiam docet, usum scientiae non potest docere.* He may speak much of knowledge, but he does not practice it or conduct it properly, but lets it be a bad work; that is to make knowledge carnally and not spiritually. For his spirit suffers no other way; what is spiritual, he must make carnal.

The fourth piece of Mrs. Hulden is when she takes before her the saying of St. Paul 1 Cor. 11, 24: "Receive, eat, this is the body that is broken for you", and wants to master it. Help God, how the spirit pales and trembles before this thunder! But he takes courage from him and says, "Oh, you poor unwise man, do you think that Christ's body will be broken as bread is broken? 2c. But, beloved, let him hear how he chokes and tortures himself here. Tell me, did Christ break himself in the bread? He was not in the bread when he broke it; so you cannot show any apostle who broke Christ's body in the bread. At last he comes to the conclusion that Christ's leg was not broken; therefore this breaking must be understood of his suffering, that is, "this is the body which is broken for you," that is, which is crucified for you. Behold, beloved, how the spirit here walks on eggs, how it writhes and wriggles, how it has mush in its mouth and mumbles, as a half-dead despondent man.

1) The comma after Abendmahl is in the old editions, but is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger. Almost throughout (not alone in this writing) the interwanntion of the Erlanger edition is taken from Walch's old edition.

No, dear little spirit, you do not escape me like this. And although I should have placed this saying above among the others, I was prevented from doing so by the unorganized suction 2) and confused writing of this book. First of all, it does not help that he wants to understand suffering and crucifixion by breaking. For the Scriptures do not say so, and he cannot prove it; so his own dreams and glosses count for nothing. It is true that the Scriptures call the afflicted broken-hearted and broken-spirit; but bodily suffering 3) is not. And even if it did, it is therefore not certain that it should be so here; it must be proved very well. So it does not matter that Christ did not break a leg. For there is none of us so foolish as to say that Christ is visibly broken in the sacrament, as thieves are broken. So we prove that Christ and the apostles have broken Christ's body, according to this saying, "this is the body that is broken for you", and must have been inside the breaking, Paul is lying.

But let's go for the joke's throat. Above we have thoroughly and powerfully proved that D. Carlstadt's *roûto* must point to bread, since he says: Take, eat, Tuto, or this is my body, which is given for you. Because here St. Paul also puts the *roûto*, and says, "This is the body that is broken for you," it must also point to bread. Thus the text enforces that this bread is the body that is broken, that in short, by force, this breaking must remain in the Lord's Supper, and over the table in the meal, and be nothing else (as I said above), but that the body is distributed into the community, as one otherwise breaks bread or distributes it into the community, that it is not necessary here to dream how Christ's body is just broken in the bread; but it is enough that it is broken, that is, distributed in all the pieces and particles of the bread completely and perfectly.

177 So the saying stands firm that Christ's body and bread are one, and where the body and bread are one, the bread is one.

Bread is broken, that [it] is as much as the body of Christ is broken or distributed, that it may be divided and received among many. For if St. Paul had not wanted the body of Christ to be in the bread, he should not have assigned the breaking (which actually belongs to the bread, according to Scripture custom and manner) to the body of Christ. But since he includes both in one another, so that he points to the bread, and calls it the broken body of Christ, that in the breaking both bread and the body are broken, no one can pass by, one must confess that the body of Christ is there in the bread; and just as through the breaking the bread does not lose its essence or name, and nevertheless remains bread and is called, even if it is broken up, so also the body of Christ remains there, even if it is divided into many pieces among many.

178 There is one more thing back there. St. Paul speaks of bread, "which is the body broken for you." Dear, how might it be broken for us? Broken among us would have been better. O how light legs has this spirit here, how his leaps over the word "for us"! Dear, why? Because he has undertaken to deny that in the sacrament there is forgiveness of sins; but such an assumption is dirt, where the word "broken for us" remains, which cannot be otherwise than that such breaking of bread and body should take place, and be instituted that [it] may benefit us, deliver us from sins. For Christ has put the power and authority of his suffering into the sacrament, that it should be taken and found there, according to the words, "This is my body, which is given for you for the remission of sins," as we shall hear now soon after; therefore this word was not to be touched by the Spirit.

The fifth piece of Mrs. Hulden is now especially about Luther, who taught that whoever's conscience is heavy with sins should go to the sacrament and get comfort and forgiveness of sins there. Here Peter Rülze is first of all a fine fellow and speaks joyfully: "O you false prophets, you promise the people God's kingdom for a piece of bread; I know that you do not make the bread better by your secret breathing and hissing; why then do you say that [it] is better for you?"

1) Wittenberg and Jena: should.

2) Ströde - Spüllicht; hence Saugeströde - Schweinetränk. Cf. Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. X, 1944, the last line.

3) Walch and the Erlangers: suffering in the flesh.

sins when you have blown over it? Why do you not take a handful of barley 2c. and eat it in God's name, that you may be free from sin? Here I must speak with D. Carlstadt himself.

My dear D. Carlstadt, since you would not or could not contest this article otherwise than thus, why do you not stay at home? You have your hands full, if there were a thousand more of you, where you are supposed to overcome me with writings and causes, and you go to and attack me only with scornful words and openly insolent lies. Do you think that I am afraid of lies, since you yourselves know that you are lying? If, in worldly matters, someone were to attack another's honor with lies in such a way that both parties knew that it was a lie, my dear, should one not say to the other: "You are lying as an arch-robber and dishonorable villain? But what should one say here, since one lies brazenly against conscience in divine matters? Well, who still does not believe that these 1) prophets are full of devils, listen here, I will convince them with their impudent lies.

First tell me, He 2) Lying Spirit, when have we ever taught that a piece of bread forgives sins? Wow! Peter Rülz and Victus Knebel, show us a single letter or point, you use it to prove your point. Since you know that we do not do this, what kind of spirit is it that makes you lie so shamefully? If you were lying out of forgetfulness or ignorance, I could take you for a human being. But now you lie so willfully, knowingly and poisonously in such serious matters, no one can see anything else in you but the evil spirit. But it is the manner of these prophets to speak thus mockingly and scornfully of divine things, to excite the mad mob, who by such words shall think that there is vain victory and triumph, though they hear no Gvund.

The other tells me, when do we hiss or blow over the bread? Yes, show it! Item, where did we ever hiss or blow over the bread?

1) Jenaer: the.
2) d. i. Mr.

>

teaches that our hissing and blowing makes the bread better? Oh yes! If so? Well, I will also make an oath: If D. Carlstadt believes that there is a God in heaven and earth, then Christ, my Lord, shall never be kind nor gracious to me; this is indeed a solemn oath. The reason is this: D. Carlstadt knows that we do not blow nor hiss over the bread and wine, but speak the divine, almighty, heavenly, holy words, which Christ Himself spoke and commanded to be spoken in the Lord's Supper with His holy mouth; I will be silent of the wicked and sinful priests. This I say, if these words were spoken by a donkey, as Balaam's donkey was, yes, if they were spoken by a devil, nevertheless they are God's words and are to be held in all honor, as is fitting.

183. Now tell me, whoever knows for certain that it is God's word, and yet may knowingly shout it out for a human hissing and blowing, mocking and laughing at it, and corrupt the poor rabble with such lies and poison, and take no fear nor awe nor remorse over it, but rejoice and take pleasure in such wickedness, as if God would crown him for such blasphemy and seduction of people and call him a grace-junior: How can he believe or think that there is a God? He must not be possessed with a devil. Now let him go, D. Carlstadt will find it, if he has not already found it; if God gives him that, then I will also say that there is no God. But I kindly warn D. Carlstadt that he should repent; God has tried hard enough, He has granted long enough, it will and must soon change. God grant that I must be a liar and false prophet here. Oh, dear God, what will we do if you let us?

You wretched spirit, why do you not attack the right cause? Why don't you punish our doctrine? You challenge a foreign doctrine in us, which you impose on us and deny, and which is not ours. What is easier to do than to conceive a lie and to attribute it to one, and to argue about it and to become a knight? 3) But this is our doctrine, that bros are not ours. But this is our doctrine, that bread

3) "to" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

I will go on: Christ on the cross with all his suffering and death does not help, even if it is recognized and considered in the most fervent, heated, heartfelt way, as you teach; there must be something else. What is it? The word, the word, the word, do you hear, you 1) lying spirit, also? the word does it. For even if Christ were given and crucified a thousand times for us, it would all be in vain, if the word of God did not come and distribute it and give it to me, saying, "This shall be yours; take it and have it.

So also, if I were to practice the memory and knowledge of Christ with such fervor and earnestness according to Carlstadt's teaching that I sweat blood and burned over it, it would all be nothing and completely lost. For there would be vain work and commandment, but no gift or word of God, which would offer and give me Christ's body and blood, and it would happen to me just as if a chest full of florins and great treasure were buried or kept for me in one place, then I might remember to death and recognize with all pleasure, have great ardor and heat in such knowledge and remembrance of the treasure, until I would be sick over it; But what good would all this do me if the same treasure were never opened to me, given to me, delivered to me and handed over to me? That would truly be "to love and not to enjoy," that would be to be satiated by the smell and drunk by the sight of the glass, just as Isaiah says, "that a man dreams that he eats and drinks, but when he wakes up, his soul is empty" 2c. [Isa. 29:8.]

The whole teaching of D. Carlstadt is just such a reverie. For with the splendid words "ardent memory, ardent knowledge, sensitive taste of the suffering of Christ," he mimics us, and brings us no further than that he shows us the sanctuary through a glass, or in a vessel, where we may see and smell until we are full, yes, in a dream; But he does not give it, does not open it, and does not let it be our own, yes, with such splendid words he wants to darken for us the word that gives us such treasure,

1) The second "du" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

saying, "Receive, this is the body given for you." The "for you" is a poison and bitter death to him. But it is our comfort and life, for it opens up the treasure and gives it to us for our own. 2)

But that our doctrine may be heard the more earnestly, I will speak of it plainly and roughly. We speak of the forgiveness of sins in two ways. First, how it is obtained and acquired; second, how it is distributed and given to us. Christ acquired it on the cross, that is true, but he did not distribute it or give it on the cross. He did not acquire it in the Lord's Supper or Sacrament, but there he distributed and gave it through the Word, just as in the Gospel, where it is preached. The acquisition happened once at the cross, but the distribution happened many times, before and after, from the beginning of the world to the end. Because he had decided to acquire them once, it was equally important for him to distribute them before or after by his word, as this can easily be proven with scriptures, but now there is no need nor time.

If I want to have my sins forgiven, I do not have to go to the cross, for there I will not yet find them paid out; nor do I have to go to the remembrance and knowledge of Christ's suffering, as Carlstadt says, for there I will not find them either, but to the sacrament or gospel, where I will find the word that pays out, gives, bears and gives me such forgiveness acquired on the cross. Therefore Luther taught rightly that whoever has an evil conscience because of sins should go to the sacrament and take comfort, not in the bread and wine, not in the body and blood of Christ, but in the word, which in the sacrament gives, bestows and gives me the body and blood of Christ as given and poured out for me. Is this not clear enough?

189 Therefore, this great spirit should have fought against us, saying, "O false prophets, you have no word in the sacrament that gives or gives you forgiveness of sin; but I say again, the word in the sacrament he should have contested, that is, the word in the sacrament that gives forgiveness of sin.

2) In the Wittenberg and the Jena: "to show".

If he had proved that we did not have it in us, he would have become a great knight. For though there were vain bread and wine, as they say, yet if there were the word, "Receive, this is my body, given for you," 2c., yet for the same word there would be forgiveness of sins in the sacrament. Just as in baptism we confess water, but because the Word of God is in it, which forgives sin, we freely say with St. Paul that baptism is a bath of rebirth and regeneration [Titus 3:5]; it is all in the Word.

190) There you now have D. Carlstadt's devil, my reader, and see how he intended to nullify God's outward word, which he neither respects nor considers, and calls a hissing, breathing and blowing. Item, how he wanted to abolish the sacrament completely, both bodily and spiritual, so that bodily. Christ's body and blood should not be there, and that the forgiveness of sins should not take place spiritually, that neither the sacrament nor its fruit should remain, and that instead of such divine order and word he should set up his own dreams of memory and knowledge. But he lacked the art. Now know what to think of him.

Here I must bring that at the very end of the book he speaks out of great reason and wisdom, saying that Christ's body was mortal in the Lord's Supper, but now it is immortal, and may not be given for us, as the words are, "this is the body that is given for you. But if it is not now, nor can it be given for us, and the words are now out and false, if they speak of the immortal body, it must also be false that the mortal body was in the bread and wine, because we have just such a supper after the death of Christ, now it is immortal, and is not given as Christ held when he was mortal. What do you think? How does Mrs. Hulde look for gaps and holes!

192 To this we first reply that Christ's blood did not become Gabriel's or Michael's blood, since it became immortal, but remained Christ's blood. For

We believe, and it is true, that Christ's blood, which now sits at the right hand of God in heaven, was shed for us once, and no other. Now if we look at the history 1) so that he acquired the forgiveness of sins, it was not done at the Lord's Supper; but now it is done and has passed away. But if one looks at the bestowal of forgiveness, there is no time, but has happened from the beginning of the world, as John also says in Revelation 13:8 that the Lamb of God was slain from the beginning of the world.

193 Because the body and blood of Christ is necessary for all who still have sins to be forgiven, it is still true that it is given for them. For although this 2) history has happened, as long as it is not given to me, it is the same as if it had not yet happened for me, that such sophisticated sophistry creates nothing for Mrs. Hulden, who does not see how it is all about the giving out, and Christ has done the acquiring for the sake of the giving out and has put it into the giving out. Therefore St. Paul also says, as mentioned above, "the body of Christ is broken for us" [1 Cor. 11:24]. Nothing prevents the forgiveness from being mortal or immortal, whether it is done or should be done; it is enough that it is the same blood. For it is poured out for me, when it is poured out and given to me, which is poured out for me; which still goes and must go daily.

These are almost the best and most beautiful pieces of Mrs. Hulden in these matters, in which one can see how she is the bride of the devil and speaks what he tells her. That now the promoter D. Carlstadt is joking and says that Christ does not come down from heaven, because Paul says, "we should proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes" [1 Cor. 11:26], and again scoffs at the word of God, whether Christ has to jump up because of the stinking breath of a drunken priest, and whether we could snatch him from heaven and banish him? Item, that Christ would have had to leave his place where he sat, if he had crawled into the bread,

1) i.e. what has happened, the factum.

2) Thus in the Wittenberg and the Jena. Walch and the Erlanger: the.

and would still have to leave heaven if he were to enter bread, 2c., and the like many shameful blasphemous words, these are all such childish, foolish, shameful thoughts and lies among themselves that they are not worthy of responsibility.

For we do not say that he comes from heaven or leaves his place alone, otherwise this spirit would also have to say that God's Son, when he became man in his mother's body, also left heaven, and everything that Carlstadt scoffs at the body in the sacrament, he must also scoff at the divinity of Christ in the flesh, as he will also do in time. Item, when St. Stephen saw Jesus, Apost. 7:55, he did not say that he came from heaven, but stood at the right hand of God. And Paul, Apost. 9, 4, also hears him speak, yet he did not come from heaven. Summa, the great spirit deals with children's thoughts as if Christ were ascending and descending. Neither does he understand Christ's kingdom as it is in all places, and, as Paul says, "fulfill all things," Eph. 1:23. We are not commanded to inquire how it comes about that our bread becomes and is Christ's body. God's word is there, that is what it says; then we abide by it and believe it; then take a bite of it, you poor devil, and inquire into it until you know how it is.

Item 196: That he also mocks us, as if we were to say and teach that the cup is in the blood, and therefore he alienates, as one sees no blood there, and always turns his ears away from God's word, and looks with his naked eyes at the bread and wine. For this spirit does not want to believe what God's word says, but what he sees and feels. O a beautiful faith! Now we answer the evil devil thus: that these words Luc. 22, 20. "This is the cup, the new testament in my blood," are not to be understood in this way, that this word "in my blood" should belong to the word "this is the cup," as this spirit pretends to be, because of its loud and wanton wickedness, but to the word "a new testament," as they also naturally stand and follow one after the other, so that it is said: "This cup is a new testament, not by itself, because it is perhaps a glass or silver, but because my blood is in it.

By the same blood he is a testament. 1) For whosoever receiveth the cup. For whoever receives the cup in this way, receiving Christ's blood poured out for us, receives the new testament, which is the forgiveness of sins and eternal life.

But I will tell you why D. Carlstadt had to blaspheme, juggle and mock in this place. The saying was too bright and too powerful, and [he] knew nothing to say about it. For he forces with all his might, and more powerfully than anyone above, that Christ's blood is in the sacrament; therefore he thought to fill the ears of the rabble with other antics 2) and to avert their attention to these words of Luke. And methinks it can also be felt in this place that D. Carlstadt denies against his own conscience that Christ is blood and body in the sacrament, and is hostile to God in his heart, and wants to blaspheme and desecrate his holy word and sacrament to his sorrow and annoyance; it seems to me, I say again, that D. Carlstadt has surrendered and has chosen to be a public enemy of God, and wants to run rather than trot into hell. God let me miss and lie.

For this saying of Luke and Paul is brighter than the sun, and mightier than thunder. First, that no one can deny that he speaks of the cup, because he says, "This is the cup." Secondly, that he calls the cup "the new testament," this offends mightily. For it cannot be that it should be a new testament by and for the sake of bad wine. Dear, 3) what is "new testament" but forgiveness of sins and eternal life, acquired by Christ and granted to us in the sacrament? If the cup is to be a new testament, there must be something in it and on it that is as valid as the new testament. If it is not Christ's blood, as he says, "in my blood," let it be said what it is. Now therefore we would say unto these spirits, O ye false prophets, which give the new testament, and promise unto the people for and in a

1) Walch and the Erlanger: new testament.

2) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: Bösen. "Possen" is given in the Erlanger as a variant of Walch, although the editor should have known that "Bossen" is another spelling of this word. Cf. Erlanger, vol. 28, p. 372, line 4 from the top.

3) Erlanger: Because.

Drink of wine. The text should also be written like this: This is the cup, the new testament in the wine. But since the words are: "This is the cup, the new testament in my blood", D. Carlstadt's art, writing, books, both which he has made and can still make, are thereby all pushed to the ground and overcome in such a way that he cannot rebel against it; but if he rebels, he shall make it even worse.

There now stands our text; now bite, bite, scoff, scoff, blaspheme confidently, be angry, dear heavenly prophets: you must let the cup remain that it is the new testament, although there would be none that points to it, and all would be on your side. You must also let it remain that it is the new testament, not through or in its essence, but through and in the blood of Christ. The blood, the blood of Christ, makes this cup a new testament, which may not be understood from the sitting blood of Christ; for the cup cannot be the new testament from the blood, which is not in it, which neither touches it nor concerns it; but cup and blood must here be one thing, as it is said above, that he who has or takes the cup, has and takes also the blood of Christ. Where do you want to go out now, dear spirits of the mob? So I will let them write and cry out for a thousand years, and I will not hold more than one word against them: "This is the cup, the new testament. O the word "new testament," how it crushes the prophets and spirits into a lump like dung!

200 I also hear them say (for I have not seen or read all of these poisonous books), how they make use of the fact that Christ, Matt. 16:18, says to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church. Here, they say, Christ begins to speak of Peter, who is called a rock, and then immediately turns to another rock and says, "And on this rock I will build my church. In the same way, when he says, "Take, eat, this is my body," he turns the speech from the bread to his seated body. Behold, how he seeketh; help that which can help; a lie.

must always have seven other lies, if it is to resemble the truth and gain a semblance.

To this we reply: If it were so that Christ spoke in the way of Matth. 16, 18, it is still not enough to set an article of faith and to build conscience on it, that it must also be so here, but one would have to prove with a clear text that it should and must also be so in this place. Therefore it does not help if these spirits say: Christ, Matth. 16, 18., turns the speech quickly from one rock to another, therefore it is also so here to turn from the bread to the body. Who can assure us of this and make us certain that this must also be so? You say it, but how can anyone believe you, since you do not prove it? You must force the likeness 2) of speech to Scripture, and not carry it from yourself. For faith (as I have often said) does not want to have a bad saying or a bad singing; it wants to have God's word, which says, "This is how it is and not otherwise. For it does not want to be a reed that the wind weaves [Matth. 11, 7].

Secondly, it is not true that Matthew 16 speaks in this way. For there the word "and" stands between both pieces, and repeats the word "rock" again, and thus says: "You are Peter, and on this rock" 2c., so that here, when he says: "You are Peter", one part is over and then begins a new one, namely: "And on this rock" 2c. Such an "and" and repetition of the word "body" is not there in the Lord's Supper, but says straight: "Take, eat; this is my body." If Matth. 16, 18. were to say: "You are Peter or rock, on whom or on which I will build my church," it would be the same speech; or if it were to say in the Lord's Supper: Take, eat the body, and this is my body; it would be the same as Matth. 16, 18.

Now Matth. 16. has an "and" and there is no "and" in between, and Christ repeats the word "rock" Matth. 16. again, and says: "on this rock",

1) Jenaer: so too.

2) i.e. equality.

But if in the Lord's Supper the word "body" is not mentioned again, it is said that with the word "rock" he points to himself or to the word that Peter spoke, and with the word "body" he points to the bread, so that these two sayings are as similar as water and fire. Also the evangelist Matth. 16, to indicate such a difference and new beginning, distinguished the rock with diligence. For he calls Peter "the one," but the other rock "the one," so that it should be understood that Peter, as "the one," is not the other rock, which he makes "the one" on which Christ wants to build his church, and he puts such "the one" and "the one" into two separate sayings, which does not happen in the Lord's Supper, where he applies the word "the one" to both bread and body in one saying, "This is my body."

204 Finally, so that he does not speak without the Scripture of all things, he (praise God!) once says a sentence, perhaps to the last, and it is Matth. 24, 23: "If they say to you, here or there is Christ, you shall not believe it. If we then say that Christ is in the host, let it be said that Christ is here and there, therefore it is not true. There, there, it is true. Well, I will give the prophet herewith also Eli singing 1) and holy evening. So blind does hatred make these spirits that they cannot see what goes before or after these words, but fall on it as it seems to them at first sight; therefore we must show it to them clearly once again.

(205) It is very different when I speak of Christ and of Christ's body and blood. For when the evangelist says, "Here or there is Christ," and the like, he is speaking of the whole of Christ, that is, of the kingdom of Christ, as is forcibly enforced by the text Luc. 17, 20. f., where he says, "The

The kingdom of God does not come with outward appearances, nor will one say, "Behold here, behold there it is," which the other evangelists thus explain, "here or there is Christ. All this is said: Christ's kingdom is not in outward things, places, times, persons, works, but, as he says there, "the kingdom of God is within you." Now it does not follow that Christ is nowhere, but that he is everywhere and fills everything, Eph. 1:23. But he is not bound to any place in particular, so that he must be there and nowhere else, as those do who do not leave our conscience free, but bind it to particular places, works and persons.

Just as he himself, Christ and his kingdom, is not bound to any place or external thing, so also everything that belongs to his kingdom is free and not bound anywhere, as there is the gospel, baptism, the sacrament and the Christians. For the gospel should and must be free at all ends and bound to no place but Rome. For it is not in Rome alone, or here or there, and nowhere else. So is baptism and sacrament. For it is not necessary to preach, baptize, and administer the sacrament in the church or anywhere else, but in all places where necessity demands it. From this it does not follow that Christ is in the sacrament as bound to a place here or there, but that he and his sacrament are or may be free in all places. Therefore these prophets do not properly apply the saying about the kingdom of Christ to the sacrament.

For if this were true, one would also have to deny [and say] that the gospel and baptism and sacrament are nowhere. For in the gospel Christ is also present, and yet must be verbally and bodily in places and places of worship. Item, Christ would not have to be in heaven at the right hand of the Father, because here one would also like to say: Behold, there is Christ. Item, St. Stephen might have said, when he saw Jesus standing, Apost. 7, 55, you deny, because Christ is neither here nor there, if the carnal thoughts of these prophets were suitable. Yes, their own teaching of Christ's knowledge and memory would also have to be nothing, because they would have to be in one place with it.

1) "Eli singen" - to sing a last little song for the farewell. In the Tischreden Cap. 54, H 25 should be read "Heli singen". An explanation of this expression results from what Carlstadt noted against it (Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 457): "There Luther sings scornfully: Eli! etc.; but the sacrament will sing to Luther: ut czuid æereliqurkti! and Luther will sing to the truth: how hast thou forsaken me!" According to these words of Carlstadt, in the expression "Eli singen" is a relation to Matth. 27, 46.

Therefore this saying "Here and there" must be understood first of all of bodily outward places and dwellings. Secondly, of such bodily places as are especially set apart before others and made necessary for salvation by false prophets, so that not all places remain free, as has hitherto been done with us under the papacy. But we do not teach that Christ's body and blood are visible in outward places, but hidden in the sacrament. Neither do we say that he must and should be free in special places and not in all, but that he, 1) together with the bread and wine, may and should be free in all places, times, persons.

209. But that he speaks: "This is my body," and not, "This is Christ," was done so that in the sacrament one might not understand the whole of Christ, that is, his kingdom, but clearly and actually his body, bodily and truly, as a piece of his kingdom and of the whole of Christ, just as the gospel is also not called Christ or a kingdom of Christ, but an oral bodily sermon, as a piece of the whole of Christ or his kingdom, and yet also has the nature of the whole of Christ, that it is free in all and not necessarily bound to a special place; therefore it is spoken of Christ as of the whole, but of his body as of the piece of the whole.

I will leave it at that for now. For the fact that D. Carlstadt denies that we have the authority to bring Christ's body and blood into the sacrament, has been proven enough above, and he must also let us, if we receive this, that the bread we break is the body of Christ. These "we" will of course have the power, in the very words, as Christ himself had them in the Lord's Supper. Item, that he pretends of the righteousness of dying, that it is inward before the righteousness of the Spirit, is his poem and has no reason. For above you have heard the right order, that the beginning and the first is faith in the heart, the righteousness of the spirit, followed by the death and dying of the old man, Rom. 8,13:

"If by the Spirit ye put to death the works of the flesh, ye shall live." "By the Spirit," he says, as the one who must be there first.

211. Herewith I answer to all of D. Carlstadt's books of the Sacrament, since he has now done and written for three years. I have answered him these three weeks, and will give him another three years and three more, so that they will become six, that they will answer me constantly, and warn them one more thing, that they watch and meet it, because they may well. I thank them with all my heart for my right of hope 2) and do not want to take much for it, so finely they have strengthened my heart in this article. For I now see how nothing at all can be raised against this article. But I have spoken of it so widely and in so many words that I have made it light and clear that D. Carlstadt writes so darkly and disorderly; and I hold it that from this book D. Carlstadt will first of all understand himself very well. For I have no doubt that he has not yet seen for himself what he is doing or where his teachings reach. For he cannot grasp or comprehend anything properly, much less talk or write.

In the end, I will faithfully and brotherly warn everyone to beware of D. Carlstadt and his prophets for two special reasons. The first, that they run and teach without being called, which God punishes through Jeremiah, saying: "They ran, and I did not send them; they speak, and I commanded them nothing" [Jer. 23, 21]. Therefore Christ also judges them, Joh. 10, 1, for thieves and murderers, who do not enter the door, but enter elsewhere. They boast almost highly of the Spirit, higher than the apostles, and yet they have been sneaking and sneaking longer than three years. If it had been the right spirit, he would have appeared quickly and would have proved his calling with signs and words, but it is an insidious devil who sneaks into the corners of the world.

2) Thus in the Wittenberg. Jena and Erlangen: Court Law. In the great "Confession of the Lord's Supper," No. 2t in this volume, § 427: "Court right. According to the latter passage, the expression "for my court right" seems to mean: according to my opinion, as my discretion.

1) "er" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

creeps around until he does harm and spreads his poison.

The other is that these prophets avoid the main part of Christian teaching, flee and remain silent. For they do not teach in any place how one should get rid of sins, have a good conscience and gain a peaceful and joyful heart toward God, in whom all power lies. This is the true sign that their spirit is the devil, who with strange new words excites the consciences, frightens

and misleads them, but does not put them to rest nor to peace, nor can he, but goes to and teaches some special works, that they may practice and be blued. But how a good conscience should be done and skillful, they know nothing at all, for they have not felt it nor ever known it; also how can they know or feel it, if they come and teach without being called by themselves? since no good can come from it. God's grace be with us all, amen.

6. D. Andr. Carlstadt's writing "von dem allen und neuen Testament 2c. How Carolstadt recants", containing in itself an "answer to the saying: the cup is the new testament in my blood 2c. Luc. 22. 1 Cor. 11." *)

March 16, 1525.

Andreas Carolstadter, Unverhört vertrieben: zu einem Gezeugniß des Evangelii, welches ich predige von JEsu von Nazareth, dem gekreuzigten Son GÖttes, den ernsten Christen, meinen geliebten Brüdern, zu Rothenburg an der Tauber, divine Weisheit, Erkenntnisniß, Glauben, Liebe, Stärke und Friede von GÖtt durch Christum!

1. favorable brothers! I have now almost completed a full reply to D. Luther's scriptless and unchristian letter a full answer now almost completed, besides other letters, that I really have to write not a little to brothers who ask me for it. But after the same answer was too large, I have taken out several articles 1) which I, each one in particular, think should go out, among which this one is from the cup, which the Scriptures call a new testament, and D. Juther calls a thunderbolt on Carolstadt's head, and considers it the best reason to prove that the Lord's blood must be bodily in the cup of dedication.

2. the same article I send to you out of good Christian love, willingness and service, considering that there are many among you to whom God's truth and judgments are earnestly dear, who will

1) Compare the introduction to this volume.

I ask you to thoroughly and diligently assess the reason for this teaching and, if you find that I am in error, to inform me of the error, and I will willingly grant divine truth and gladly deserve it.

3) But in my conscience I am sure what I have finally written in the matter of the Sacrament, that it is so and does not dare 2) to be otherwise. I also hope that you will feel and notice in this article that my teaching is divine, well-founded and demonstrable, that I greatly praise God's grace and the surpassing love of Christ, and that I confess the right faith in Christ; and that I am not to be regarded as an errorist or heretic. I am also willing to be heard by you, and ask you for God's sake to admit me to a public interrogation, to hear the merits of my faith.

(4) I am ever ready and willing to answer enemies and friends; I will also come to you shortly and ask for interrogation, which I hope to obtain. But if it should be refused to me, I would have to defend myself not only against God, but [also] against the imperial majesty,

2) In the old edition: nothing.

as the highest member of the Christian community, and especially that I, against the order of Your Imperial Majesty, am being persecuted and expelled without being heard. But I have no doubt that you will fear God, our almighty Lord, so much and give Him the honor that you will hear me for the sake of the instruction and leave a better one with you. God commanded. Date 16 Martii, Anno 1525.

From these words: The Cup, the New Testament.

Now of Christ's speech concerning the blood, it is to be noted that Matthew and Marcus do not say of the cup that the cup is the New Testament; therefore, according to the opinion of the preacher at Nördlingen, it should follow that it is not necessary that we call the cup a New Testament. But the above two evangelists tell how Christ took the cup and gave it to his disciples, saying, "Drink from it, all of you. And how the Lord then spoke these words: "This is my blood of the new testament, which was shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. Matth. 26. Marci 14.

2 But from this we learn that the disciples drank a purely natural wine; for the priests say that their bread and their wine remain in their nature until such words, which they call verba consecrationis, have been spoken or read over them. Now Christ made his disciples all drink hot from the cup (in which was natural wine) before he spoke verba consecrationis. Therefore they drank the wine before, because the wine was changed into blood. Therefore, from these two evangelists, it cannot be concluded that the disciples drank the blood of the Lord bodily in the first supper, but the contradiction that they did not drink the blood of Christ bodily, as now reported.

(3) But that Christ called them all to drink out of it is explained that Christ speaks of the drinking vessel which the Lord gave to his disciples. It must not be proved that the disciples drank out of a drinking vessel; it is necessary that one have eyes or ears to understand words, and see or hear what Christ says. But that some priests say that Christ says, "Drink from this blood, all of you," and want to dispute this from Matthew and Mark, we must let happen. For they will say the length, that fire is not warm or hot, *calix* blood is called, and *sanguis*

a drinking vessel, so that they keep their Lord God and their benefice.

4) But it belongs to you laymen to investigate, to read books or listen to books, and even to look for what you need to know. 2) Do this yourself and you will soon find out the truth. Do this yourself, and you will soon discover the truth, and learn that the disciples did not drink from the blood, but from a drinking vessel. I am amazed that the priests are so great that they dare to prove from Matthew and Mark. Just look at what Matthew and Marcus write.

The **pronoun τοῦτο** points to the blood, and not to the cup or drinking vessel; this I refer to unsuspecting judges of the Greek tongue, who have experienced the manner of our New Testament in the Greek tongue.

Luther does not rely on Matthaëum and Marcum, but on Lucam and Paulum, Luc. 22. 1 Cor. 10. b) But some Lutherans (whom I have taken from Luther's arrow through a bad scripture, 4) and Luther himself) resort to this speech: "they all drank from it" Marc. 14); and say: they all drank from the blood of Christ. To this one should now ask: whether they could prove this? for you are to believe them nothing without scripture. But if we had no evangelist but Marcum, it would be done for the priests. For Marcus tells us that they all drank from the cup, and that Christ then spoke the words of the blood, which they call verba consecrationis. From this it follows that they drank pure wine. What is your wine, you priests, before your words of blood? Is it not pure natural wine? You should all say yes. Let the wine remain natural wine, of which Marcus writes, and reports that the Lord said the words of blood afterwards.

Luther devastates these words: "The cup, the new testament in my blood, which is poured out for you", Luc. 22, and thinks that this text is the right scripture to prove that the blood is in the cup, and must be, yes, it is the right thunderbolt on Carolstadt's head.

If this is the right reason to prove that the blood of Christ must be in the chalice of the priests, then I have good days, because the priests do not read this scripture when they eonserrir; therefore I demand their missals to testify.

1) Theobald Billicanus, pastor at Nördlingen.

"ulh" Works. Vd. XX.

2) i.e. see.

3) Should probably read "1 Cor. 11. But also 1 Cor. 10,16. could be meant. ,

4) "by a bad writing" i.e. by a simple scripture.

I do not know any other way, because the new pope 1) and his bishops at Zwickau and Nördlingen, 2) keep the words of the old pope; I have to let their books judge and pronounce that.

8) Since neither the old nor the new pope hold the right reason, it is believable that they have not had the blood of Christ in their cup thoroughly and truly until now, because 3) they omit the right words. So the Carolstadt will not be of the devil for the reason that he writes thus: The priests have no blood in their chalice. Then I think that Luther's thunderbolt will be a buttered bread, and his strongest servant will also be dead.

009 But I will give him better, and say, that the cup was not a new testament in the time of the first supper of Christ. How do you like that? I say, Christ taught in his first supper what his blood would become in the future, and what the memorial cup would become by blood.

Will.

(10) You all know that a will is not a testament before the death of the testator, for a will is a last will and testament made or confirmed at death. Now where there is no death, there is no will. Hebr. 9, 16. 17.: "Death makes the will strong and perfect"; the life of the testator makes the will ineffective and invalid. "A will becomes firm by death, otherwise it has not yet power, if he who made it is still alive." This is the nature of the will, that he who made it dies and is dead, since a will is the last will and testament. But where he remains alive who makes his will, it is not a last will. What shall I say, because there is writing? "Where there is a will, there must be the death of him who makes the will," Heb. 9:16.

(11) That Christ was still alive (at the time) when He instituted His supper is so evident that no one may prove it; therefore His blood was not the blood of the Testament at that time, and even less the blood of the New Testament, in the time after which Christ said, "Father, take away the cup from Me," Matt. 26:39, after which the angel comforted Christ, and the Lord sweat blood, Luc. 22:44. But if the blood of Christ at that time was not the blood of the

1) This refers to Luther.

2) Hausmann and Billican.

3) Zn the old edition, Carlstadt's writings consistently say "seitmal" instead of "sintemal".

new testament, the cup was much less a testament, which does not belong to the testament, but only through the blood, or in the blood of the testament. Therefore I say: Christ touched the secret and hidden article of the law in the Lord's Supper, and told the disciples about his spiritual priesthood, sacrifice and blood, through which Christ wanted to enter, although the disciples did not understand it, because only on the day of Pentecost.

(12) Christ taught his disciples that his blood should become the blood of the new testament only in the future, and that the cup should be poured out through his blood when his blood is poured out for us for the remission of sins. Therefore Christ says, "This is my blood of the new testament which is poured out."

(13) When the blood of the goats and calves became the blood of the Old Testament, when the goats and calves died, and the blood was sprinkled upon the people for a purification of the flesh, Heb. 9. The New Testament must answer the old, and yet surpass the old.

(14) Of this article of faith Christ said, and taught, that his own blood would become the blood of the new testament, and that the old testament (which was full of sins) would soon have its end. For he who speaks of the new says that the old must pass away. Heb. 9.

The Old Testament.

(15) The old one was an outward revelation of God's will, and all that was of the old law was outward and bodily. Moses read and told God's commandment to the people, he stabbed calves and goats, he gathered blood; he had bodily things to take the blood and sprinkle it on the people. Namely, he took hyssop water and purple wool (as a sprinkler) and sprinkled the blood on the people bodily; he sprinkled the book, the tabernacle and all the vessels of God's service; and all that Moses did was external and bodily. His preaching was external and his sprinkling was external and bodily. For Moses sprinkled the people outwardly and bodily with blood; and the same blood was a blood of the testament, for which innocent animals must die. (And in the same it is not like a testament of a man, who fixes his last will with his own death). The same blood did not purify more, because as far as it touched. It touched the outer body and not the conscience. The conscience of the sins remained dammed; but the external and bodily impurity of the blood did not touch the conscience.

purity to serve God outwardly: as to approach the tabernacle, to go in before God, to stand in service bodily.

New Testament.

16 But the new testament is a true testament, because he himself died who made it, that is, the Messiah, who is Jesus of Nazareth. It also has death and blood, as the old, and the death of him who was a mediator or preparer of the new testament, and in him the new is above the old. But in this it is especially above the old, that the priest of the New Testament does not sprinkle us bodily with his blood, but spiritually, that is, Christ does not cast his blood bodily or with drops into the people, but spiritually. Neither does Christ take an outward sprinkling, as Moses took Hysophe 2c., but Christ sprinkles His people with His blood by the Holy Spirit, Heb. 9.' And by His divine power Christ pierces all things bodily, and enters into the conscience and heart of His people, and washes the consciences from evil lusts and works, to serve GOtte in truth and in the Spirit. Heb. 9. Jn. 6. 1 Pet. 1. 1 Jn. 1 and 4. Eph. 1. Col. 1. Rom. 3. 2 Cor. 6.

The shed Blnt on the cross of the will.

(17) Therefore the blood of Christ shed on the cross is the blood of the new testament, and it had to be poured out to become the blood of the testament, as the blood of goats and calves was poured out for the old testament. And the blood of Christ had to become a blood of spiritual sprinkling and forgiveness of sin, if it was to become a blood of the new testament. For this reason Christ says: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is poured out for you and for many, for the remission of sins", Matth. 26. Marc. 14. And everything that belongs to the new testament must become a new testament through the blood or through the death of Christ, as the cup 2c. "The cup, the new testament," which is **a new testament "through the blood,"** is because we drink from it in remembrance of the shed blood of Christ. 1 Cor. 11.

Sprinkling.

18) In this way the poet 1) writes to the Hebrews that the blood of the Lord is the blood of the New Testament. Namely, for the reason that

1) "Poet" here stands in the meaning of author.

The blood of the Lord, shed on the cross, is a blood of spiritual sprinkling, which touches and cleanses our consciences, Revelation 5, Acts 20, Hebrews 9, 10, 12 and 13, and washes away sin. 20. Heb. 9. 10. 12. and 13. and washes away sin; figured in the third book of Moses 4.14. and 16. For God promised that He would give His new testament in the heart and be merciful to sinners and remember their sin no more, Jer. 31. Heb. 8.

(19) There are two characteristics of the New Testament: one, that God would write His laws on the heart; the other, that the forgiveness of sins should follow this writing on the heart so surely that God would remember no more sins. Jer. 31. Isa. 43. That God writes into the heart is the revelation of His Son, an art or understanding of His sacrifice and shed blood, which understanding the Father alone gives, Joh. 6. Matth. 11. That is faith, or the heartfelt and living knowledge of the death and shed blood of Christ. So Christ as a spiritual priest (through the Holy Spirit) casts His blood into hearts, souls and consciences, and cleanses our hearts and consciences through faith. Apost. 15. Rom. 3.

20) This revelation, or the new law, is immediately followed by the forgiveness of sin so sufficiently and with such foreknowledge, 2) certainty, that man actually feels that God no longer remembers any sins. Thus God cleanses through faith, from the shed blood of Christ. Apost. 15, Rom. 3. Therefore, we must walk with full faith, Heb. 10, and not with our feet. We must draw the blood of the cross of Christ with our hearts, and not draw the blood in the body of Christ or in the cup with our mouths, if we want to think it is a blood of the new testament, when it is a blood of the true divine new testament.

21. This faith and this way of the New Testament the new pope devastates; and makes us out of the blood of spiritual drink and spiritual sprinkling a blood of bodily drink and bodily sprinkling, and lately, a blood of the Old Testament, against all the writings of God that write of the blood of the New Testament, especially against these: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for you and for many, in remission of sins"; because Christ by this saying "which is shed in remission of sins" publicly indicates that his blood is a blood of spirits, of souls, of hearts, and of consciences, and is not

a blood of the body. Revelation 5 and 7, Hebrews 9. and 10.

22 For the new pope writes against it, and says that we should drink the blood of the Lord bodily for a new testament; which is contrary to the manner, contrary to the nature, and contrary to the attribute of the blood of the new testament. The pope also uses external things, as an external cup, and gives the blood of Christ bodily into the mouth and belly of his apes, and is like the must in two ways, namely in that he takes external and bodily things to the blood of Christ, as Moses.

(23) Moses took hyssop water and purple wool, and dipped or dipped them in the poured out blood and sprinkled his people. But the new pope takes a cup of water and wine and gives the blood of Christ bodily into the mouth of his people, and says it is the blood of the New Testament. But is this not a great mockery and derision of the blood of the New Testament? Does not Luther, in such words, say that Christ's blood is a blood of the New Testament, but with his sense and heathen otherwise, and thus that [it] is a blood of the Old Testament? It is One kind and One power of the blood of Christ in the cup (if it is drunk bodily, as Luther writes of the bodily partaking of the blood of Christ) and of the blood of Moses. For this will not help the sacramentalists, 'that they give the blood hidden under a strange form, since Moses had the book and tabernacle, the altars and other vessels with his blood, to whom the blood of Moses was as unknown as the blood of Christ in the cup is unknown to men; this you shall keep.

(24) If ye know that the blood of Christ is the blood of the new testament, ye know also that only the blood of Christ poured out on the cross is the blood of the testament; for therefore it is the blood of the testament, and the answer of the character of the old testament. And so you also know that you are not to taste the blood of the Lord bodily, but only spiritually; that you are to receive it in your heart, in your conscience, and in the depths of your souls; for this belongs to the new testament, which cancels the old, which was received bodily.

(25) Now you will notice that Luther is a Mosaic preacher and teacher, and not a Christian one; and you can understand all this from the words of Christ, who said in his supper, "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for the remission of sins. Only notice these words of the new testament. Item, "forgiveness of sins" 2c.

(26) Whoever receives the blood of Christ other than for the remission of his sins receives the blood of Christ in unbelief and does violence to the blood of Christ, for he takes away from the blood the glory of the New Testament and the power of forgiveness.

27 But he that receiveth the shed blood of Christ, as the blood of the new testament, receiveth it spiritually with his heart at the cross, and not out of the cup bodily with his mouth.

028 But whosoever receiveth the blood of Christ bodily receiveth it not for the remission of sins, neither as a new testament, but as a bodily drink.

(29) Therefore, if he drinks from the cup of the Lord, thinking that he will drink the blood of Christ in the flesh, he is guilty of the blood of Christ. For he contradicts this word, that the blood of the Lord is the blood of the New Testament, shed on the cross for the remission of sins.

30 The new popes lead us into such unbelief, and the thief Billikan is especially mischievous and willing to make such a foolishness and idleness of the Body and Blood of Christ. But whoever wants to be saved, let him pray to God; for you all truly need great prayers and help from God, since we see that the devil is standing in new choir robes, and dares to blind those who see.

(31) Our new popes are not sufficient for the evil of making the blood of the Lord common blood, the blood of the New Testament the blood of the Old Testament, and the blood of spiritual sprinkling and spiritual purity the blood of bodily sprinkling and bodily purity. No, because they want to continue with their error, and not only give us the blood of Christ to drink bodily, but also put poor, miserable, lousy, sinful and unbelieving priests over it as mediators of the New Testament and the blood of the New Testament, so that they may sin against the blood of Christ.

For they write, preach, and sing that a poor, afflicted, and unbelieving minister, in virtue of the words of Christ (which they may not show), may give the blood of Christ in their cup or sacrament to the people of God, as a blood of the New Testament. Therefore, I must show them their unbelief and say thus:

(33) If the blood of Christ, which a priest gives to him or to another to drink bodily, is not a drink of righteousness, then the precious blood is not a drink of righteousness.

1) In the old edition: solchem. - "Diebold" is Theobald.

The blood of Christ in the chalice of the priests is not the blood of the new testament, because it does not quench the thirst for righteousness, that is, it is not the blood that forgives sin, Rom. 3. And again, it cannot make the chalice of the new popes a new testament, because such blood itself is not the blood of the new testament, nor can it be the blood of the new testament. Therefore I would not have anything to do with them, and they, in turn, could not claim by their blood that the cup is a new testament through their invented blood, which is to be in their cup.

34. But if the blood of Christ in their cup is blood of the New Testament (as Luther once puts, but denies the other time, times thus, [at] times differently, as his book writes in front thus, behind differently) - but if the blood of Christ is blood of the New Testament in the cup of the priests, and the true, that our beautiful, new, wordy, adorned priests could give the blood of Christ to drink: so it will follow that the blood of the Lord shed on the cross would not be blood of the new testament, and that the poor ass-drivers, and the pleasure-grabbers, and the godless parsons would be the colored graves, mediators and preparers of the new testament. This would ever be a beautiful figure, and so Isaiah must lie, who writes of Christ that he is very high and excellent, Is. 52, 13, Cap. 11 [and] 9, and Paul would also have to lie, who gives Christ the process in all things, Col. 1, 15. ff.

35 But that the people, that the sinful priests would be priests and mediators of the new testament, if they could give the blood of Christ to be the blood of the new testament, is found in the epistle to the Hebrews in the 9th and 10th, and also in other books. And I reserve this beforehand, that one thing is in the bottom, if I say: Christ sprinkles the believers with his blood, or so: Christ waters the believers with his blood' you have Hebr. 9. and 10. Joh. 6. Open your eyes, you will find this. Or put thus: The blood of Christ is a blood of the new testament, or a blood of our redemption, Eph. 1. That is one. The other: He that can give the blood, or sprinkle us with it, is a mediator of the new testament.

36. the last I must prove, and gladly do; "for these are bright words, that Christ Jesus by his blood is entered once into his tabernacle, which was made by God, and not of men's hands, which is heaven, Heb. 9:11, 12. and now sitteth on the right hand of God, and waiteth till his enemies be made the footstool of his feet, Heb. 2 and 10. item,

By his own blood the high priest Christ Jesus entered into the holy place, Heb. 9. Take this in hand, for you hear that Christ entered into his holy and divine tabernacle by his own blood, that Christ became a mediator and preparer of the new testament by his poured out blood. This is written in Heb. 9.

37. that Christ, as the most high priest, is due to sprinkle his people with his own blood, you have Heb. 9. it was necessary that the heavenly things were sprinkled and cleansed by the sacrifice and shed blood. Item, the blood of Christ has cleansed our conscience, Heb 9. It sprinkles our hearts, Heb 10. Item, Heb 12. You have both, the mediator JEsurn and the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. Hebr. 13: Christ sanctifies his people through his blood.

(38) From these scriptures it follows that it is proper for one thing and one office to give the blood of Christ, and to cleanse by the blood of Christ the one to whom the blood is given. For the blood of Christ is by its nature and power of God a blood of spiritual sprinkling and holiness. But this is impossible for all apostles, to sanctify the least of these by the blood of Christ; for if apostles could do this, they would be like Christ and be our beatifics.

(39) Nevertheless, the new pope is a mediator of the new testament and testator when he says that the priests give the blood of the Lord in their cup to the laity. But is this not a great dishonor and contempt of the blood of Christ, since Luther holds the blood of Christ in such low esteem that a priest can give it as a drink? Is it not a wretched thing that we have to hear that Luther compares such vile and lowly priests to the most high priest and puts them at his side and may deny the entrance (which once, to an eternal and full redemption, was made through the blood of Christ) so often in one day? This actually means: to promise the blood of the New Testament and to trample it underfoot, Hebr. 10.

Luther writes great books against the sacrifice of the priests, that they get lost in the mass and speak thus: We sacrifice Christ! and writes how they lest God destroy the suffering and sacrifice of Christ. But he does not want to see that he retains the root of the error of the apostles, writes on it and from it, and that he writes the blood of the New Testament from it, and that he promises, despises and blasphemes the blood of the New Testament just as horribly as the old papists promise the sacrifice of Christ.

41. Is not this that Luther sets poor sinners as priests [a contempt] of the blood of Christ?

So that at one end he writes thus: The blood of Christ, drunk from the cup, cleanses the sinner, and says that the priests pass and give the same blood? Is this not blaspheming the priesthood of Christ? Is this not promising the blood of the cross as if it were not powerful and rich enough for eternal salvation? What will follow? That Christ is not a single mediator, a mediator of the New Testament; that we have many mediators, namely crooked godless priests; that the blood of the Lord on the cross is not the blood of our sprinkling, our righteousness and our life.

42. for if the blood in the cup of the priests be the blood of our sprinkling, or of our righteousness, or the blood of our remission of sins: then Christ poured out and offered his blood on the cross (through the Holy Spirit) freely. Gal. 3.

(43) These and such despises of the blood (shed on the cross) are as bad, harmful and shameful as the old papists' foolishness in sacrificing the body and blood of Christ for a memorial, against which Billican cries fiercely.

About our priesthood.

44. but this will not help the old nor the new popes, that we have all become priests through Christ, as it is written: "You have made us priests before God", Revelation 5:10. 1 Peter 2:9. For this is not meant that we might offer the flesh and blood of Christ anew, or that we might make ourselves powerful of the body and blood of Christ, as those do who present and give the body and blood of the Lord to their people through their sacrament; for this power belongs to the most high JESU Christ alone, and to no one else. If we assumed such power, we fell from our priesthood, that is, from Christ, through unbelief, because we sinned against the priest, against his sacrifice and against his blood. Against the priest, that he should die more; therefore also his ministry would not be better than that of 1) Aaron, Heb. 9. Against the sacrifice of Christ, which would not have been fully adequate to give eternal redemption at once; Against the blood, that its shedding could not work eternally for redemption.

45 But so we became priests through Christ. We had no access to God, we were in God's wrath, we were criminal before God.

GOD, we were ugly, we stank of sins 2c., were not allowed to come before God at all: and then Christ the priest came and offered his body, and shed his 2) blood by the Holy Spirit on the cross; and sprinkled our consciences, and cleansed us from evil works, to serve before God, Heb. 9. And gave us access to God, took us from the wrath of God and placed us in the love of God; made us undefiled and blameless, that we might offer to God through Him a sacrifice of praise, the fruits of our lips confessing to God, Heb. 10, that we might offer to God our bodies, sufferings, lives and spirits, Rom. 12, of which we were not able before any. So we find priests through Christ.

(46) We have the priesthood by faith and by the glorious knowledge of the priesthood, the sacrifice and the blood of Christ. Without faith and apart from the knowledge of Christ we would have none of these. But through our faith we are neither able 4) to offer again the sacrifice of Christ, nor to give His body as food, nor 4) to shed again the blood of Christ, nor to give it as a drink. Therefore our priests must not subject themselves to the great things of the priesthood of Christ; they may well let the sacrifice, the body and the blood of Christ remain as [it] is sacrificed.

47. So we have that Luther by his teaching (when he writes that he can give the blood of Christ bodily to drink in his cup) put himself and his followers at the side of Christ, and want to make themselves mediators of the New Testament, to be like the highest priest, to have a like office; to have power to distribute the body and blood of Christ; To make of the blood of the new testament the blood of the old testament, and of the blood of our spiritual sprinkling the blood of bodily sprinkling, which is a great abominable sin, that is, an antichristian doctrine, contrary to the blood of the cross, and a punishment or contempt of the new testament.

48 It will also not excuse Luther, whether he writes differently with the appearance (because the evil root of his teaching remains), that he boasts much of the word and says: The word does it, and we do it in the word (of which the devil could also boast), if it is evident that Luther boasts of the word of God, which he does not have. Luther boasts of the word of God, which he does not have.

2) "shed his" put by us instead of: "shed".

3) In the old edition: den.

4) So put by us instead of: "against", which often stands for "neither".

5) Here We have erased the words: "and blood".

1) In the old editions: des.

and cannot hang it up. Luther has not one syllable in Scripture that indicates that the blood of Christ in the cup is New Testament blood. Then he has much less in Scripture that the cup is a New Testament through the blood of Christ that is in the cup than he says. And has still less indication in the Scriptures that a minister can bring the blood of Christ down from heaven into the cup and give it as a blood of the testament.

(49) By these reasons (of faith) it is well established that the cup is not a new testament by the blood that is poured

in it, but by the blood of the cross, by the blood that Christ the priest poured out. And it is immediately said that the cup is a new testament in the blood, but that in death the cup is a new testament. For the death of Christ belongs to the new testament, just as the poured out blood of Christ. - The 9th chapter of Hebrews and the other apostles who write about death and the shedding of blood will tell you this.

50 Now as little as it will follow that the death of Christ must be in the cup, if it were written publicly, than secretly yet powerfully, is written: The cup the new testament in my death. 1)

(51) Therefore Luther's will that the blood in the cup must be bodily, if the cup is a new testament in the blood or through the blood, does not exclude it. Behold, we find a people of God and a people of the New Testament by the blood of Christ. But does it follow that the blood of Christ must be bodily in us? No. We have faith, and the cup is used by us, in remembrance of the shed blood of Christ, as a drinking vessel. Therefore the cup is a new testament through the blood [shed on the cross].

Now let us see if this text: "the cup the new testament in my blood" may serve Luther somewhat! Let us lay this text back and forth, unfold it, turn the back to the front, the innermost out, and try whether Luther has a foundation for his teaching, which he built on this foundation.

(53) Let us leave the text as it is, and thus insist: "The cup the new testament in my blood"; what follows? that the blood of the Lord is bodily in the cup? Where do you have Scripture? you answer: Allhie. How does it read? not thus: in the blood, in the blood? Not? Well, then you would read nothing 2) from it, except that the cup is in the blood. Does this seem foolish to you, and contrary to our senses, reason, and faith? you should know that your braided

mind is much more foolish, scripture-less, bare, and wretched.

54 For he hath all the infirmities which this mind hath: The cup is in the blood bodily; and concerning these infirmities he lacks writing or written conjecture. You should read: The cup is in the blood; so thou redest the blood is bodily in the cup: if I am foolish in thy mind, to say, The cup is bodily in the blood of Christ, therefore it is a new testament: thou art foolish still in our mind, when thou sayest, The cup is a new testament in the blood, which is bodily in the cup. For this scripture leaveth thee, and setteth up, according to the letter, another understanding, which no man receiveth.

55. lay the text thus: The new testament in the blood is the cup. Does not the sense and understanding follow again, which no man and no church has ever accepted, namely this: The cup is in the blood? But this you would not notice, if you thus collect the words: The new testament in the blood of Christ; the cup is the new testament; therefore the cup is in the blood of Christ.

56. turn the same speech thus: In the blood the new testament the cup. But what would you draw from it? This? The new testament is in the blood, the cup is in the blood, because the cup is a new testament in the blood? Doesn't that follow? It doesn't? [It] follows, b) Ei! so thou seest that this bright writing overthrows thy ground, and takes the blood out of the cup. Now where is the bright sun? Has it faded? Has it become dark? Where is the thunderbolt? I mean, it has fallen into Luther's doctrine and dreams, and has struck the ground and the building into a heap, and he is waiting for it not to fall on his head. Such weather God imposes, if one wants to be ungrateful. There the Billikün will concoct new blood, 4) and invent a blood and bring it into his cup from

1) The meaning of this confusing sentence should be well: From the words "the new testament in my blood" it does not follow that the blood of Christ is in the cup, any more than from the words "the new testament in my death" it would follow that the death of Christ must be in the cup, although the latter version of the words (according to what has been said in the preceding paragraph) is the correct one, for the death of Christ is that by which the new testament comes into being.

2) So put by us instead of: not.

3) "IM) follows." put by us instead of: "folget?" in the old edition.

4) So put by us instead of: hack out.

a new Bible, which is neither 1) a blood of the New Testament, nor a blood that is useful for anything; for he does not want to suffer that one thus smuggles: The blood is, by these and other scriptures, not in the cup, therefore it is not in it; although he does not present any scripture that the blood of the Lord is in the cup.

I preached the grace of the cross at the beginning; some laymen have taken it so well that they conclude that Christ is of no use to them in the sacrament; after this protection, 2) "that the sun may shine on all ends, and that Christ may be useful to all ends," they asked nothing, for they knew how to speak of the usefulness of Christ's suffering. Then our papists should say: What do the body and blood of Christ accomplish in the sacrament? to what end are they useful to the recipients? They do this 3) so inconsistently that everyone almost begins to doubt whether Christ is in the sacrament? Our papists should also prove that Christ is in their sacrament. But what they do seems to be good from our Scripture, which we are now dealing with. If it were directed with scolding, blaspheming, cursing, banishing, and giving to the devil, they would have already gained their cause; for I would not like to answer them to their mockery.

(58) But this I desire, that they teach me with clear, bright, and certain Scripture, that how and why Christ is in the Sacrament? If they would do this, I would gladly let myself be taught; so gladly that it should be noticed that I would follow without scolding.

But what shall I do? I, who am attacked with the above-mentioned scripture as with a thunderbolt, am assigned to the devil? I, who declare that this writing, "the cup the new testament" 2c. brings the blood from the cup and gives a mind, which no pope has accepted? What shall I do? I know this need to no one but God alone to complain.

But that this text: The cup is the new testament 2c. does not keep the blood in the cup, is indicated in two ways. I will turn and reverse the text a third time, thus: The cup is your blood, the new testament. What follows? That the blood is your cup? No! Because that would have to be

also follow: The blood of Christ is in the cup a new testament; or: The blood is through the cup a new testament. This would be to blaspheme the new testament of Christ! Although Luther's opinion struggles for it, if he succeeds. So again the mind remains: The cup is in the blood, understand: bodily; because the popes want to have the blood of Christ bodily in the cup. But the popes do not accept this; so we accept even less from dreams.

61 I am afraid that the popes will lose their status, how much they are angry, throbbing and shouting, cursing, maledicting.

62) On this article, I must make it known to Christians that the blood of Christ is a true drink, John 6; the same drink no Christian should drink bodily, that is, with mouth and belly, for then the blood of Christ would not be a true drink, but with the heart in faith, who well recognizes the blood of Christ shed on the cross; he drinks well and his thirst is quenched, as Christ says, "He who believes in me will not thirst forever," John 6.

63. I would gladly know what the godly thirst for? Do [they] not thirst for righteousness? What is the righteousness of the godly? Is it not faith and knowledge that washes away the many sins? Isaiah 53. 1 John 1. Is not the forgiveness of sins the blessedness of the faithful? Let Paul answer you in Romans 3, and Romans 8.

This must be the reason of those who thirst for righteousness, that some feel their sin and thirst for certain forgiveness; for God has revealed it to them, that through the shedding of His blood One would give sure forgiveness of sins abundantly, fully and sufficiently, with full assurance, and eternal peace, Rom. 5. 5; the same is the Messiah, who is Jesus of Nazareth, for God has sealed and sent him, John 6:9. Whoever therefore recognizes Jesus Christ finds in him that his blood is the true blood of the new testament, which was shed for all sin. Therefore his thirst is satisfied forever, for he knows by faith that Christ Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God, who through the Holy Spirit shed [his blood] for the remission of sins. In the same he is satisfied; he thinks of no other salvation, and it grieves him that some seek their salvation in other things, or by other means, than those do who would rather be saved by the blood of the sacrament than by the shedding of the blood of Christ on the cross.

1) "Neither - neither" in the meaning: neither - nor. So put by us instead of: "again - again", because the opinion of Carlstadt will be: Billican will invent a new blood kmd in his cup, which is neither a blood of the new testament, nor something useful.

2) So put by us instead of: "nor diß Schützerey. (That the sun shines all end" etc.) - Schützerei - pretending of an ABC pupil.

3) In the old edition: des.

that which Christ says: "Whoever believes in me will thirst no more for ever [not]," John 6.

Therefore we must recognize or rightly believe the shed blood of Christ, shed on the cross, if the blood is to be our drink; for Christ poured out his blood on the cross for a spiritual drink, when he gave his flesh, raised on the cross for the life of the world, for a true food, John 3:6, 12.

But if we are to know the blood of Christ shed on the cross, if it is our true drink, we must come with faith and in the heart, Heb. 10, Rom. 3, our inward man must come, and not the outward. Is this true? Yes, it is true. It is false, made up and lied about, that the blood of Christ is our bodily drink, which Luther teaches.

67) Yes, 1) the pope punishes Christ; Christ says: We are to drink in the heart and faith; so the pope says: You are to drink with the mouth, Christ says: You are to hear and learn from the Father and thus come to me. Luther says: You shall hear me and come to the blood in the cup. Christ says that his blood is a true drink, that is, a drink of eternal salvation, of eternal life before God; for it is a spiritual drink. But Luther says: The blood in the cup is not a true drink, and is not a drink of salvation and life before God, but the blood of Christ you shall drink from our cup bodily.

68) The blood in the cup is a blood of a new testament, although it does not forgive sin, nor does it give birth to spiritual life. 2) It is a common blood that Judas the betrayer, Pilate, Herod and the murderous priests drink. But what comes of it? What? Not that Christ said wrongly that his blood was a true drink of life? and that the truth was a lie, saying, "He who drinks the blood remains in me? Item, he who drinks, has eternal life? And that Jesus also knew not what he spake, saying, There cometh no man unto me, but he whom my Father hath begotten? But so Luther writes against Christ, and not against me. And especially he writes against the blood of Christ, when he writes: that the blood of Christ can be a bodily, or false, and ischariothic drink; for the little river flows out of this well: This blood of Christ (in

the cup of the priests) is a bodily drink in which Judas, the betrayer of Christ, has fellowship.

Luther found and dug out this well, therefore the poisonous water is also his, which tries to wash away the ground of the cross of Christ. But it will split on the hard rock, believe me. We have neither sand, nor gravel, nor pebbles, but pure, hard and true rock; know this, and you will know it.

(70) If Luther did no other harm in Christendom, it would be truly great and terrible that he makes a false drink out of a true drink, a bodily drink out of a spiritual drink, a drink of life out of a drink of death, a drink of the elect out of a drink of the damned, and punishes Christ, who publicly says that his blood is a true drink, John 6 and 1 John 1. 6, and 1 John 1, which says that those who have fellowship in the blood of Christ have no fellowship with sins. And again: that they enjoy nothing of the blood of Christ, who have fellowship with sins. For this I would like to praise something from the 12th chapter of John, if it were necessary. But there is enough in the teaching of Christ at one end and St. John at the other to shut Luther's mouth as it is now shut in front of him and will soon be shut more powerfully or more violently.

Luther has already been revealed that he writes differently about the blood of Christ than the truth, and wants to make the blood of Christ a bodily, unspiritual, powerless and spiritless drink, to dishonor the Lord Christ and to disgrace his blood; therefore beware of his teaching. Take care that his rhetoric does not deceive you; do not let it be said to you, 3) that Christ (John 6) did not write enough about the drinking of his blood.

Wait, and do not make the blood in the chalice of the priests the blood of the Old Testament, as Luther does, who gives it bodily to drink, who leaves the name of the blood of the New Testament in appearance, but in root and reason he robs the precious, noble, delicious blood shed for us of all worthiness. He takes from the blood the spirit, the strength, the power, the perfection, the benefit, and the name of the New Testament, to his own detriment and to the condemnation of all those who sit on the beast he rides.

I write, as I understand it, without desire,

3) So put by us instead of: to put away. Probably "einrunen" will be written by Carlstadt.

1) Za" set by us instead: Da.

2) So put by us instead of: gebühret.

that one might fall into God's wrath, and know it no other way. And I ask God daily for His mercy, so that He will not let me write otherwise than His truth, and reveal it to me if I am wrong. But the more I think, strive and think, and the more firmly and steadfastly I have pleaded and begged, the more I have come to understand the devil's trick, who has given Christians the idea that they can get help from the sacramental nature of Christ when they bodily receive the Body and Blood of Christ through the Sacrament.

May the Father of all mercies enlighten us, teach us right reason, and keep us in constant peace! Amen.

Luther has faith in Christ against him, so all scripture abandons him. What should I do? What do you want to do, dear Christian? We must ask for wisdom and strength.

75 From the above speech it is easy to notice 1) that these words: The cup is the new testament in my blood, which is poured out, Luc. 22, or these: This is my blood, which is of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins, Matt. 26, are necessary words, which Christ spoke out of necessity, for many causes.

76) To the first. That Christ had to proclaim publicly before his end that he was the Messiah 2); that all the writings of Moses, the prophets, who had prophesied of a new testament and of the blood of the new testament, should be fulfilled in the Lord and in his blood and attain an end.

This was a joyful and necessary sermon and promise; it was also a ministry above the ministry of all the prophets, and above the ministry of John the Baptist. For the Baptist pointed to a stranger, but Christ pointed to himself, and to his own blood, and said, This is my blood of the new testament; and that ye know it even now, that the blood of the new testament is blood, I say, which is shed for many for remission of sins. If you hear the new testament, that is, the forgiveness of sins, just realize that my blood is the blood that is to be shed for the forgiveness of sins.

78. in that true and full pardon shall be through my blood, my blood is the blood of the new testament, in which sins are made whole with one another.

forgive, so that [the] conscience takes precedence over sin, and God no longer wants to think anything about sins.

79) But in that 3) [it] is poured out, it is a blood of the testament, for every blood must be poured out and sprinkled into the people of the testament, which is to become a blood of the testament, since a testament without death is no testament. Therefore, the blood of the testament must be the blood of death, as the blood of Christ was on the cross. For this reason the apostles write at times of the death of Christ, and [at] times of the shedding of blood. This is a valiant and sufficient cause, that Christ before his end said of his shedding of blood that [it] would be a blood of the Mediator of the new testament, which would be shed for the full and everlasting remission of sins, and thus become a blood of the new testament.

80 From this cause another follows, that Christ spoke of his blood in such a way, that we might know how the cup of the supper would become a new testament. Namely, when Christ had shed his blood for the remission of sins, and his congregation came together and drank from the cup in right remembrance of the shed blood; as Paul writes to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 11, with bright words thus: You shall do this (as often as you drink) in my remembrance. Paul says soon before that, that the cup is a testament in the blood of Christ; this was also true of Paul: a new testament in my blood; as if the other clause had been added to it, which reads: which is poured out for the remission of sins (which the other evangelists have expressed to us in a greater and more certain sense). For we all see what Paul calls a new testament, Heb. 9. 10. 12. 13. why the blood of Christ is a blood of the new testament, namely on account of forgiveness; which with him enough is written: The blood of Christ is a blood of the New Testament, and thus much is said as that the blood of Christ must be shed for the full remission of the sins of Christ's people and of God. This is what everyone sees in Hebrews 8. 9. 10. So the name of Christ coincides with the death of Christ, Matth. 3. 2. lucas at the last.

(81) Therefore the cup is a new testament through the blood, or in the blood of the new testament, that we drink of the cup in remembrance of Christ who died and shed His blood for us.

3) In the old edition: that.

1) In the old edition: dissolute.

2) This form "Messiach" is probably set by Carlstadt on purpose to let see that he understands Hebrew.

Luther may lay it on me as if I had written that such glorious and necessary words of blood should be left outside; but let it be far from me! But it would serve Luther if we put such words under a bench. It would serve me and the believers in Christ, that we try such words of the Lord and understand their content.

83. for we grasp that the cup of the Lord is a cup of the new testament through the blood of the cross, which flowed from the body of Christ hanging on the cross. For the same blood is the blood of the new testament. But if the cup is a new testament through the blood of the cross, then the cup is not a new testament through the blood that is supposed to be in it. For even if the blood of Christ had been in the cup at the time of the supper, when it was in the body of Christ, yet the cup would not have been a new testament through the same unshed blood, since the nature and quality of the blood of the new testament is that it is shed; when Christ would shed his blood 1) for the remission of sins.

If the blood (which is said to be bodily in the cup) made the cup a new testament by the same bodily essence, then the weapons of Christ's suffering would certainly have become a new testament, the scourges, the crown, the spear, the cross, the earth, the nails, on which the blood of Christ bodily and visibly hung or stuck. But who says that all these things are new testaments? And if someone said so, he would have to dispute it with scriptures, if we were to believe him. But if these things are not called the new testament, who can stand to call the cup of the Lord a testament, that the blood of the Lord should be bodily in it?

85 Let us call the Scriptures the New Testament because they testify of the New Testament, that is, of death and the shedding of blood, and keep the remembrance of death, and not because death and the shed blood, or Christ himself, is bodily in it; why not also drink of the cup of the Lord, which the Lord hath set before him for his remembrance?

The blood shed on the cross is the blood of the New Testament because Christ shed and offered his blood through the Holy Spirit for us and our sin on the cross, Heb. 9. To this we must direct our remembrance. He that thinketh long, and thinketh not the power of the cross, thinketh not that which he ought to think, or that which he ought not to think.

1) We have erased "the" before shedding.

how he should think, because Christ clearly says: that is poured out for you. Therefore, if a man drinks from the cup of the Lord without a remembrance of the shed blood of Christ, he is guilty of the blood of Christ, and all the thinking you have is lost if you do not have such a remembrance.

From this speech of Christ it also follows that they are fools who call the Lord's supper a new testament, especially those who call it a new testament because Christ forgives sins in the invented sacrament, or that the power of forgiveness is in the sacrament. 2c. For this reason is fictitious and false, even if an angel set it up.

Forgiveness of sins is on the cross. Christ bore our sins on the cross, washed them away and paid for them. 1 Pet. 2. Is. 53. Col. 1. For this reason they lie to Christ crucified, who call the Lord's supper a new testament for the forgiveness of sins; and they break the power of the cross of Christ, in which alone and sufficiently is forgiveness of all sins. But Luther is a master of this error, who also damages many people, and makes the suffering or death of Christ fruitless for half or half of what it was.

(89) But that Luther might paint his doctrine with a color, and not be seen to do what he does, he says, The cup is a new testament, for the remission of sins; for remission is contained in it.

This is a color and a lid without writing. But isn't it a beautiful color? Doesn't it shine well? If Luther had put writing on it, who would not believe him? But must Luther ever lead the fools by the monkey rope? Or is this blasphemy of the blood, of the cross, only 4) of men, and not also of God? If we did not have the speech of the Lord about the blood of the New Testament, what would we put against it? How good would Luther have it? What would I have to hear?

But praise God! we have the Word of God, which is bright and clear and powerful, to uncover this mantle, and to reveal the promise of the cross of Christ. For Christ speaks thus: The cup the new testament in my blood, which is poured out for many 2c. Come here! Do not both your ears ring? Ei, how do they buzz? I mean, this saying breaks Luther's foundation? Not? if then? Why has

2) Thus placed by us instead of: "in the new. That the correction we have made is correct is evident from the following paragraph.

3) So put by us instead of: and.

4) So put by us instead of: all.

Christ did not say: The cup the new testament in my blood, in which the forgiveness of sins is granted? Answer more! Is it enough that the cup is a new testament, that forgiveness is granted in it (which is still unproven)? why then does Christ say: the blood that is poured out? and not in vain, but is poured out for us in forgiveness of sins?

(92) But if this is true, that the cup is a new testament in the blood shed for us in forgiveness, the other is a lie, that the cup is a new testament for the sake of the confession of sins. For the confession is powerless, and not a testament; but the shedding is powerful, testamentary, and fixed. Now if Luther wants to insist on his Scripture and hold that Christ acquired forgiveness of sins through his shed blood, he must also confess that the cup is a new testament in the acquired forgiveness of sins, because Christ says that his blood is a blood of the new testament, which should be shed in forgiveness of sins. But the other thing Luther says is punished: the cup is a new testament, because Christ has decreed [forgiveness of sin] in it. Do you see now, Luther, how I do not distinguish these words? how they smash your building into heaps? how they shatter and crush your vault? how they take the blood from your cup?

This is one of Luther's strongest warriors, who is not only struck down with his own sword, but robbed of all his possessions.

(94) I counsel you, brethren, to open your eyes, to ask God for wisdom, to meditate well on the Scriptures; for you see how the Scriptures at first have a semblance of establishing the error of the popes, only because they are used by one whom you take for a prophet. But if you look rightly into the Scripture, you will find not only a rock, [but also] a sharp sword and a powerful hammer, 1) which strikes the new pope's sophistry to the ground and crushes it.

95 Whosoever therefore shall call the Lord's supper a new testament, for the remission of sins, which shall be strong therein, doeth violence to the new testament of Christ, and is an enemy of the cross of Christ: know ye this. The cause is shown above.

Now notice what springs from this finding:

1) So put by us instead of: not the pure rock; [but] a sharp sword and a troublesome hammer 2c.

The cup is a new testament in the blood that is to be in it. First, that the blood in the cup is poured out for us and is poured out as often as the blood of Christ makes the cup a new testament. For this is what the Scripture gives: Where the blood of the new testament is bodily, there is shedding of the blood, Heb. 9. From this it follows that the ministers give the blood of Christ for us, as they give us the blood of Christ to drink. For it is a giving 2) and blood for us, and for our sin, and for the life of the world; therefore he that giveth must give that which cleaveth to him.

97 Secondly, that the blood of Christ may forgive the new sin. To this they will say no with their mouth and yes with the root of their error.

From this it follows for the third, that the priests sacrifice the blood of Christ as often as they give it to the people for a drink. Therefore the new popes are as bad and evil as the old papists; therefore I refer to the reason of the 9th and 10th chapter of Hebrews. Chapter to the Hebrews.

The fourth is that they want to be mediators of the New Testament.

100. fifth, that Christ must die often; for where the negation of the testament is, there is the negation of death, Heb. 9.

101. sixth, that the death and shed blood of Christ was not the death and blood of the new testament. Heb. 9.

Seventh, that Christ's death, sacrifice and blood are imperfect.

All this flows from the error of the popes, who are also pious 3); and all this an understanding man can nullify from the words of Christ, especially by these words: This is my blood of the new testament, which is poured out for many, in remission of sins; the cup the new testament in my blood, which is poured out for you.

Dear brethren, let us not tarry with the scriptures against the new testament: for they that despise, or have no respect unto the sacrifice, and blood, and testament of Christ, have no redemption.

105. before this letter I> have reported that any will and promise of God may be called a testament; as the promise of Abraha, Gal. 3, and the Jews of the testament children, Apost. 3, and this promise, that the body will be given for you, can be a testament; therefore, I have not wanted to further unfold it.

2) In the old edition: enter.

3) This probably means: one is as pious as the other, Luther as pious as the pope.

7. Carlstadt's explanation of how he respects and wants to have respected his doctrine of the reverend Sacrament, and others. *)

July 25, 1525.

Explanation of how Carlstadt respects and wants to have respected his doctrine of the reverend Sacrament, and others.

Because I have heard from Andreas Bodenstein of Carlstadt that some fall upon my books, which I have written about the reverend Sacrament, as upon a proven divine teaching, and now consider it certain that the Body of Christ in the Sacrament cannot be bodily, I must explain myself better and report what everyone is to think of my writing.

2. although I meant that no one would want to draw such a serious meaning from my books, which he would consider a certain divine reason, because I write in clear words that I want to accept Christian instruction; so that I ever secretly admit my guilt and confess that I myself am still uncertain. Item, because I also write that I have no Scripture that drives me to the old or other understanding, and have placed my letter in such a way (as it seems to me) that it should ever be understood from it that no Scripture would faze me, nor throw me under this obedience, that I would have to say: The body of Christ must be bodily in the bread of the Lord 2c.

(3) For I speak and write this from my head and from my ability and bestowed grace, and not from all men's understanding and grace, for 1) in such writing or speaking, all this is also impossible, that there are many thousands to be found, who have received much more skillful eyes and ears from God than I, who could hear God's word more thoroughly than I, who find an understanding of God in the place where I can find nothing. For I know it well that by natural powers I am not able to fathom nor dig out the meaning of holy Scriptures. The readers of my books should have considered all this, and not consider anything to be proven and divine, before they assured themselves of God from the holy Scriptures. But since it has not happened, and not much happens yet, such disciples, who alone understand who is writing, should know this:

1) In the old edition: when.

4. that I have been willing to give a divine and proven doctrine; but not before, nor any further, than when we have sufficiently searched and ransacked the Scriptures, so that we actually know and do not mean 2), become certain, and do not doubt anything. Before that happens, which is still undone, my teaching should be considered nothing better than a delusion and conceit.

(5) And let the people search and discern the time, and draw no full or final judgment from my Scriptures, but stand still. As Paul teaches: One or two should speak; the others should judge or recognize. But if a revelation happens to one, the speaker should be silent. This is what my readers should do, namely, recognize, and not conclude or make certain, before the revelation has come, or before they have been overcome and caught by God's word and driven into an obedience of divine truth.

(6) But most of them forsake the holy Scriptures, and little regard what is founded in the Scriptures; but many boast of persons, and have no other consolation or reason than this: he or that one wrote it; he learns 3) this, I hold it with him. So they do not seek the fountain of living and unconfessed waters, but cisterns, from which of course nothing good and no truth can flow, but foolishness, deceit 2c. Namely, they forsake God, and look at men, of whom it is written: What goes out of their hearts stains them, Matth. 15, 18. Item: All men are liars, Ps. 116, 11. No one respects God, Ps. 14, 2. Do you not know what the Scriptures speak? Does not God say thus, "Cursed is he who trusts in man?" Item: Everything that reveals flesh and blood is satanic and not divine, seductive and not true, contemptible and not praiseworthy? Is this not frightening, that human wisdom is an enmity against God? And that our wisdom cannot please God?

2) "not meant" - not merely holding an opinion. 3) learn - teach.

From this you should all be wise and certain that what the flesh and blood of Carlstadt invents, understands and presents or learns is not good, nor can it be divine. But now it is not good nor dangerous. So you should be afraid in Carlstadt's books that you might catch something for God that is Carlstadt's, something for good that is evil. Now open your eyes and brains and ask God to keep you from such teaching as often as you read the books of men. Truly, it has ever been repugnant to me that some fall for the person and attach themselves to it. But if you want to boast about persons, Zwinglium or Carlstadt, you would gain nothing, as is now said, and put yourself in danger, as I have now warned you. About this you know almost well that many saints have been, and still are, who hold this doctrine: The body of Christ is bodily in the sacrament and is bodily partaken of, to be divine. How many martyrs have died in this faith? how many of the other saints? Do you want to talk about scholars? Which one is more learned than Augustine? Do Cyprian and Jerome not count for anything? What is Ambrose? what Bernard? If you also want to praise the bunch, the other part has it far better. Although this is forbidden, nevertheless some babble into the new mind, and know of no other reason to speak but of poor persons.

I confess this before God without reproach, but from the heart. Everything that I have ever written, spoken, or even taught from my own property, or have found from myself, is human, false, unsolvable, seductive, satanic, to be feared and to be fled; I must confess this to the honor of truth and to the praise of God in divine things or teachings. Now boast of Carlstadt's writing or books without understanding of divine truth! May you still blow out the doctrine of a poor man and exalt yourself with it?

(8) Not only in this article about the reverend sacrament do I want to have said this and to have kept it from my doctrine, but in all martyrdom, which I have written out, about the mass, about idols, and about other articles. Namely, this is what I want to have: No one shall think that my doctrine is good, just, true, divine, or wholesome, unless he has been assured of it from the wholesome word of God; for I will have judged my writing according to God and from God's word. From the holy scripture the reader shall praise or rebuke my teaching. But many fall upon their consciences and feet into my books, as hungry

Swine in dung, and when the swine is, they drag in the dung, and the noble pearl, God's. Word, they tread among themselves in the dung, and direct God's word according to my doctrine, all absurd and perverse, and contrary to my will.

What is the cause? This is the reason that most of them seek not reason and truth, but folly and novelty. For 1) methinks that not a few fall into my delusion and conceit, for the sake of novelty and oddity, and intend nothing else than to talk something new in front of others in tabernacles and in the tassel 2). But aren't such right pleasure diggers, poor and foolish people? Would not all desire to write be extinguished in the face of such ambitious gleamers? Are these not the loose, robbing and unbelieving people, who seek nothing but honor and glory? Who then dishonor and revile God's word the most, when they carry around and spread His divine word for their own glory.

10) Truly, there is nothing in such people but a colorful exterior, and inwardly vain and evil. 3) They build and comfort themselves on nothing but a reed or a gentle wind of the person. These are the swine to whom no pearl should be presented.

(11) But this is not to punish all men, nor to deter or dissuade devout Christians from the reading of Christian scribes. For Paul writes: Ye shall try all things, and keep those things which are good, 1 Thess. 5. Neither do I wish to turn away any man from the practice of prophesying, nor to hinder the least from hearing and judging, for I know well that Paul writes: I want you all to prophesy, and to know or to judge, 1 Cor. 14.

(12) Neither will I speak into the divine revelation of anyone, knowing what is written in Matt. 2 and John 5, nor dampen or quench the Spirit of God, for the Scripture says, "Do not quench the Spirit," 1 Thess. 5:19, but test whether it is of God.

(13) What is good and divine is wholesome and true, and to be accepted in whom it is found, whether old or young, man or child, high or low. Whatever is divine in my books, I do not contradict, nor does anyone force me to contradict divine truth, hear me.

14. but I can not stand that sows in

1) In the old edition: If.

2) tassel - quarrel: so set by us instead of: in quasi.

3) "Oeß" is unknown to us, perhaps: Aas? The plural of "Aas" is similar in Low German.

my doctrine porcelain,' who want to be Christians, and eat nothing, but only what they consider to be human. But the doctrine of God they sniff at, as dogs in the run-up, and ask nothing after God and after their blessedness. Remember me: What is not godly, that I reject and want [it] to be thrown down freely by everyone.

(15) But what you are still uncertain of, you shall not make yourself certain of by my Scriptures. Truth, the truth of God, known by the grace of God, that alone can and shall make you free from all error and lack, secure and certain, John 8, which you must seek in the place where it lies, or standing in the street and crying out: Come to me 2c.

(16) I have had to let it happen that my books came to print, that I did not mean otherwise, nor do I understand otherwise even today, except that my conceit is well proven, good, right, divine and wholesome. But I am not sure of this, therefore no one may make me greater than I am, nor make me higher than I pretend to be. My books could also do no harm, nor seduce anyone, if they were read and respected as I want them to be read and respected, as described above. For they do so little harm that some have become firmer and more certain in the faith than before. Therefore I have not deserved great ingratitude.

(17) Though I would that none were written in the world, for the sake of the fellows who ask nothing of divine truth, or think that it is certain and approved, that 1) they have no other evidence than the name of a poor person. And truly, if I had worried about these dangerous times, no one would have brought my books from me with a wooden axe. For I have had to wander about in misery, and have had to be at the ends of all my enemies, where they wished me or lied to me. This is also one of the causes that cast me into suspicion of rebellion among the noble Christians, who are more careful 2) than they realize.

18 And indeed, I had not spread my doctrine of the Sacrament 2c. to more persons than those who heard me orally; and if one had not done so, such books would still be in ink and pen. A good friend asked me to write and lend him such a mind for his person; he brought such a teaching of the Sacrament from me with many kind words and a noble request. After that, my little books came into print, and

1) In the old edition: that.
2) condemn.

out of the pressure into the wide world, and I, the poor, have thus come into poverty, and have become a disgust and an abomination to many, who have sought me out and brought me back, not as an enemy, but as a madman, with sighs out of Christian love; for I have always desired the light, offered myself for justice and interrogation, and have wanted to be wise to something better, where I have ever been.

(19) From this only a man understands how he should judge and hold my writing, and that I myself must not swear that it must be so. But I have used, introduced and presented writings, on which I have founded and established my doctrine. If I have now misused and perverted these writings (which would truly be done out of ignorance and I would be sorry for it), then my teaching is certainly not good, nor divine, nor acceptable.

20 I also hear that Doctor Zwinglius is to write in a booklet that my teaching is right, but does not follow from the holy scriptures which I have introduced. If this were so, the good man would have given him and me a hard push. For I have this scripture: The flesh is of no use, even for a reason. Zwingli, however, considers it the best and strongest reason than I do, even higher; therefore I do not know what he himself means and how he wants to have understood it, or how certain he is in his heart, or whether he spoke such a judgment for the sake of a person. But this is what I want from my readers, that all those who know that my reasons are unhelpful or unsuitable, or that they are badly laid, should also consider my building, which I have placed on it, to be wrong. For we are concerned more than fields and meadows, life or death; we are concerned with eternal life or eternal fire. Therefore, let each one look at the right ground of God, knowing and not supposing, nor concluding anything until he becomes certain. For we are not to go along in a fictitious faith that does not know a word of God. But no one should find me or persecute me because we care so much. If he is a Christian, I deserve thanks. For it is undoubted that many thousands in this and other articles have known nothing more than to say of mere old custom, who truly do not know one letter of the word of faith, from which faith comes, and are now moved to look at the Scriptures and the word of God themselves and with diligence 3); which will bring them great salvation. For we have never heard of any other wisdom, nor

3) So put by us instead of: "in the flesh."

of 1) divine mystery, as Deut. 4. and 29. and in many epistles of Paul it is written.

21 For why? they must not think that they have a right faith or blessed eyes (as the apostles of the Lord had, and we all must have, if we want to be righteous and blameless before God), if they have not been taught by God, and know nothing to testify of the word of faith, but only of this fiddle: I have heard it thus, my parents also have believed it thus. For Christ says thus, He that is of God heareth the word of God, Joh. 5. My sheep hear my voice, and they hear not the voice of strangers, Joh. 10. Beware of false prophets, they speak the visions of their heart, Jer. 23, 16. Item: Thy mother is a Hittite, 2) thy father an Amorean; as the mother is, so is the daughter, and the son as the father, Ezek. 16, 44. Therefore the glory and comfort is false and to be feared, in which the world has lain before, and has known nothing but the faith of parents, and the cry of wolves wearing sheepskins.

I rejoice before God that in all my writings I have sought, meant and laid this foundation, that Christ, through His obedience in His death on the cross, has become our righteousness before God, and our full and eternal Savior. So that we have full forgiveness of all sins through his suffering, as Paul writes a hundred times, and Isaiah and Christ have taught before. Item, that we have this forgiveness of our sins not out of vain grace, but out of righteousness, that is, we have a right honest payment for our sins, that is, Christ suffered as much and more than we all have sinned, and he redeemed the handwriting of our guilt with his suffering, and paid all that was written in the handwriting, and nailed our handwriting to the cross. The handwriting of our guilt is the law of Moses, which Moses wrote as a testimony of our sins, guilt, wickedness and foolishness, as Moses himself says, or God through Moses 5 Mos. 31. The same law of God reveals our sins, Rom. 7, 7, and as often as we look at it, so often we find our guilt; and the deeper we get into it, the more sin we find, and to that our cursing and God's wrath against us. But Christ has taken away the same law or handwriting, as it is said, and put it on the cross.

1) Thus set by us instead of: before.

2) Thus set by us instead of: "Cetea" according to Ezek. 16, 3. 45.

Eph. 2, and so completely abolished that there is no longer a conscience, but the conscience and the law of sins are abolished, Heb. 9. So that we may no longer fear either the plague or the guilt, nor the wrath of God, nor the devil (to whom we were given because of our guilt), and may cheerfully ask and answer, "Who will accuse us because of our vices? God is the one who justifies us. Who will put us to shame? 3) Christ is there, who died for us. What? God is on our side. So if God is for us, who can be against us? God did not spare His own Son, but gave Him for us; how could it be that He 4) did not forgive us all sin? Rom. 8. therefore we have righteousness, and with righteousness we have been set free, and our debt has been paid, and nothing has been given in it; for God gave His Son for our debt, and the Son gave Himself as a ransom for us, 1 Tim. 2. He has paid our debts more precious than silver and gold, for He has redeemed us with His flesh and blood, body and life, and has paid all the debts of the world abundantly and completely, and paid them all at once, and He has not owed a single mite. Therefore we have rightly come from the devil through Christ, and not by pure grace. It is true that if we hold God and the righteousness of Christ against us and compare them, we have nothing but pure grace. But if we compare the redemption of Christ with our guilt, we have more than grace. For Christ gave us his suffering, that is, Christ gave us money and made it our own, that we might pay all our debt. If someone gave me ten guilders, with which I paid my debtor, the gift would be vain favor or grace; but the redemption would be in justice. Even if he gave the money himself and made me free, there would still be grace and justice, and I would be sure and certain of redemption.

(23) So I have taught the forgiveness of our sins, and this foundation I have laid, and have called the faithful to learn how Christ is even our Righteous One, as He was promised by the prophet, Jer. 23, Isa. 53, Luc. 2. And how Christ justifies us through his suffering, and how we have obtained forgiveness of sins in the shed blood of Christ, so that they do not seek forgiveness of their sins or understand it as when a priest forgives sins, or when Christ said on earth, "Stand up and be forgiven."

3) condemn.

4) So put by us instead of: "he."

but to speak of the righteousness of our redemption, and to understand the righteousness of our faith, and how God justifies our hearts through faith in Christ. But this is the right reason, namely, Jesus Christ crucified; and no one can lay any other reason, I rejoice.

(24) If I have built hay or stubble on this foundation out of ignorance, then I have done it out of ignorance; I am even unconscious of it. But if, as I have now said, I had a zeal of God and no art, and built something on it that is to be consumed by fire, I hope for myself that I have suffered enough fire and overcome the damage.

If anyone is deceived by such hay, wood or stubble, he should accuse himself and not me. First, that I have not commanded or compelled anyone to accept my teaching. Second, that I have pointed people away from me to the truth and to Christ 1). Thirdly, that every Christian should know from the teaching of Christ that he should be as simple as a dove, and as witty as a serpent, and test the spirits whether they are of God or not, as I have said above. Therefore, the fault of the foolish readers (is anyone deceived that I am not aware of), of whom I spoke and lamented above, is that they bring in humanity and do not fathom God's word.

26) Therefore, I humbly hope to all Christian princes and lords, and will kindly take care of all other Christians, that they will not accuse me too highly after this purification, nor even blame me, that some hold such, some such a different meaning of the reverend sacrament, or understand it differently, as 2) it is commonly preached. What God plants remains before wind and water; what God does not plant is wiped out and perishes; no defense helps. Tort 3) does no violence.

27. humbly ask all Christian princes and lords, and all who love God, to measure this purification in grace and friendship, not to wrong me, so that I do not write such flowery words as I would like to write, if I could; not to further harass or persecute me unheard,

nor allow myself to be harassed or persecuted before I am convinced.

28 And if ever they would not spare me, that they might spare their own salvation. For God will measure all men by the yardstick and by the measure with which they measure. But whosoever shall offend the least of these, which is due unto God, hath offended the apple of God's eye, Zech. 2:8. God shall also punish not only felonious persecution, but also that which is done out of the mouth, as it is written: Whoever says to his brother, Fool, is worthy of fire. Whoever is angry with his brother is guilty of judgment, Matt. 5. Whoever hates his brother is a murderer, 1 John 3. These are terrifying words to consider in the heart of all those who fear God's punishment, or who know that God would compare His punishment, which He consumes out of His divine longsuffering, with the greatness and severity 4) of His punishment, Romans 2. (2) Whosoever therefore will not spare me, let him spare himself; for nothing remains unrewarded; this is what God has said, who does not deny. I am a member of all Christians, for I know and confess that Christ has redeemed me through his death, brought me into the kingdom of his Father, and made me a partaker of the heavenly inheritance. Therefore, if the faith which I have in the perfect righteousness of Christ and our redemption has caused me to believe this doctrine, I beg you not to think me a stranger, and not to corrupt me, because Christ has redeemed me and died for me.

But if some would not consider me a Christian, they must consider me a stranger, and judge me by the right of God, as God's commandment is. If princes and lords, citizens and peasants do not want to spare me again, they should spare the judgment of God and themselves. Judgment is ever of God, Deut. 1, and not of men, which commandeth that no man be ashamed of a man's seed; saith also unearthly, 5) that it shall befall him that begetteth falsely, or that judgeth falsely wilfully, as him whom they abridge, or afflict, or injure unjustly. Now I am neither overcome by two witnesses, nor by one, and yet I am almost weighed down by everyone, as if I were the very worst. One does not want to see me, the other asks to catch me and murder me, the third begs to sell me food and drink, the fourth pushes otherwise, and is of the urge to kill me.

1) In the old edition: gereiset.

2) In the old edition: deme.

3) Should perhaps read "There"? because the meaning seems to be: Where GOD plants something, violence can do nothing against it.

4) compare - balance.

5) uncanny - obviously.

niß 1) so much that methinks that things are more orderly in Turkey.

(30) Christ commanded the rulers that they should seek out and bring back the erring in mercy, and that they should let ninety and nine sheep go until they bring an erring one to his right. But the way this is now done in Christendom is pitiful to hear, and not in great honor, but it will gain its reward when the righteous judge sets his judgment, and then he will judge and punish the unmerciful with unmercifulness.

Dear Christians, believe with moderation the evil, but think one thing, that this malice, envy and hatred neither invent nor speak anything good. That I have acquired envy and hatred through my teaching of the Sacrament, I have come to realize with insurmountable damage. But if such envy and hatred had been divine in some, there are still many more of them who know no more of God than the miller's ass, 2) without further understanding or loving my suffering and that of Christ than Caiphas, who have persecuted me out of poisonous envy and hatred, and would have strangled me if I had not been protected and provided for by God, 3) who have hated me without order and without reason, who have invented all kinds of lies about me and thrown them out, and have drawn others into their hatred against me. But shall it all be true what such malicious tongues lie against me? But how can I defend myself against them?

I am said to have been the peasants' captain or instigator, who suffered little peace, much danger, great mockery and violence from the peasants. Such suffered violence I can prove. But they may not prove their lies. But I cannot do anything about the fact that they so hate me for such teachings. God has led me into such teaching, which I could not resist, nor could I foresee his ways beforehand, through which he has now led me.

33 Recently, I ask those who are able to do me violence to spare themselves and keep God's order.

1) i.e., of affliction, of distress. - Instead of "that" we have put "of".

2) In the old edition: an dem; "an" often stands for "without".

3) Through Luther, who kept Carlstadt hidden in his house for more than eight weeks; in Luther's house this writing is also written. Compare the introduction to this volume.

34. those who like to carry around new newspapers, let it be said to them that they should not be comforted by my books or my teaching.

(35) But to others who desire a true understanding of sacred Scripture, I counsel that they place themselves on God's word and ask God for understanding and wisdom, who graciously endows all who seek in truth.

36 But those who want to have people, as we really should have people, for the sake of the work (as Paul teaches 1 Thess. 5, 13.), and praise them, will find more convenient ones than I am, who are of a higher spirit than I am, who are more skilled than I am. I write this out of truth and duty, because [Paul teaches] to think more highly of others than of oneself, Phil. 2, 3.

(37) My soul praises God and justifies His ways, and applies to it as God does. He cast me down, or cast me up, so far as to give me his good peace, divine will and strength, and to implant in me obedience to him, and he shall remain my Lord and my God forever, amen. Dat. Jacobi Anno 25.

* **

After that, one 4) is not unknown to me, who tends to click his own into my books, because of which I have to fear that it might happen to me now more than before, and that such a one, or other idlers, might not only price me some words and sentences, but whole books behind my back, 5) in which such offenders might attack and revile me, or other people under my name, with painting of my diction, which they are able to do: Accordingly, everyone is hereby informed, faithfully warned and kindly prayed not to buy a new book under my title, or to consider it mine, if it does not contain these letters in the first leaf: H. G. V. B. M., that is, Helfe GOtt Und Bewahre Mich, and is printed in Wittenberg.

4) This may refer to the schoolmaster in Rothenburg, Valentin Jckelschammer (Jckelsamer).

5) In the old edition "to praise", which we have contracted into "zuprelsen", which is to be taken for "to ascribe". This results from the following warning of Carlstadt, in which he indicates that books are issued under his name, which he has not written.

8. D. Martin Luther's answer and refutation of several erroneous arguments (mainly from the *Dedit*),

which D. Carlstadt led against him to defend and maintain his false opinion of the Holy Sacrament. *)

November (?) 1527.

Translated from Latin.

To Doctor Andreas Carlstadt.

Grace and peace in Christ! I had hoped, dear Carlstadt, that you would present reasons that could or would have moved you to your opinion; but just from your explanation of the word *dedit* (he gave) I recognize that you rather search for reasons (*exquirere*) from syllables and letters. This can be nothing else than that you want to flee the light intentionally. For where will be the end of the disputing, if you want to continue in this way to forcefully press and stab the syllables? 1) Why don't you rather come to the point? Accept what I say in short words, because I want to speak most clearly.

There are two things involved in this matter, namely the words and the thing. With regard to the words, the question is whether it can be proved that they must be taken differently than they read? with regard to the matter, the question is whether the body of Christ is given and eaten bodily in the Lord's Supper? We therefore endeavor to wrest the matter from you by the words, as you endeavor to wrest the words from us by the matter. For if the words must be taken as they are, we have undoubtedly prevailed and wrested the matter from you; but if you

you have proved the matter, you have undoubtedly wrung from us the words, namely, that they must be understood differently than they read.

Now, this cannot be denied, the question of the words must be treated first, that is, one must first see what the words say (*quid nominis*), then what the thing is (*quid rei*). Here we stand and say (since neither you, nor anyone among you has so far proved that these words: "This is my body" must be taken differently than they read) that one must simply hang on the words as they read. For you too have not brought forward one letter from Scripture, by which you proved that *τοῦτο* refers to the body of the seated Christ, but you invent this from your head, just as neither Zwingli nor Oekolampad prove with any syllable from Scripture that "is" is taken for "means," or "body" for "sign of the body," 2) but they too invent such from their head. Since we seize you here publicly as arbitrary inventors of words, against the use and nature of all languages: how then can we be moved to your opinion? Yes, how should not your conscience beat you (*movet*), which feels this sting and calls out to you, saying: The words are so, and you do not prove that they must be taken differently? For if

1) *muAirs st xunZers*. Instead of *muZirs* - to roar, to shout, we assume *urZsrs*, after which we have translated. In the old translation it is "stöcken und blöcken", which is also what ours comes to.

2) Instead of *oorporsa*, read *oorxoris*, as the old translation has.

*This writing is originally written in Latin and is found in Aurifaber, vol. II, p. 196, but with the wrong year 1524. From another manuscript in Löscher, *Historia motuurr*", suvpl. p. 4, and in De Wette, vol. III, p. 231, according to Aurifaber. German under the year 1528 in the Wittenberger, vol. IX, p. 277; in the Jenaer (1566), vol. IV, p. 376; in the Altenburger, vol. IV, p. 447 and in the Leipziger, vol. XIX, p. 701. We provide a new translation According to Aurifaber. Comparison with the old translation has enabled us to make several significant improvements to the Latin text.

Even if we admit, which is impossible (*per impossibile*), that 2) so that it would not be necessary to waste time and you prove the matter, namely, that the body of Christ is words. But because you may not be able to do this, since not given in the Lord's Supper, what will you do, since I see that you have become a new orator from books conscience holds these words against you: "This is my without a teacher, one must give you credit for this and body"? Will you say they must be taken differently? How? bear it.

Here you will all be forced to fall silent, since neither you can prove your *roüro*, nor those their "means" or "signs" (*figuram*). And so you leave us no text at all, because you impose nothing else (*concluditis*) than that the words must be taken otherwise than they are. But how they should be taken, you cannot say at all, and so you pass over the cry of conscience, which is tormented (*mordetur*) by the words as they are, since it has never heard that they are taken otherwise than they are. But what kind of spirit this is, which alone brings about that no text remains in the Lord's Supper, then also asserts that the words must be taken differently than they read, contrary to the use of all languages, and neither wants to nor can prove this, can easily be judged. Since, then, in the wrong order, you ignore the right understanding of the words (*quid nominis*), then also seek to attain "what the thing is" (*quid rei*), without 1) giving the words their right, we stand against you invincibly and say: This is how the words sound, and you also do not prove with one syllable that they are to be understood in the opposite sense or in a different way, yes, you ignore them contemptuously: therefore it is certain that you are mistaken. Especially in the holy Scriptures it is necessary that one first and certainly has the right understanding of the word (*quid nominis*), because it is about unknown things that can only be grasped with faith.

Now I come to your perverse order, by which you struggle to attain what the thing is (*in quid rei*), while you despise what the words say. And first of all, I would very much like you to have omitted a great many things, of which you no doubt have

First, that you teach me that passages of Scripture are to be interpreted by comparing them with other passages, and that, trusting in this rule, you also begin to draw the sixth chapter of John, as it were, as a light on the words of the Lord's Supper - here, I beg you, hear me patiently. If every passage of Scripture must be interpreted by another passage, where will there be an end to comparing the passages of Scripture? For in this way it will happen that no passage of Scripture will be certain and clear, and such a comparison of one passage with another will take place *ad infinitum*. In this way, another will presume to interpret the sixth chapter of John through the Lord's Supper, just as you presume to interpret the Lord's Supper through the sixth chapter of John, and he will make use of your rule, namely, that one passage must be explained by another. Do you not feel that you have here laid a quite unreliable foundation, and are proceeding from the particular to the general? For this rule: one passage must be interpreted by another, is without doubt only something particular, namely, a doubtful and dark passage must be interpreted by a clear and certain one. For to want to interpret clear and certain passages by comparing them with others is to mock the truth in an unworthy manner and to bring clouds into the light. Likewise, to interpret all passages by comparison with others would be to throw the whole of Scripture into an infinite and uncertain desolate heap. Is this not clear enough? No doubt you realize very well that this is the case. When you

2) In Latin: *me tidi non sonssärs*, which does not fit into the context. The old translation offers: "that I know and admit", which we have assumed. We assume that it must be read: *ins NO88S st sonssärs*, which is repeated at the beginning of the penultimate paragraph in this writing.

1) 8IH6 Httiä *nominis* must be read; 8IV6 is wrong. The old translation has "without".

Therefore, if you wanted to use this rule of comparison as a basis, you had to 1) first make certain and read the proof that the passage about the Lord's Supper is doubtful and obscure, that is, that it requires the application of this rule of comparison with respect to the sixth chapter of John. But you do neither of these; neither do you show that the passage on the Lord's Supper is doubtful, nor do you prove that it must be compared with the sixth chapter of John, but both, though unproven and uncertain, you boldly seize upon and presuppose as something certain and proven. What wonder if you dispute and conclude nothing but monstrosities? But the doubtfulness [of the words] in the Lord's Supper you could have presented (docuisses) in such or similar a way, if you had said: Because these words "my body" 2c., or this speech "this is my body" are taken in Scripture in various ways and doubtfully, therefore a certain understanding must be taken from elsewhere. If you had proceeded in this way, truth would have met you and said: 2) Stop, brother, the passage about the Lord's Supper is not doubtful; or prove the doubtfulness, because these words: "This is my body" are clear according to the use of all languages and are nowhere taken or understood differently in Scripture, unless you prove the opposite. Therefore, it cannot be admitted to you that you compare them with the sixth chapter of John according to the rule mentioned before. For this rule does not apply here unless you can prove the doubtfulness either in the words or in the syntax.

Secondly, that you assert in many words that Christ quite actually taught John on the sixth, where, how, for whom, when, how often, for what purpose, for what instruments [mouth or heart], his body was given for food, - there I commend your effort to show your oratory. But, dear man, you know that I do not know this.

nor was it necessary for this to be brought forward. 3) The sixth chapter of John is sufficiently known to me, and I know that it is taught there that the body of Christ or rather the flesh of Christ is the food of souls. Again, you do what should not be done 4) but omit what you should do. From one particular you conclude the exclusiveness, 5) namely: in the sixth chapter of John it is taught that Christ's flesh is eaten spiritually, therefore it is taught that Christ's flesh is eaten only spiritually. Where did you learn this inference: Eating spiritually is the same as eating only spiritually, or because Christ's flesh is eaten spiritually, it cannot also be eaten bodily? Show the passage of John 6, which proves this conclusion, which you are inventing here. How can I believe that you are moved by this conclusion? At least I think you see clearly that we cannot be moved by it. For with the same conclusion you could say according to Gal. 4, 19: Christ is born spiritually in the Galatians, therefore he cannot be born bodily of Mary; Christ dwells spiritually in the believers, Eph. 2, 22, therefore he cannot dwell bodily in Capernaum or in heaven; Christ is crucified spiritually, Gal. 3, 1, therefore he cannot be crucified bodily by the Jews on the cross. And many such things could be attracted by the spiritual touching, seeing and hearing, in order to deny that this could not have happened in a bodily way. So you see in how many ways this reason of yours is not valid, namely, that you make something exclusive out of a certain thing (ex definito), then also that you violate the passage John 6.

3) According to the old translation, instead of eo read: sa, and after prockuei put a period.

4) The text: Iterum yuoä uZsnäuW 6kt obviously needs a change. According to the old translation we have added: Itsrum uZis, r^uoä von uZenäum 68t, 6t omittis, c^uoä LAsnäuri 6st. This omission will be caused by the occurrence of the same words twice.

5) Dx partieulari inksrs exelusivurn. This is rendered in the old translation: "From a single piece you conclude into the common, and absolutely everything." This one sample alone irrefutably proves that Luther did not make the translation.

1) Instead of erit, erat will be read.
2) äixssst, not äixssss.

You are twisting the meaning of the Lord's Supper and Word of the evangelist "and spoke" 2) Respect given, by proving nothing. which he clearly indicates that the bread was given while

Thirdly, that you urge with a very long and very dark speaking, and he adds what he said, "Take, eat, this is verbiage that there is a contradiction in our opinion, my body." From this it is clear that the giving of the bread namely, that because the word "he gave" is placed before, took place at the same time as the speaking or with the this text "this is my body," this proves that the giving had speaking, while these words of Christ "this is my body" already happened before Christ spoke: "This is my body," sounded and were pronounced, so that your thought is so it is necessary that the disciples had already received absolutely nothing, according to which you imagine that the bread given by Christ, and so Christ only said, "This the bread was given before the words were pronounced, is my body," after the giving and receiving had taken just as in the book and on the paper "gave" is written place, so that this necessarily refers to the body of Christ before this speech "this is my body". Therefore, according sitting there, since the bread had already been given and to your understanding, the text should be multiplied in this received beforehand. This, if I am not mistaken, is the way: Christ broke and gave to the disciples, and they took the meaning (vis) and the bright light (lux) of the word "gave," and ate; whereupon Christ said, This is my body 2c. For which you have treated so splendidly. But I beseech thee so you think that it happened immediately, since the for Christ's sake, that thou mayest consider and observe the evangelist wrote down the word "gave" to read, and you with thyself, if thou canst, how tremendous blindness thou do not see that by these words: "Take and eat, this is my sufferest here. I fear that you are so struck [with body" an event (factum) is represented by the evangelist. blindness] as a punishment for such blasphemous For imagine that you were present at that first supper of teaching. Let us speak roughly. Some of the words are Christ, that you saw and paid attention to Christ, what he the words of the evangelist who tells the story, namely did and said. Here behold his hands with which he takes these: "He took the bread, gave thanks, and gave it to his the bread, saying nothing of giving, but keeping the bread disciples, saying" (dicens); some are the words of the Lord in his hands; he gives thanks; after giving thanks he is who speaks, namely these: "Take, eat; this is my body." again silent, saying nothing of giving, but saying these Now between these words of the evangelist, who tells the words, "Take, eat; this is my body." Under these words, story, and the words of Christ, who speaks, put a certain or soon after them, or with them, and not necessarily length of time (aliquod intervallum temporis), during which Christ before, the giving itself takes place, as the nature of the gave the bread, and the disciples received and swallowed event and of the story compels us to understand, so that the same; but after the bread is swallowed, then Christ no one can deny that the bread given is his body, since shall continue, saying: "This is my body," where "this" in giving it he calls it his body. Therefore, since you put a necessarily points to the body of Christ, 1) because the space between the giving and the naming, 3) you are bread is already gone, namely given and received, inventing something against the nature of the event. At perhaps also [completely] consumed, so that it cannot be least you commit yourself to an impossible thing, that is, shown by "this." Who should not see here your ridiculous to prove this interspace. thoughts or rather the effort of a man who wants to err and seeks to err? Why don't you stick to this

2) VO06U1 äiosutis must be translated like this. This refers to the above-mentioned words of the evangelist, in which "he spoke" was expressed by diosirs.

3) ÄppsNutionkiL refers to appslat in the next preceding sentence.

1) Instead of äsnaonstrunt may well be read äsnaonstrst.

since the evangelist, through that participium dicens [Luc. 22, 19. xxxxx = speaking], has a

The idea of the mixing space of the time and the giving, which happened in the same, as you invent, remains unproven (nuda) and useless. Thus, your thought of the mixing space of time and the giving, which, as you invent, took place in it, remains unproven (nuda) and useless. 1)

For that you demand to be answered whether Christ gave his body before he uttered the first letter of this speech, "this is my body," what is this but a mere rank and captious mockery of the words of Christ? For suppose the bread was given either after the speech was finished, or before it was begun: what, I pray thee, is the use of that? or what is the use of it to thee? since the participle "speaking" shows that Christ, in giving, had said, "This is my body." Certainly, if I gave you a hundred florins, it would not matter whether after or before giving I said thus: Here are a hundred florins. Nevertheless, the nature of the event and the narration of the story would lead to the conviction that the giving and the saying took place at the same time, that he gave the bread and at the same time said, "This is my body. For this is what happens in every action, that the giver gives and speaks at the same time, or calls what he gives. Unless you want to bring back to us that old Vettelian question of the instant of confirmation (de instante) consecrationis, since the papists teach that after the last syllable the body of Christ is there and not before. We despise these thoughts and do not impute specific moments or times to God, but let it suffice that we simply believe that what God has said will certainly happen or be, may it be what it may. For we do not argue about the moment in which the leper was cleansed, since Christ said Matth. 8, 3: "I will do it, be cleansed", but rather about the moment in which the leper was cleansed.

It is enough for us to believe that he has become clean, as Christ said. So we believe that the son of the king, John 4, 50, was healed, as Christ had said: "Go, your son is alive", and do not worry about the syllable or the moment in which this happened. And that Lazarus came to life again, as the word of Christ cautions [John 11:43], "Lazare, come forth!" and leave it to idle men and useless babblers whether he came to life again at the word "come forth" or "Lazare," and the like. So also here we say that the bread is the body of Christ, because Christ says, "This is my body," and leave it to others, namely to the word-wrangers (xxxxxxxxxx), to argue about the nu and about syllables. For we are commanded to believe that the words of God are true; but not to inquire in what nu or how they are true and fulfilled.

From this, I think, it is sufficiently clear that you draw the word "gave" quite badly to the action of the Lord's Supper, since it is a word of the evangelist who narrates the past (praeteritum) Supper, therefore he was forced to use a time word in the past time (praeteriti temporis). But the action itself is presented to us with words belonging to the present, in the form of command and in the mode of reality (imperativi et indicativi modi), namely, "Take, eat, this is my body," which do not allow one to imagine a commingling space or a giving in past time (praeteritam dationem), but show (objiciunt) that from Christ there is a giving in the present time, precisely by saying, "This is my body." But that thou exaltest that it is called bread, 1 Cor. 10:16, "The bread which we break," 2c., who denieth this? but that thou makest it nothing but bread, how wilt thou prove this? But you can read about this in my last booklet. For this very passage bears powerful witness against your *roûto*: "The bread which we break" is not bread alone, but the sharing (communicatio) or "the fellowship of the body of Christ." And these are the passages of Scripture which you demand, by which

1) Instead of *mutiUs* (what does not exist) read *inutilis*.

2) So the old editions; in De Wette and Aurifaber *irrstunt*. - By "Dirmung" the papists understood the transformation of the elements into the body and blood of Christ.

We prove that the disciples have been given the body, and they cannot be overthrown by you, we know that. Of course, I wonder why you say that these words, "This is my body," are held against you in vain, on no other grounds than that you say that the dispute is over the word "give," and that the word "gave" means something different from the word "is," but just as they mean different things, so they also prove different things. What you want here I do not understand; only that I think these words: "This is my body" are despised by you, and yet you bring up nothing but that "gave" means something different than "is". As if we could not also despise your "gave" and say that "body" means something different than "mine". Yes, every word has its own meaning; does it follow from this, with correct inference, that a speech consisting of such words is false or to be despised?

From the ordinary (translatitia) meaning, according to which you dispute that the body was given and broken for us, we allow you to say as much as you want. For we also maintain that Christ was given for us on the cross, although we deny that he was broken on the cross. You, too, will not prove this, nor have you proved it so far. But that in the Lord's Supper there is an ordinary (translatitiam) giving 1) is not true, although it is true that there the bodily giving represents the spiritual giving, by which the Holy Spirit gives into the heart to believe that it is Christ's flesh, as the same [Holy Spirit] gives us this flesh bodily to eat in the Lord's Supper. And this twofold giving does not conflict with each other, nor does one exclude the other, but agrees very well, just as that he gave himself bodily to the disciples as a servant [John 13:4 ff], by washing their feet and serving at table, does not prevent his not giving himself spiritually to believe in him. You make very bad fol-

1) In his writings, Carlstadt mocks Luther's teaching by mockingly asserting: whether the body of Christ is given in the Lord's Supper as long and large as it hung from the cross? Cf. Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, 2487, § 21.

It is a spiritual giving, therefore there is not a bodily giving in the Lord's Supper. Such conclusions, I say, you should prove, while you always pass over them and prove to us the antecedent, which we admit and which does not need proof. In short, you ask me to produce a clear scriptural passage which says that Christ took his body and gave it, just as you have proved that Christ took the bread and gave it. Very well! If you insist on this and will not believe, if I will not show these syllables and letters: Christ took his body and broke it and gave it to his disciples, then be victorious and follow your head; I cannot show such syllables. But at the same time, behold, if I could teach such a text: Christ took his body, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples: what need is there then that he should call it, and say, This is my body? Do you wish him to become only an idle talker, that he might speak in the words which you prescribe for him? 2) We know that in these words: "Take and effet" the present giving is indicated by the giving, which no one can deny, so that if someone wanted to put an explanation (glossam) over these words, he could write over the word "Take" like this: Behold, here is a present giving. But after one has this present giving under the word "Take," the naming that follows immediately without intervening space [and] without change of person, namely, "this is my body," by which he names the bread, compels that the body of Christ be truly given. For it is against all reason that one should understand that something else is given than what the giver names in the act (eo facto) and at the time when it is given and named by him, as I have also declared against you in the first German book 3). Therefore your time word in the past time "he gave" falls away completely.

2) Here follow in the old translation the words which we do not find in the Latin: "Rather than believe the words which he has presented to you..."

3) "Against the Heavenly Prophets. No. 5 in this volume.

and is cancelled out by the word of the present time "Take", in which not "he gave" but necessarily "he gives" is understood; and "he gave" remains in the mouth of the evangelist, who narrates the past, and "he gives" in the mouth of him who narrates the present and hears and sees Christ presently giving and speaking and calling the received bread his body. And as much as you insist on the word "he gave," which is the word of the evangelist who tells the past, so much do we insist on the word "take," which is the word of Christ who acts presently.

But since the understanding of the Lord's Supper depends on what Christ does (*ex Christo agente*), it is clear that your disputation is wrong, in that you presupposed to speak of what Christ does, but leave that open and take the narration of the evangelist. Yes, not [once] the narrative, but the time of the narrator, namely, because the evangelist narrates long after the supper, he is forced to use a word of the past because of the time that has passed, which you paralogist 1) insert into the action of Christ, after the past time has previously been made a present one. 2) You also do not consider that if the evangelist could have described the present action as a present one, he would not have said "he gave", but thus: "Jesus takes and gives, saying, Take" 2c. Now look at your conclusion (*sylogismum*), which you conclude from the time to the work, as if you wanted to say: The evangelist wrote like this long afterward, so Christ did not do so then, because that one wrote in past time, "he gave," 3) so Christ gives.

1) xxxxxxxxxxxx = one who is affected by wrong conclusions.
deceives. - *Evangelista*, *paraloZista* a play on words.

2) This particularly difficult passage is called in Latin: *ante tsrupus prastriturn praesenter taotuni*. The old translation reads: "which word alone happened before the present time, you, Squire Paralogist, the rst, you deceiver, into the doing of Christ hinem brauet, so it yet alone before and before present action geschehen heißt und interpret."

3) After *æclit* a comma will have to be placed and after "VUristus" the comma will have to be deleted.

not in the present time. It is to be marveled how you can come up with such trivial thoughts, but even more to be marveled that you base yourself so much on them. I have spoken this more broadly because I see that you are confident and praise many things here that I would have refuted immediately with the one word "Take," but I wanted to speak at length so that you would not think that you had been despised in your many speeches.

Then you dispute this about the person of the giver, and in many words say that Christ is the only one (*unicum*) and the glorious one who gives his body. As if anyone did not know or doubt this, although you know well enough that we completely hold and teach that Christ alone is the giver of his body in the Lord's Supper. For no one among us says in his own person, "Take, this is my body"; indeed, no one says, "Take, this is the body of Christ," but Christ speaks and says, "my body," and commands us to speak thus. It is therefore that you give such superfluous (*copious*) reasons that the body of Christ is not given by us, 4) when you should rather have proved that Christ does not give his body through us, as through his instruments. Does he not also give his baptism, himself as the only one and only one, but through us? Does he not remit sins only through us? Does he not teach the gospel alone and preach and exhort (as Paul says) through us? Does he not alone give food, drink, and clothing, wife, house, and all things, yet through others than [his] instruments? Therefore it was not necessary to teach that. Christ alone is the one who gives his body, for no one denies this. But this conclusion you should have proved, which you presuppose and do not prove, namely, that he cannot give his body through men, although he gives everything else through men, even gave the Son through the Virgin Mary, and even gave the Godhead through mankind. But your reasons are rather sought, because you strive to contradict...

4) "not" is inserted by us from the old translation.

than that they should be brought forward or flow from the inclination 1) to learn. In the same way, you would deny that the Holy Spirit was given through the apostles; indeed, it would be said that not even Christ gave the Holy Spirit through his bodily blowing, since he alone could give the Spirit as God. If I had known beforehand that you would be moved by such reasons, I would not have agreed (pactus) with you to dispute this matter. For what is to prevent you from bringing forward many wagons full of such reasons at every hour until the end of the world, of which you know that they serve nothing for the matter and only prevent time [spoil] and better work? But I had hoped to hear reasons that could move you. Now I, who am busy enough elsewhere, am given to hear how various and improper things you could invent or think, as if no one else but you alone could do this.

Therefore, I ask you again that you henceforth, when you want to present your reasons (argumentari), spare me, and that you do not overburden me of this difficulty, nor teach me 2) about what you know that I know and admit, that is, that you do not merely state the propositions 3) but also discuss and prove the sub-propositions (subsumta) and the conclusions. I concede almost all of your propositions, but I deny your subsumptions and conclusions. I

You wanted to make an effort to prove these [latter], but you constantly neglect them and make yourself sour to prove the supersets, which nobody denies. E.g. here: Christ alone gives his body, therefore we do not give it, the conclusion must be proved. For the proposition is admitted that Christ alone is the giver of his body, but the conclusion that we do not give it, that must be proved. For although we do not give, yet because Christ gives through us, it is also rightly said of us that we give as servants, as of an alms which the Lord gives, it is also rightly said that the servant gives it at the command and by the order of his master, since Paul also [Rom. 2:16] calls it his gospel, although it is God's, and Christ says that his teaching is not his [John 7:16], and promises that he who believes will do greater works than he himself has done [John 14:12], although he himself does everything in us. This, I say, you should have invalidated and made your conclusions firm against such things. I am forced to let my pen stand still here, for I have hardly been able to write this with many interruptions; then I am also prevented by much business. Furthermore, because I have been called to Torgau three times and have traveled to the court and am now required to go there for the fourth time, I want you to read this in the meantime and see the answer I have begun. 4) I will, after I will have returned and as soon as I can, answer some more. 5)

1) In Latin: *yuana odlata aut movsvtia uKsetuin üisoenüi*, which probably needs an alteration. According to the old translation, we have assumed: *ant üueutia aüeotu*, etc.

2) Instead of us, we have assumed *nee* according to the old translation.

3) *askuiutum* is the first part of a final speech, usually called the major *spar8 propoMoni*], which tends to contain a generally valid sentence.

4) According to the old translation, *videri* must be read instead of *viäers*.

6) The further answer to Carlstadt's arguments was omitted because Luther had learned in the meantime that Carlstadt had secretly published several books and had contacted the enthusiasts in Silesia, Schwenkfeld and Krautwald. Compare the introduction.

9. of Wolfgang Fabricius Capito Urtheil, "What to think and answer about the split between Martin Luther and Andreas Carlstadt. ." *)

In late 1524.

Grace, peace and knowledge of His truth from God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Great joy and rejoicing is now among the wicked, dear pious citizens and Christians! They hope for the victory against the truth, because Martin Luther and Andreas Carlstadt are divided. They say with them thus: Every kingdom, if it is divided in itself, is laid waste, and one house falls upon another, Luke 11, v. 17; Christ is now divided into pieces, 1 Cor. 1, 13, he may no longer exist; our honor and enjoyment of the outward service of God must now be raised up again, for where the spirit is extinguished, the flesh has all room. Which cry ye shall not be deceived.

2. "Ye know whom ye have believed, that he is able to keep your salvation unto that day," 2 Tim. 1:12. Only keep yourselves, as ye hear from us daily in the Scriptures, according to the example of the saving words, of faith and love in Christ Jesus, in whom is given to us forgiveness of sins and grace, according to the holy call and purpose of God, and not according to our works; insist on it with gladness. For our Lord "Christ JESus is set by God the Father over all that may be called", Eph. 1, 21.

3. at evening they shall turn again, and yet not be satisfied, as David saith, when all help shall be withdrawn from them, when they shall be found to have done to their destruction that which they thought good, Deut. 12:8, and that the end of their way shall be the ways of death, Prov. 14:12. yea, then in the joy [of the righteous] their heart shall be bodily, their joy shall be concluded and ended with fearful gloom. And, actually speaking, I say that they shall

[already] now and are full of mourning. When Zophar Naamites 1) heard the stiff hope of righteous Job, and the punishment of the wicked, his thoughts surrounded him, and a tumult grew up within him.

4. these our enemies, when they see our constant hope and peace, "that we have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit from God," 1 Cor. 2:12, which is a spirit of strength, and of all joy in the Lord for building up; so they shall tread upon us, as the counsel of the Jews, Acts 5:24, treadeth upon the apostles. 5, 24, over the apostles; and hold us in contempt, that we regard not. We may be the sabbat of the world, 2) and the spectacle of the world and the angels [4 Cor. 4:9], that we may obtain the prize which is of God alone.

(5) They command that we should not teach this way to our neighbors, because Christ died and we should show kindness to our enemies. But what do they refrain from? how many strange lies have they invented upon us? To one they admit that he was a whoremonger among the servants; to another that he was with the maid and committed adultery; to the third that he stole. Now they bring up a speech that we desire to overthrow all authority; now that we lead selfish doctrine, which [we] alone neatly touch their devilish dealings. Now and otherwise, and yet otherwise, as their father, the liar and the blasphemer, instigates them.

6. if all this does not help, the brave people say that we have to help the evangelical people.

1) i.e. from Naama, Job 2:11.

2) Shabab - the waste, the sweepings.

3) Instead of "Schauspiel," the old edition reads: "Schaufalt."

*This writing appeared under the title we put above it without indication of place, time and printer. However, as Walch notes in his introduction, it is assumed that it appeared in Strasbourg in 1524. Capito was at that time prepositus at St. Thomas in Strasbourg. In § 6 of this writing Capito speaks of the "past summer", therefore this writing is to be put in the late year 1524, in any case only after Carlstadt had begun to write publicly against Luther, which happened soon after August 22 (the day of Luther's meeting with Carlstadt in Jena). Cf. the first note to No. 3 in this volume and to No. 3 in the appendix of this volume. Compare also § 15 of this paper, from which we see that Carlstadt had already arrived in Strasbourg at that time. Carlstadt arrived there in October; therefore, it is possible that our text was written in October 1524. We reproduce the text according to Walch's old edition.

del are acting unjustly, and Luther himself is already writing against us. This rumor they have often renewed last summer and recently again pretended that a message from a Elector had heard from Luther himself over the table, how unreasonably we are going, and how defiantly he wants to push us to the ground; which Luther has contradicted by a letter 1) to me. So stiff-necked is malice that it, so often caught in a lie, does not know how to be ashamed. A thief, caught in the act of stealing, is frightened from the heart and ashamed, Jer. 2, 26. and these our enemies, the great thieves of honor, are so often caught in the falsehood, and still have no abhorrence. But our spirit is not dampened by this, we are not dismayed, we do not turn away from the truth, neither do we fear their lies nor their insistence, but we persevere in the word with all joy.

For this reason the devil stirs up offence from the false brethren, and moves some vain, conceited and ambitious ones to fight over words, 3) which alone are sufficient to overthrow the minds of the hearers. They raise foolish questions that teach nothing, but only give birth to quarrels, 1 Tim. 4, 7. and 2 Tim. 2, 16. 23. Such a nest of caterpillars sprouts 4) in Swabia, as they say. They are enemies of the cross of Christ, and leave no bright scripture unpunished. Such work brings the flesh everywhere, Gal. 5, 19 ff, which is uncouth, rough, hateful, biting, unkind and full of glory. If all vices are quiet, they fall into the judgment of the blasphemer through honor, avarice and proud words; [through] fights, which they undertake as out of a zeal for the truth, and yet seek themselves alone, and not the benefit of the community, with a bitter spirit against his adversary, when the zeal for God should be tempered according to love. We should not pay attention to rash teachings, which are thereby recognized, because they raise more questions than improvement in God in faith, 1 Tim. 1, 4. We should pay full attention to the commandment of the Lord, "that 5) the main sum is love from a pure heart, and a good conscience, and from undyed faith". What does not reach there, leads to useless gossip.

8 But where, under the appearance of love, we omitted to proclaim salvation, it would be un-

We are like a foolish father who would let his child take a sharp knife in his hands so that it would not cry, which has so far occurred in the necessary teaching of us. The faithful ministers in the Word have attacked error violently, insisted on faith, magnified the grace of God, diminished our merit, denounced what is sin and what is righteousness; driven back false worship with bright writing, by manifold and diligent preaching; torn the public outrage out of the heart by the Word before, then with fugues 6) and [in] all silence outwardly done with deed. For with the spirit of his mouth the Lord will destroy the son of perdition, and not with his hand, 2 Thess. 2, 3. God has also bestowed grace and continuance 7) with all quietness and rest. The difference of days and food is gone, as papal celebrations, fasting, confession, going to the sacrament; yes, all self-willed worship dies out with us. The burning of wax, consecrated salt, taking water, vigils, masses, and the seven times of hearing, seasons, souls, pilgrimage, Roman grace and indulgences all go to the ground, without noticeable movement, that with rumbling no force would have been able.

(9) An honorable council has bravely cleared the temples of idols, extinguished many lights and eternal lights, and will continue with the same lime tree as soon as God bestows mercy and remove all idols. But why should one rush in and lay hands before, neither the Word would be driven? Idols do the most harm in the heart. For those who have heard the word know "that the idol is nothing in the world," 1 Cor. 8:4, and it causes them no offense. Let the images be a good creature of God. Those who have not yet heard the word will only be embittered by accepting idols before the sermon and will be struck on the head, so that they will give all the less ear to the truth afterwards. God gives faith through the heard word and not through the sudden acceptance of idols. Also, there would be great harm, without hope of some fruit. For what is it that some idols are rudely torn down from the walls, since they do not harm the believer and harm all things to the unbeliever, but are still left in the heart, since they exclude all faith 8)?

10 Paul did not take away any idol in Athens, did not lay a hand everywhere, but preached of the true glory of God against idols.

1) This will refer to Luther's letter of May 25, 1524, Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 900.

2) In the old edition: "we do not possess". The reading "ersitzen" is probably not possible, because this word means: to gain possession through many years. Cf. Dietz, Wörterbuch, s. v. ersitzen.

3) Maybe: sweep.

4) "weimein" will probably be as much as: wimmeln.

5) So put by us instead of: "that", according to 1 Tim. 1, 5.

6) d. i. by right.

7) In the old edition: Vorgang.

8) In the old edition: abandoned.

And when they did not accept such teaching, he departed and [did] not touch an idol with his finger. For all our actions are to begin and flow primarily from within the heart, not to be driven in from without. And therefore, as some attribute to us, we do not want to defend the idols, but to serve the stupid and to do useful things in time, which would otherwise be enough to harm in a hurry. Thus our action is regulated according to love and has progress, if otherwise we would have embittered the sweetness of love with clumsy purring, and would have accomplished nothing.

We will go the way God wants us to go, even if an angel from heaven wants to drive us against it, and we will diligently strive for the glory of God, not forgetting our Christian love and our duty to the temporal authorities. Anti-Christ and the haters of God shall have no rest before us, and the good-hearted we want to act beautifully and cleanly, even if all devils would be sorry, who by the help of our enemies with all speed may do no hindrance, whether they nevertheless lead us into worries, and make us sing 1) and cry out to God all the more earnestly: God help us! Amen. And it may be that we may turn away the weakness of the church, if it is our weakness, because we have not yet perfected the earnestness and the lively activity of the Spirit. Therefore we pray always for the increase of grace, and yet we wait for the working of Him who works all things in all things.

Do not be dismayed, dear friends; trust in God through Christ: "No one can snatch you away from his hand," John 10:28. "Be no longer children; do not be carried about and be carried away by all kinds of wind of doctrines through the craftiness of men and deceitfulness, so that they would gladly deceive us," Ephesians 4:10. The word of God is more powerful. Our reason does not deviate where we insist on it; and outside the word of God we do not want to show you anything with knowledge.

13) But because dangerousness is not the least of the false brethren, 2 Cor. 11:13 ff, and the same is true, also because that they might rise up, who are perhaps covetous of vain honor, and indignant and hostile among themselves, as in the days of Paul among the Galatians, Gal. 5:25, some of whom will jest with the Scripture, and serve their addictive lust with it, 2) who, alas! little regard what offence they bring, what sorrow,

1) "to blow dry" i.e. sonare, to make one's voice heard, to pray.

2) So put by us instead of: "of their addictive lusts, there with those; who" 2c.

Fears and tribulations introduce them to the well-intentioned conscience:

14 Also because between Martin Luther, through whom God has hitherto, and still, wonderfully promoted His glory and revealed His word, and Andreas Carolstadt, whom we also like to think of as a learned assistant in the word, some quarrel has arisen through the blasphemers: 3)

(15) I have this comfort and report in haste to ascribe to you; for even as you all shall be moved and troubled for his sake 4) as for me, and say:

(16) First, our faith should not hang on human days, but only on the word of God and His promise. Therefore, the Scripture reproaches the one who trusts in a man who values flesh for his arm, Jer. 17:5. All men are to be taken for men, and we are to hope in no one else, so that our hope may be in God alone. Experience teaches us daily how vain, uncertain, false and deceitful human nature is, which is enough for us to exercise our senses. Where temporal hope ends, divine hope begins. The tribulations further this, for we see how the Lord led the people of Israel forty years in the wilderness, so that he might humble them and try them, that it might be known what was in their hearts, whether they had kept his commandment, Deut. 8:2.

(17) Thus, through such impulses, our mind is trained to distinguish between good and evil, and to be accustomed to derive from God alone all creatures, (5) who alone is to be our God. Otherwise, divine honor would be accorded to man, whom we considered so true and certain that he would not err, even though all men are false. Many are deceiving themselves, 6) that they hope in God; but from bad temptation or human error of their rulers they fall; for their foundation was set on a man's faith and reputation. When they fall, everything falls according to how great a pretense and false security they had. God wants to clean us up here and bring us to the true foundation of his certain word; the loose sand must be cleared away by repugnance. Therefore

3) So put by us instead of: have.

4) "For the sake of his future", i.e. because of Carlstadt's coming to Strasbourg. From this it also follows that this writing is to be placed in the late year 1524. It was written "in haste" not long after Carlstadt's arrival. - The words "as it arrives to me" - as it arrives to me, as it is reported to me.

5) lenden - to steer.

6) "To spoil oneself" - to stand in the delusion in relation to oneself. So put by us instead of: "to spoil oneself."

God makes it difficult for us to fall, so that we may stand up with more awareness and realize that the prize is His alone.

18 Now we are by nature inclined (which is a great mistake) to praise divine gifts to man, when in such gifts we should praise God alone; which brings much harm. Therefore the apostles Barnabas and Paul, when they were raised up for gods in Lystra, bravely resisted, 1) and turned the glory on GOD, Apost. 14, 14. f. Yes, Paul also abstains from boasting the truth of his gifts, "lest anyone should esteem him more highly than he saw in him, or heard of him," 2 Cor. 12, 6.

In this way, Luther only warns men not to throw his name on the gospel, and displeases him that some want to make sects out of his name and call themselves Lutheran, because he teaches nothing by himself, but shows the content of Scripture; which he does better and more skillfully, according to my respect, neither in several hundred years by anyone nor never happened; so naturally, so full 2) and bravely from the reason and the truth he does it commonly. So that I do not want to have punished anyone's judgment or diminished his respect. From this it follows that some would put too much stock in him, and wonder more at Luther than at God Himself, from whom such gifts are customary and given to the Christian community. What delusion God takes from us, and shows us that we do not yet have enough faith, who deviate or become fainthearted in ourselves for the sake of invasive arguments and disputes. Let him who is not finally called fall in the name of God; nevertheless, it behooves us to look into the commandment and word of God and to adhere to it as the most certain without change.

(20) There is much impropriety involved in this business; by it God the Lord wants to tell you laymen and make you understand how dangerous it is to think higher of men, for the Scriptures command and give you to grasp that something wrong is found in all men, so that the glory of God alone may remain. But, dear friends, you should not judge from heat. Remember that Paul and Barnabas also divided, and yet they are both two honest men.

1) So put by us instead of: to be.

2) satis - enough. - Note how Luther is praised here by Capito as an outstanding, incomparable teacher of the divine word, while Carlstadt's praise (above in § 14) is quite faint. Yes, in § 25 he is called her "counter-dealer" and "opponent".

3) "full" of kntis enough.

Apostle. Although the disgraceful name-calling bears evil upon him. And is not commanded to judge the persons, but to examine the doctrine according to the full 4) Scripture. The foundation still exists: God knows His own.

(21) But because the ungodly crowd now certainly hopes for the downfall of the gospel, you should not allow yourselves to be weighed down, as their unrighteous lives have caused the pious to suffer 5) and be weighed down, Habak. 1, 13. f. For ye have often known among yourselves that the prophet saith truly, The hope of the wicked is spoiled." And further: "The joy of the hypocrite is instantaneous," Job 20:5, "ends with sorrow," Proverbs 14:13. Hitherto, by the grace of God, all their plots against them, for the advancement of the word, have gone forth without harm to us; let us hope for the same in the future. For no one can harm us: "We die or live, we are the Lord's."

22 Secondly, it should not be unnecessary for your love of commerce to have a common account. For the fear that precedes is usually more serious than the present danger. It is also proper that you shut the mouths of the stubborn and meet them with a true answer.

23 And say that in the following points there may be no misunderstanding, in which is the sum of our salvation. "God has put all things under sin, that He might have mercy on everyone," Gal. 3:22. "By grace we have been saved, through faith in Christ; and that not of ourselves. It is God's gift, not of works, lest anyone should boast," Eph. 2:8, 9. Since we are saved by grace and not by works, and since the papal church sought salvation through much bodily exercise, it follows that they, with all their idiosyncratic services and ordinances, such as mass, vigils, singing, reading, whistling, priests, churches, salt, and other things, consecrated the Holy Spirit, churches, consecrating salt and other things, praying for souls, calling on the dead saints, honoring images, confessing, doing enough for sin, discerning time, food and place, and with other acts is against Christ and dishonors God the Lord, Matth. 15, 2. ff.

(24) But here is a little difference: we desire by the word to bring all abuses and unrighteous service out of men's hearts first, and then to put an end to them outwardly. Against this some of our neglect and slothful hand

4) "satis" from satis - enough.

5) "befühlen" does not occur in Luther; "befühlet hat" is here in the meaning: this feeling (of invocation) aroused [in the pious^].

and want that all these aversions be accepted with hand We exhort you daily from the epistle to the Romans what beforehand, and that one does not give room to the lazy we should offer, namely "our bodies for a sacrifice that is bunch so long, according to their outrage, to seduce the living, holy and pleasing to God, which is the reasonable souls so blatantly and to blaspheme God. service of God," Rom. 12:1.

(25) Now rejoice, dear idolaters, for we, the We still have chasubles, albums, the chalice, standing evangelicals and believers in God, have been divided; (1) against the altar, and likewise common antics, which, if we ourselves have serious adversaries who dispute with God wills, shall not last long. But in such matters we would us out of the Scriptures, and help and counsel us, so that not gladly trouble the stupid, nor act contrary to a temporal there is no peace among us. It is a necessity; otherwise authority, which is given to us by God, and which also 2) our undertaking will not be driven away. For if we, who seeks God's honor through peace, without confusion of the act against you by the free word alone, stand, then your common good. Why would we give offense to our brother high-bearing necks must in time escape from the yoke of for the sake of outward dress, for which Christ died? Christ and give way; if we are driven away and our Though we would suffer it to be already changed, yet with adversary [Carlstadt] asserts, 3) then you must once 4) justness and order, as all things ought to be done by us. be stormed and rushed; there is no remedy. To both Then our abolition [i.e. elevation] will also fall, which is thus parts our zeal for God will not abate, therefore you have assigned to the sacrifice of God, so that not every thing is no gain. For we will finally, both parts, press so that you a sacrifice, if it is abolished in a different opinion than are no longer ungodly; which God will soon provide! sacrifice. Acting against a protestation brings harm in the Amen. right; but we testify to ourselves that we do not want to

For the sake of the mass, we are also at one with the sacrifice, nor do we sacrifice, but only make the usual bright truth against you idolaters, that the mass is not a show of sparing the weak. sacrifice, that it should not be held in a foreign language, (30) From which we will not soon depart, but will that it should not have the useless harmful additions, that continue demurely after the example of Paul, which we all endowments of masses and all priestly masses are may also maintain with written causes, where it will be against God. Both of them go against you: we are necessary. With friendly action and diligent activity of the justified in saying that they wanted you journeymen to lay word, something has happened in one year to promote the down your trade once, as it would be good and useful for honor of God here in Strasbourg, which would never have it to be laid down soon. been achieved with an outrage and with the hand of an evil

(27) Therefore we avoid the name of the feast, and authority. We should ask God that we may serve Him in call it the Lord's supper. For the Hebrew tongue calls it peace and quiet and in all fullness, and should be sacrifice, so that the name may not support your trade. rebellious even in a common use? God forbids us to do so, However, if someone calls it a mass for the sake of its and no one shall be able to do so. We do not want to argue use and out of habit, without any elaboration, we cannot with anyone who has a different opinion. Only that each punish him. For nothing depends on the name; the heart one may be sure of his own mind, and preserve among and mind are to be considered. ourselves the bond of brotherly love.

(28) The bread and the wine we have taken out so far 31 The words of the Lord's supper in Matthew, Mark, (5), and yet we know that the sacrifice called in the Law Luke and Paul admit both parts to be true; but where the Thruma and Tnupha was taken out. But so that this little word "that" is to be applied, to the body or to the bread, would not be regarded as a sacrifice by someone, we there is a misunderstanding.

32 But, dear friends, consider the main thing, which is faith and love, and consider that the Christian is inward and invisible, and that he is not bound by any outward thing, whether it be a sign or a sign.

6) So put by us instead of: "of the common use", according to 1 Cor. 12, 7.

1) So put by us instead of: "to work gescheiden". The expression: "Zweiung" is found above, at the end of § 19.

2) "otherwise" probably - by the way.

3) This shows that Carlstadt also tried to intervene with his fist in Strasbourg, while the preachers there tried to introduce the innovations only by word.

4) "once" in Luther - once, dereinst; here we in the following paragraph it seems to stand in the B^meaning: at once.

5) So put by us instead of: unzher.

other, and consider [the] use of the Lord's Supper, namely, who carried him. Where we have no bright word, we refrain the contemplation and remembrance of Christ for the refreshment of our hope, through which we are united in God together with all believers in Christ. This is the reason why the Lord has given such a supper. It is superfluous to investigate further. We should refrain from asking foolish questions 2c. We are to nourish our faith with the Lord's bread and wine, through the remembrance of His body and blood alone, and leave the rest. "If anything else is needed, let God reveal it to you", Phil. 3, 15.

(33) There are some unnecessary questions about baptism, which may not be important to us, since our actions are based on the Scriptures, and no believer in God can doubt them. We have taught that those who have been baptized into the Lord Jesus have been incorporated into his death, and through baptism have died and been buried with him, and in his resurrection have risen to new life. Therefore, the use of baptism is that we steadily die to the old Adam, which death is to last as long as this life lasts.

34. and baptism includes only water and these words: I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son 2c. The rest are all additions, brought by the ancients to decorate the baptism. We omit the chrism and the oil, where people come who may suffer it. Because such things have too much great prestige and obscure the grace of baptism in us. The chrism and the oil, which the suffragan bishop has charmed with his woad claims, are held in higher esteem, neither of the bad water, which God has blessed by His word. From this it has also followed that the unintelligent crowd baptizes the weak children once again in the church, who are baptized without chrism and oil in the house by the women before. When opportunity and time will require it, as we hope to do in a short time, we will press closer to the Word, and improve the whole incident in a Christian way. For the time being, we are only concerned with 1) the use and practice of baptism, which is the main issue. We do not ask ourselves at what time and at what age children should be baptized, since God gives His grace and gifts supernaturally, and the Lord gives the gout-breakers faith,

(35) But the fact that some make outward things high and proclaim them earnestly is to be regarded as a faithful precaution, for they may think what error may follow and be followed, which they would gladly prevent. They know that the wicked synagogue, the papal church, is built on external things, which they pretend are necessary for salvation, thereby extinguishing all faith.

(36) Sometimes, however, one gets into a dispute over external things, which arises from human movement, because the zealous desire for peace is very urgent for many. Therefore, we should be warned not to be moved by external things, even if they have made highly famous men important, because they do not harm the faith and may not cause offense where one is built on Christ.

(37) It is a sign that this man does not have Christ, who is distressed and anxious when he hears the scholars inquiring about sacraments, images, and other external things. For the kingdom of God is within, and sufficiently bright and clear in Scripture that it cannot be hidden from the common mind. Where much art and practice belong, there is nothing that actually belongs to blessedness.

Summa Summarum, dear pious citizens, insist on Christ, whom God the Lord alone has shown to us through bright scripture; and what else drives the scholars to avarice and fame, let them leave and be like great artists. Our salvation is not in words, but in the power of God. Trouble must come, because those who are proven must be revealed among us. But woe to the man through whom trouble comes!

Neither be weighed down by the pride and arrogance of the wicked; they rejoice in evil things. We should only be long-suffering, so we will see that the enemies of truth will become ashamed, so that our hope will never 3) be put to shame. God grant you to continue in His knowledge without offense! Amen.

1) "alone" set by us instead of: all.

2) So put by us instead of: that.

3) So put by us instead of: always.

10 Martin Bucer's Reason and Cause, from Divine Scripture, of the Innovations to the Lord's Supper Called the Mass 2c,

at Strasbourg, written in his and his colleagues' name, together with a letter to Count Palatine Friedrich. *)

December 26, 1524.

To the Most Serene Prince and Lord, Lord Frederick, Count Palatine of the Rhine, Duke of Bavaria, my most gracious Lord.

1. noble highborn prince, gracious lord. I wish grace and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ to E. F. G. with the offering of my submissive, completely willing service, always ready, beforehand. I say praise and glory to God, our merciful, most gracious Father, who has so graciously preserved E. F. G. until now, that she has by no means allowed herself to be moved to persecute the Gospel of our Savior JEsu Christ, as fiercely as 1) some of the [so-]called clergy have violently worked against it, but has also given her an inclined, good-willing heart to His holy Word, which shows itself daily more and more in true Christian deeds. 2) For it is a special great grace and blessing of God, when he sets godly princes before us, as it is his great wrath and heavy plague, when he lets the godless, children 3) and fools rule, as this is read in Isaiah 3 and 32, along with many other places in the Scriptures. And the wise prince Solomon says [Prov. 29, 2.]: When the righteous 4) flourish, the people prosper, but when the wicked rule, the people mourn." Therefore, like all godly people, it is a special joy for me in the Lord that I can hear the praise of how Father G., together with several other princes, has an inclined will to promote the holy gospel, which is a noticeable salutary splendor of his mercy and great grace, which I also have to rejoice in particular for the sake of Father G.. For when I was redeemed from the monastic state, in which there are truly few who know God, they so graciously appointed me as a servant.

1) d. i. yes also.

2) So from transposed instead of: "eiget". It is possible that originally "euget" was written rst, that is, lets itself be seen, shows itself.

3) So put by us instead of: "godless children".

4) Thus set by us according to Prov. 29:2. instead of: "rights".

After God had given me another calling, I took leave of absence again and was dispatched, so that I should rightly desire E.F.G.'s welfare and salvation before others and ask the Almighty for it with the utmost diligence, and also hear with great thanksgiving and delight of heart that He creates and works such things so abundantly with her. He, our God and Lord, who has the heart of all kings and princes in his hand, Prov. 21:1, and who alone works in all, both the will and the deed, Phil. 2:13. May He begin and accomplish His work in you, namely the knowledge of His most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, "whom He raised from the dead and seated at His right hand in the heavenly realm, above all principality, power, authority, dominion and all that is to be called, not only in this world but also in the world to come; And hath put all things under his feet, and hath set him before all things to be the head of the church, which is his body, and the fulness of him that filleth all in all". Eph. 1, 20-23.

(2) It may not be lacking, as the Lord himself also foretold, that there must be many unbelievers who come under his name, and manfully, but before princes and lords, as many others are attached to them, spare no possible pains to turn away from this our Savior the things and things that are common to them. "But it would be in vain if the bird's yarn were set before its eyes," as Solomon says [Proverbs 1:17]. The certain testimony of the Lord, which also makes the unwise wise, the imperishable bright word of God, will thus guide and direct, that such deceivers of their deceitfulness and false glittering shall not obtain a continuance with her. For who would there be whom God would not otherwise have cast down and blinded, who would not immediately see from the bright law of God that we are all sinners and condemned by our actions, when no human being anywhere can be condemned by the law of God?

*) The original edition appeared in quarto, without indication of place and time. . (Walch.) The text is after Walch.

who loves God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself; on which two pieces the whole Law and the Prophets hang, so that whoever lacks them has transgressed all of God's commandments. Since we are all transgressors of God's commandments and therefore condemned and maledicted, we will never be able to help ourselves or other people from such condemnation and malediction; as we are in disgrace, so all our deeds will be displeasing to God. The tree is of no use, 1) how could the fruit be of any use? If all God's Scripture directs us to the only begotten seed of Abraham, in whom all nations shall be given, our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone redeems his people from sin, and leads them to obtain from him forgiveness of sin and eternal blessing through true faith: Who then would be so foolish as to dare to obtain such things by himself or other creatures, by his own work or that of others, be it confession, imposed pardon, indulgences, the merit of monks, or whatever else has been devised for the comfort of some idle bellies, and for the great harm and damage of poor ignorant souls?

Christ says: "Come to me, all you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest," Matth. 11, 28, and Joh. 14, 6: "No one comes to the Father except through me," and Joh. 15, 5: "Without me you can do nothing. Who would not want to leave everything and surrender to him completely with good faith? Truly, whoever trusts in our Lord Jesus Christ and thus surrenders to Him with true faith, as such a heart would mean and love in our Savior alone, would also have to be hostile to his sins and his entire previous life, and would have to be thoroughly repentant and displeased about them, and would also confess his sin before God and all men, where it would bring correction and give cause to turn to God's goodness, and would confess it from the bottom of his heart. Repentance would no longer consist in praying one Our Father or five times a day, giving one alms or two times a week, fasting one day or six times a year, but in spirit and in truth such a person would pray without ceasing at all times and call upon God for mercy for himself and all people in his heart, and also live his life soberly and with the breaking off of all bodily excess, to curb his flesh and make it obedient to the spirit.

2) and to devote his whole life, what he is and what he is able to do, to the service of his neighbor, to everyone who needs him, and to be ready to do to anyone, as Christ Jesus did to him, who also laid down his body and life for his enemies; and this is truly and Christianly praying, fasting, and almsgiving, yes, it is the one right penance that every Christian should practice throughout his life, ready to suffer and endure everything that God inflicts on him to suffer. Thus he dies to sins, and the baptism of Christ is completed in him, thus he considers and proves in himself the death of Christ, which memory he also keeps the Lord's Supper to promote and strengthen, 3) and knows that by merely attending Mass, or if he does so, nothing against sin can be accomplished or earned. This is what a true Christian is like, and such fruit is produced by faith where it exists, this is taught by all divine Scripture, this is what those who preach the Word of God and the Gospel preach; yes, G. H., this is the most unheard of, most harmful, most poisonous heresy, which cuts off all good statutes and order, breaks up and destroys obedience, peace and unity, against which our [so-called] ecclesiastical prelates are subjecting all princes and lords to move. Then one shall act against them with iron, water and fire, as against the Turks and the worst enemies of God that ever came on earth. But such nonsense is nothing new; Christ, our Lord, who preached just such things and led the most holy life, moreover, confirmed his deeds and teachings with such great and many miraculous signs, their forefathers, the Pharisees and scribes, also did so, as was also done before to all the prophets and afterward to all the apostles, and so ever from the beginning of the world taught the truth, by their equals. The world cannot do otherwise; it hates and persecutes Christ and anyone who wants to have anything to do with him.

4) E. F. G. has lived with so many [so-called] clergymen, prelates, cardinals, bishops, abbots and others and has had knowledge of them, 4) but I know that she asks God that he protect her from the clergy, so she has seen with the greater part of the same clerical fathers. For more splendor and opulence is not found in the most worldly princes than in those who are held closest to the highest holiness, to whom one must also kiss the feet. Now Christ has once spoken, and cannot be otherwise: "He that is not with me," saith he, "is

2) So put by us instead of: to bring.

3) So put by us instead of: hold.

4) So put by us instead of: had known.

Against me; he that gathereth not with me scattereth." So our [so-called spiritual squires are with Christ as wolves are with sheep, and gather with him as the wind gathers the chaff, yea, they are like him 1) in all things, as water and fire, night and day, hell and heaven. In Christ there is nothing but humility and temporal contempt, in them there is splendor and pride; in Christ there is poverty, but a mind that is always ready to help anyone, in them riches and avarice, for whom the earth is too narrow; in Christ there is meekness and gentleness, in them war, murder, condemnation of unheard causes, driving out, burning and erasing; in Christ constant teaching and preaching, in them flowing 2) and hunting. In sum, Christ carries the cross everywhere, that he may help others, so they let themselves be led in litters and lay the cross on all whom they do not worship with will. Christ takes nothing and gives to everyone in vain, 3) so they take from everyone and give to no one in vain, unless it be pretty damsels and minstrels.

5 Therefore, G. H., Christ so earnestly says: "Either plant a good tree, and the fruit will be good, or plant a rotten tree, and the fruit will be rotten; for the tree is known by the fruit. You vipers, how can you speak good, because you are evil? When the heart is full, the mouth overflows. A good man brings forth good from his good treasure, and an evil man brings forth evil from his evil treasure," Matth. 12, 33-35. And if men see such fruits in our clergy and also in all their advocates, which befit Christian spiritual fathers, like pine cones 4) on a fig tree, they must be seen and confessed to be rotten trees, therefore their counsels, doctrines and statutes may not be Christian either; "When the heart is full, the mouth overflows. Therefore, where they are to advise how Christians are to be taught and governed in a Christian way, it is just as if one wanted to set faithful shepherds for the sheep and take counsel with the wolves. It is obvious and cannot be denied that they do not seek God, for otherwise they would live differently; they seek their splendor and pleasure, but what good do they want to advise or do?

6. such is also good to assume that they work so anxiously that the things

Our faith and Christian doctrine are not to be publicly interrogated, but all who do not preach to their liking are to be condemned unheard. But Christ may not lie, who says, "He that doeth evil hateth not the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his works be punished. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest; for they are done in God," John 3:20. f. They have so many learned doctors, clothed in fine garments and scarlet, all the high schools are with them; is their thing so righteous, and that which we preach so unrighteous, why come they not to the light? The Scripture of God is written to all believers, so all believers have the Spirit of Christ, by which the Scripture is understood: so take the Scripture before your hand, show each part its doctrine and deeds, and all Christians will well see how according or according to the Scripture each part acts. From such interrogation and judgment, they may by no means reject F. F. G. and other princes and rulers, whom they call worldly, as impossible, and who do not understand trade; 5) for truly no one has less understanding of things than they, which is obvious and no one can deny; and all believers can and should recognize, discuss and judge all things concerning faith and worship. For God alone has given His Scriptures to His believers, and so also the spiritual judges all things, 1 Cor. 2, 15; for whoever does not have the Spirit of Christ is not His, Rom. 8, 9. Moreover, if a male is to be a believer in God, he must also know what the Word of God is, which alone is to be believed. Therefore (as contrary to nature as it is to condemn something unheard, and Christ Himself says that all His sheep know His voice, even the old very best councils, described by emperors and held in their and their rulers' presence), 6) the E. F. G. should never let himself be persuaded to stand by those who, unheard, want to condemn and exterminate all who do not preach according to the liking of the aforementioned clergymen, and allow them no judge but themselves. For it is against all natural equity not to let Christ preach otherwise, and to condemn unheard all who preach him otherwise, because they want to prove themselves with all their doings as renounced enemies of Christ. It may also not help them that they always reproach that our preaching and teaching was rejected by all at Costnitz in the common concilio.

5) Thus set by us instead of: understood.

6) These brackets are set by us.

1) So put by us instead of: him.

2) This will probably mean the unclean rivers (xollutioues).

3) i. e. free of charge.

4) In the old edition: Dannzapfen.

If the people of the kingdom were condemned, one could not hold a concilium of one's own for each of them, then it would be a frivolous act to again enter into disputation, which was once so seriously decided by the concilium. For, concilium aside, the word of God is to be preached; if someone does not preach it and will not desist from it, he is to be put to death, but he is to be examined and questioned as to whether he has preached it or not. No concilium is allowed for this; every Christian authority will be able to recognize, if it has the Scriptures of God, whether an opinion is in accordance with it or not. The dispute is not about what is right, what one should preach or not. God has decreed that one should teach His word, and the law is His law; the dispute is whether the preachers or their opponents preach the word of God or that which is contrary to it, and which act according to or contrary to God's law. So that one should put to death a man who has killed is the right that remains, and is therefore not a question; nor, if one has killed, should he be brought before the law, hear his answer, and inquire whether he has acted contrary to the law or not; and should one who preaches the bright word of God, and has the courage to prove it, not come to any interrogation? and that the most holy and the most clerical should refuse? who, if they wanted to be Christians, are obliged to point out and report to every erring person with all meekness; is this not a perverse, impudent ferocity, which would be repugnant to the Turks?

7 To all this is well known how it happened at Costnitz in the Concilio. All the princes and estates of the empire, whom the papal household calls secular, were persuaded that they had no right to judge in matters of faith, so they ordered the prelates, who had been appointed, to do so. If the same should have recognized something abortive in their splendid, machiavellian, cowardly, wanton life, as is the entire divine Scripture, it would have been contrary to the order of nature, which always loves itself more than others and always puts the temporal before the eternal. The pious Emperor Siegmund would have liked to carry out a reformation of the clerical state and has worked himself up in the same, but he was thus superior through the [so]-called clergy, as still happens today, when one comes together that the clergy have three votes, so pious secular princes, who put their body, honor and goods to the empire, do not have one; that all things would have to proceed sooner than such a salutary reformation. For one sees and grasps that from the heel to the

There is nothing wholesome or whole in the entire aforementioned spiritual state. Therefore, it will not be easy to let the Word of God be the guideline for all teaching and preaching, regardless of what was decided in the Concilio at Costnitz; to interrogate anyone who dares to prove that his preaching and teaching is the Word of God; if one does not consider it frivolous that in many lesser matters it is examined what is or is not in accordance with the law, and what was decided by the ancients is not respected.

8. The divine Scripture lies so brightly in the light of day, that 1) what the aforementioned spiritual crowd teaches and does is contrary to Scripture; This is also recognized by a large part of the respectability, where there is only freedom to preach the word of God, that no one with understanding and no one who has not renounced the truth beforehand, may consider it useless or unnecessary to grant interrogation, speech and deliverance from matters of our faith and Christian life, which are now in obscurity. Yes, no one who loves Christ can refuse such things, much less condemn someone who is unheard. But of course, whoever thinks about the matter a little, will soon see that the clergymen mentioned have no reported pleas where they would be justified in their cause. They know [that] where they come before the common respectability and their trade is held against divine scripture, yes, only against natural equity, that they would not stand. Therefore, all their work and effort since the last Imperial Diet, held at Augsburg, has been directed solely to ensuring that no one is granted an interrogation, but that only men who do not want to give them victory are condemned unaccountable and unheard. E. F. G. may well recognize how not only unchristian, but [also] how unnatural such a thing is; as she has also recognized this and has long since noted that they, the supposed clergymen, desire to bring their cause out by force; therefore your soul will never consent to their counsel;

(9) Neither shall they be moved to lie without ceasing, that they would abolish all authority, and if reformation be obtained with them, they shall then be moved to all authority, and dissolve all obedience. For if one preaches the word of God, one teaches that every soul should be subject to and obey the authority and all authorities, as Rom. 13, 1. ff. Tit. 3, 1. and 1 Pet. 2, 13. is expressed. For of course, if one teaches God rightly, it may not be that His order, to whom all authority and rulership belongs, is not obeyed.

1) In the old edition: the.

anyone resists. But they, the [so-called] clergy, if they wanted to be spiritual and apostolic, should serve like Christ, our Lord, and not rule; as he did not let him serve, but served us and gave his soul for salvation for many, and said to his disciples: "The worldly princes rule, and the rulers rule by force: so it shall not be among you: but if any man be mighty among you, let him be your servant and whosoever will be chief, let him be your servant." Matt. 20, 25-27. But now they leave the divine service of the divine word, and go with violence over all authorities and rulers appointed by God, yes, as Peter [2 Ep. 2, 10.] prophesied of them, "walking after the flesh, in the lust of uncleanness, despising the rulers, being thirsty, thinking highly of themselves, and not trembling to blaspheme the majesties". Therefore they are the same ones who dissolve divine order and obedience, and destroy all authorities according to all their will, when the word of God teaches masculine, corrupt and uncorrupt, to be subject to principalities and powers and to obey the authorities.

10. Now and all here in Strasbourg, if for the sake of peaceful attendance and Christian unity an honorable council, my gracious lords, has intended to the [so-called] clergy to enter into civil unity and duty, like other inhabitants, noble and ignoble, one finds among them those who may spend, Such would be a breach of their oath and honor, just as if their oath bound them and their honor were to be neither faithful nor loyal to those with whom they live, indeed, from whom they get their nourishment here 1) and are in part their relatives by blood, nor to obey Christian commandments and prohibitions that serve and are necessary for respectability. For civic duty and alliance, which is expected of them. Nothing else demands it. If many insist on their liberties given to them by kings and emperors, it is obvious that such liberties are only given to spiritual holy fathers, so that they may follow the service of the divine word all the more freely, and by no means be more needy of such loose servants, who would be subject to an authority, and only to a strict one, than not soon a people on earth, as one can obviously see. If one examines their letters of freedom, indeed, all their old donations, one will find that many other people have been given such, to which our [so-called] spiritual crowd is like, as Abraham had the pharaohs.

were like the sowers who crucified Jesus. But as it is shown above, that they make many pretexts, by which they think to show that it is not proper, in such matters of faith, to grant anyone a public interrogation and questioning, and yet is the fundamental cause, why they so much shrink from public interrogation, that they know their causes to be essentially rotten and of no use; so also in this case they accuse this and that, so that they pour out godly and cheap obedience from themselves, and is but the some right cause, that their life is thus formed, that they may suffer no Christian authority, which then is "instituted of GOD for the vengeance of evildoers and praise of benefactors," 1 Petr. 2, 14., therefore also Paul speaks Rom. 13, 3.: "The mighty are not to be feared for good works, but for evil ones." Thus it is that they, the aforementioned clergy, find those who despise and reject all divine authority, as they may not suffer any because of their unrighteous life, and falsely attribute this to the preachers of 2) divine word, who teach and preach not only that all other proper authorities, but also that they, 3) (who should not rule worldly), are to be feared, 3) (who should not rule worldly, if they want to be descendants of the apostles, because God has sent them to be worldly rulers) should be obeyed by all who are under their authority, as long as they do not command anything that is against God and affects the soul, yes, out of the word of God they exhort what concerns only the temporal, as body, honor and property, even to suffer violence from them. But if all their business is to deceive and seduce the poor simple-minded layman, and if by their works, which they do so brazenly that they have long been an abomination to all respectability, and no one who loves discipline and shame likes to have anything to do with them, they prove that they are born not of God but of the devil (for John says: Whoever commits sin is of the devil): then it is no wonder, indeed, it cannot be otherwise than that all their feuding and saying is vain lies. The devil is a liar and the father of lies, John 8:44, so what else would he teach his sons?

They also show such a kind of superfluous here and everywhere. They alone have invented, testified and written out so many clumsy, unrhymed lies about me, the poor and inept servant of the word, that it is highly astonishing. There

2) So put by us instead of: the preacher.

3) The brackets are placed by us for easier understanding.

1) After the word "here" we have deleted "are".

I must have led a disorderly life before 1) when I was at the same time at the court of E. F. G.; I must have run away from the court of E. F. G. with great shame, if she did not graciously give me special gifts and presents; my housewife ran away from me; I circumcised children; I did this and that. Some of my co-workers in the Word have preached that our dear wife, the mother of Christ, is a dog; another has said that he preached that if a man is away from his wife for a while, she should take the next one whom she likes: If we preach about marriage in this way, out of the law of God, if one were to comply with it, some of the clergy mentioned would have had to be evicted long ago; for one finds highly learned clergymen who have denied one's wife in their spiritual court and taken her immediately.

12 And therefore, G. H., since also by my co-workers and preachers of the Gospel here in Strasbourg, upon and through the certain word of God, some things have been changed and improved in the divine service, of which our said adversaries far and wide 3) lie abominably before princes and lords, as they have also done to us before, I have described such things to E. F. G. with reference to divine Scripture, on which everything has been done. with reference to divine Scripture, on which everything is based, in the shortest possible way, so that it, reported to the truth, would know the less to let itself be taken in by some hot tales, even though great bishops and prelates would bring them forward, because they believe too much in such things, even still, and truly to say, they are often invented too quickly. I also want to inform E. F. G. herewith, if there is something in my fortune that I could do for her service and favor, that I would be quite willing and ready for it, because I have her gracious good deeds, abundantly shown to me, her unfit servant, still in fresh memory and will always have them.

13. my humble and very diligent request to you is that you graciously accept my letter, which is based on Christian opinion, and not let anyone turn away from the eternal, certain, salvific Word of God; the anointed one, whom you, high and low stan-

4) Prince of the kingdom, sayings and complaints are not to be challenged so highly and that nothing of unheard cause is condemned, nor the persons are regarded. Christ says: What is high among men is an abomination in the sight of God. He has chosen the despised and the lowly to proclaim His word to the world. Read 1 Cor. 1 and 2. But we are sure of our things, that we commit ourselves to death, where no one 6) can prove that our preaching and what we 7) do on it are not equal to and in accordance with the certain word of God, written in his holy Scriptures; it is also our greatest complaint that our adversary has so far everywhere prevented us from giving public reason and cause for our teaching and doing before all the world, as we know how to do. We seek the light and do not shun the light as our adversaries do. May the Almighty, through Christ our Lord, grant E. F. G. to grasp his word rightly, and thereby to remain and persevere steadfastly for the certain welfare and blessedness of you and your subjects. Amen. Given at Strasbourg, the 26th dee. 1524.

E. F. G.

servant Martin Butzer.

Christian reader! So that I do not offend anyone, I will take care not only to set down the opinion of divine Scripture, but also to use its words. Therefore, let no one be afraid whether he will read other words here than those in common use. If he examines the Scriptures, he will find that such words are written by the Holy Spirit and not only by me.

Of innovation at the Lord's Supper.

1 The Lord's Supper, as the Holy Spirit calls it through the mouth of Paul, has been called Mass for a long time, namely among the subjects of the Roman Church, and it has been said that when the priest says Mass, he offers the body and blood of Christ for the living and the dead; that no more useful and wholesome good work has been considered. And to signify this offering, the bread and the chalice of the Lord have not been taken care of, not even because-

4) some - any.

5) "ever world" - from the beginning, from time immemorial. 6) perhaps: someone?

7) In the old edition: me.

1) "formerly" put by us instead of: "before Masver". Should it perhaps be "before M. G. H." i. r. before my gracious lord?

2) "him", namely the law. Thus put by us instead of "him"; likewise equally from it "their" put by us instead of: "their".

3) "wide" set by us instead of: "ready".

No one has ever partaken of the Lord's supper; more, such garments are used as the sacrificers, called **sacerdotes** in Latin, used to some extent among the Jews and pagans, 1) so that the mass of all things would be equal to a sacrifice and would be considered as such.

(2) But we, informed by the graces of God of His Holy Word (to Him be eternal praise!), know that the most abominable, poisonous, and all-damaging dishonor and blasphemy of Christ our Lord and Savior is to think and say that the priest offers Him up in the mass. Therefore, since light has no fellowship with darkness, Christ does not agree with Belial, and the believer has no part with the unbeliever, 2 Cor. 6:15. We have completely put away and put to rest in our congregation everything that has been added to the Lord's Supper without Scriptural grounds, for the purpose of fortifying and defiling Christ and divine grace, so that we no longer use the name Mass, but the Lord's Supper, which we hold in remembrance of the death of our Lord, and by no means as an offering of his body and blood, without the raising of the bread and cup; nor, unless some have received with them the bread and the cup of the Lord. For this purpose, the priest and minister of the congregation do not use any special garment, except that which is called the surplice, and none of the sacrificial garments, such as alb, stol, casel, 2c., nor any other vestments invented by men without the word of God.

3 Because it is not enough to do what is right and just in oneself, but a Christian must, as far as possible, see to it that what he does is also better for the elect (to those who are rejected, it must be a stench of death to do what is good), for true Christian love requires that we be ready to die for the salvation of our neighbor, as the Lord has done for us, I will not say, that we should strive to be better for others. To this end Paul exhorts the Romans Cap. 14, 19. Let each one of us, he says, set himself up to please his neighbor, for good, for correction. For even Christ had no pleasure in himself, but, as it is written, "The reproach of them that revile me is fallen upon me." And to the Corinthians he thus writes [1 Ep. Cap. 10, 31.-11, 1.]: "You eat or drink, or what you do: be indecent, both to the Greeks and to the

Jews, and the congregation of God, even as I also please everyone in all things, seeking not what is profitable for me, but what is profitable for many, that they may be saved. Be ye followers of me, even as I of Christ."

(4) Therefore, as far as possible, we would like to make everything that we have changed and improved in this and other things on and through the word of God pleasing and better for everyone, so that, as everything is right and godly in itself, it would also be considered and accepted by men for the glory of God, whose words we have followed in this, and also for the good of all who have promised themselves to Christ. Piety and edification of all who have promised themselves to Christ, that they too have undertaken to follow the voice of their shepherd and the teaching of the one Master and Teacher whom the Father has given us, alone, putting aside what has been fabricated by men in such matters concerning faith and worship. Furthermore, it is incumbent upon us to be as diligent as possible to see to it that our treasure, the holy gospel and eternal word, and even our ministry, is not blasphemed, Romans 14 and 2 Corinthians 6, so that what we do is not only pleasing and better to those who are willing, but also, as far as we are able, unpunishable and irreproachable to those who are wicked.

(5) We do not know how to obtain both of these better or sooner, if we only show the Scriptures and God's word, which we have followed and complied with in our actions: if the chosen ones of God hear how they recognize and love God the Lord as supreme, then they will also be completely pleased with him, since they find his command and order. With David the whole faithful crowd sings Ps. 19, 10. 11.: "The judgments of the Lord are righteous, all righteous. They are more precious than gold and much fine gold; they are sweeter than honey and honey germ." And in the 119th Psalm v. 103. f.: "How sweet are thy words to my throat, more than honey to my mouth. I am made understanding of that which thou hast commanded; therefore 4) I hate all false ways." Therefore, when the sheep hear their shepherd's desired and beloved voice, they will know it immediately and follow it with all eagerness; they will have pleasure and joy that we are given to follow such. No human authority, doctrine or custom will be respected anymore, we are bought at a high price, because we should be servants of men, 1 Cor. 7, 23. With body, honor and goods we want to be submissive and obey all human order and authority,

4) So from unS.put instead of "let", according to Ps. 119, 104.

1) So put by us instead of: been.

2) So put by us instead of: to add.

3) The brackets are set by us.

But the spirit must be devoted to God; and as no man can know the counsel and will of God, so no one can teach us how and wherewith to please Him, but He Himself alone. Therefore David says in the 119th Psalm, v. 130: "When thy word, O Lord, goeth forth, it enlighteneth, and giveth understanding unto the simple." And soon after, v. 133: "Direct my ways by thy speech." Therefore God in the 5th book of Moses 12, 8. has quite seriously forbidden "to do that which is pleasing to any one" fund v. 32.:] "All that I command you, that you shall observe to do. Ye shall not do any thing thereto, neither shall ye do any thing thereof."

Thus we are certain and without any doubt: whoever is godly will read the clear, bright words of God, on which and according to which we have acted, but will not only have no complaint about 1) our innovations, or rather our return to what is rightly old and eternal. He will not only have no complaint, but will praise and bless God, who has led us back to His way and to His command from the canker of so many disorderly, harmful human commandments and customs, and will also subject himself and others, 2) to the same or even more perfect reformation, to the clear and pure word of God, which belongs to the worship of God.

7) We do not know any other way to frustrate the malicious ones more strongly, 3) to blaspheme the word of the Lord and our ministry. For if they do not want to take pleasure in our telling them that God, who is supreme, has commanded and ordered us to innovate or rather to reform, how can we do otherwise to them, since Christ says, Matth. 15, to let them go, the blind leaders of the blind? We could not show them any higher commandment and right than God's; whoever will not let us stay with it, we must not esteem highly. One must be more obedient to God than to men. Since God's command cannot be pleasing to such, it would be bad for us if our deeds were pleasing and blameless to them. We can do no more than to answer to everyone who demands the reason for the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear, as Peter teaches. Whoever does not want to receive such things, and turns the word of God to the wind, respects more the customs of men, and

Statutes, for the command and order of God, we must submit to the judgment of God, and if such cry out to us as heretics and evildoers, we will not be challenged, for the servants have also called Christ, the father of the house, Beelzebub.

I therefore conclude that anyone who has not renounced natural respectability and fairness will not condemn us unheard and before he has heard our responsibility. If he then hears that it is based on the clear word and expressed command of God, he will not be able to push us any further. But whoever would not be satisfied by such a thing, or, as many foolish people do, would not hear our answer and condemn unrecognized actions, we do not respect or fear them, for they also do not respect or fear God, and even act contrary to all natural justice. To those whom God has not rejected and even blinded, we want to show and demonstrate the reason for our actions from divine Scripture, so that they may recognize us as their Christian brothers and common members, love us and also defend us against all men. This letter is also written to serve and please them.

From the name of the night meal of Christ.

First of all, our brethren have an abhorrence of the name Mass, and use to call it the Lord's Supper, which in the Roman way we have now long called Mass. Although we do not know how to quarrel with anyone over the words, with whom we can compare ourselves to the matter in hand, for such quarrels over words bring hatred, strife and other things, which destroy Christian faith and love, 1 Tim. 6, we must still confess that it is more Christian and more certain that we call that [which] Christ our Lord has instituted for us, by the name that the Scriptures give it, for with such a name, 5) of which we can know no quality anywhere. Some think that Missa, which we say in German, is a Hebrew word, derived from the word Mas, which means an obligatory gift, as tribute, and means a sacrifice, as such is read for it in the 5th Book of Moses, Cap. 16. And therefore, because the most abominable abomination is to consider the Lord's supper a sacrifice, they cannot sufficiently reject and condemn such a name. But since such a name does not exist among the Greeks, who then call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, they cannot condemn it enough.

1) but - again. - Instead of "our" we have put "ours".

2) So put by us instead of: "submit". The constructive" is: he will submit to bring himself and others to the word of God.

3) i.e. to remove the cause.

4) In the old edition: such.

5) In the old edition: such.

Liturgian, that is, to call office or service, and is also not healthy in the old Latin, as Cypriano, Hieronymo and others, it wants to be doubtful that such name comes from the Hebrew, because the Greeks, the first disciples of the Hebrews, as well as the old Latin otherwise would have had it in use.

(10) But let him come from whence he will, or be called what he will, which no one has yet been able to decide, so the divine Scripture does not have him; and this is enough that he should be rejected and reeled in by Christians 1). It also seems to have happened by God's special providence, because the world has been so blinded by the false and most seductive opinion that in the Lord's supper His body and blood are offered up by the priest, that it no longer even knew what the Lord's supper was, or what it was good for, that it was also given a name that no one knew, nor where it came from or what it meant. Since "there is no fellowship of light and darkness," 2 Corinthians 6:14, we who are children of the light should completely renounce darkness and its works, as well as its names. David, Psalm 16:4, says: "I will not offer their blood 2) drink offerings, nor take their name in my mouth." So also we, as we have an abomination to offer up the body and blood of Christ again, so also such sacrificers, sacrifices, works, names, and what they deal with, should be an abomination to us.

(11) We know that only the Spirit of God can understand what is divine, 1 Cor. 2:10; therefore no one else can call such things. Therefore, if he calls it the Lord's supper, we should not need any other name, nor should we first bring the Holy Spirit to school and give his things strange names, which we may not know where they come from, but only from the spirit of error and lies. Then where else, and where this name Mass in such an interpretation, as the mass goers have brought it into use, would be good for [something], it would not have remained unreported in any way in divine Scripture; for it teaches everything that may be useful and good abundantly. So we teach the Lord's Supper as the Spirit of God calls it, and we do not call it Mass, 3)

1) This expression "verspult", which is repeated at the end of the following paragraph, is synonymous with: abgethan, verworfen.

2) We have omitted the word "are" after "blood". Cf. the Hirschberg Bible "ä Ps. 16, 4., note 6.

3) So put by us instead of: "and not called Mass."

so that, as our actions, so also our words are in accordance with divine Scripture; but we admonish that no one start a quarrel about the name, or condemn the others, if only with the name the error is not also accepted, as if one gave and sacrificed something to God. This is our doctrine and its reason, the name "Mass", which we wanted to be already done and reeled off, and that only this name "the Lord's Supper" was used, as it is called in 1 Cor. 11.

That the Lord's Supper be kept in remembrance of the death of our Lord, and by no means for a sacrifice.

12) That 4) [it is] the most pernicious and abominable error to suppose that in the Lord's supper the body and blood of Christ are sacrificed, has now been proved by so many in writing, and is preached everywhere, since God's word is known, without ceasing, that it is not necessary to refer to many writings about it. The words of Christ are clear. When he had taken the bread, given thanks and broken it, he said: "Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is a new testament in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink, in remembrance of me." These are the words of the Lord, as Paul received them from the Lord, 1 Cor. 11, in which everyone sees that the Lord alone commands two things, namely, to eat the bread, to drink the cup, for the one; the other, to do this in remembrance of Him; which remembrance, if done righteously and in faith, immediately brings from it itself the proclamation of the death of Christ. For who could consider and believe this as his eternal salvation and not immediately be eager to sing and tell everyone about it? Therefore Paul says immediately upon the Lord's prefixed words, "For as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall proclaim the Lord's death until he come." Since we are not to add to or subtract from the words of the Lord, just as in such matters we may know nothing more of ourselves than he has revealed to us, it behooves us to keep strictly to the command of the Lord, namely, when we partake of the Lord's supper, to receive the bread and the cup of the Lord, remembering his death and proclaiming it, and to do nothing else.

4) In the old edition: the.

sacrifice ourselves presumptuously, which the Lord has not thought of in a word.

(13) Also Lucas, in [the] histories of the apostles, when he reports how the believers kept themselves, and also remembers this supper, as being wholly respected, and giving it the words, writes: "But they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and in fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayer." See, he calls it badly the breaking of bread, does not speak: offering in bread, or something like that. He who does not want to be quarrelsome, because this breaking of bread is counted as part of the apostles' doctrine, fellowship and prayer, will 1) let it be spoken of as the Lord's supper; for to speak of taking common food, among such high spiritual things, would be inconsistent and not in keeping with the apostolic spirit. Nor is the communion of the cup, because it commemorates the breaking of bread alone, excluded, but rather understood. For it is entirely to be assumed that in such breaking of bread they kept themselves fully in accordance with Christ's institution, and thus the communion of the cup by no means abated.

14 But be it so, it is undeniable that Paul spoke of the Lord's supper in 1 Corinthians 10, saying, "The cup of dedication which we dedicate, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" He does not say, "The cup which we offer, but which we bless, that is, over which we praise and glorify God." He does not say, "The bread which we offer, but which we break, that is, to share in eating, as it is the custom of the country to break bread when one wants to enjoy it.

15. Now, if we could know nothing of such use 2) of Christ, for [what] his Spirit reveals to us in the Scriptures, it should be left us enough to reject the opinion of sacrifice as an undoubted finding of the devil, and most abominably to shrink from the fact that Christ our Lord did not think a word of sacrifice, but commanded [to] take alone, and to remember his doing so, and thus to follow the example of David, when he says: "I love thy commandment above gold and fine gold; therefore I keep straitly all that thou hast ever commanded. I hate every false way," Psalm 119:127. f. To add to this, if anyone does not want to be satisfied with what has been reported, let him read the whole of Scripture, and he will find that all the Scriptures point to the one sacrifice of Christ, when he offered up his body on the cross,

by which enough is done for all the elect, and not a word that such a body should be offered by the priests so many thousands of times daily. But that we should offer our own bodies, a broken spirit and a bruised heart, and the sacrifice of praise to God daily, of this the Scriptures teach us everywhere.

16) In Hebrews 9:24-28 we read: "Christ did not enter into the holy place made with hands, which is the antitype of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God. Nor did he often sacrifice himself, just as the high priest enters the holy place every year with someone else's blood, otherwise he would have had to suffer often from the beginning of the world, but now, at the end of the world, he has appeared once to abolish sin through his own sacrifice. And as it is appointed unto man once to die, and after that to be judged, so Christ was once offered to take away many sins, but the second time he shall appear without sin unto them that wait for him unto salvation."

What could be said more clearly against the nonsensical sacrifice of the Mass? Where are the mass-goers, the poor belly people, who still want to sacrifice Christ daily? Listen, Christ does not sacrifice himself often, otherwise he would have to suffer often; from this it follows that if you want to sacrifice him daily, he must suffer daily and you must crucify him daily, as you also do daily, you poor murderers of Christ. After that you hear that he appeared once at the end of the world to cancel sin by his own sacrifice, why then do you say that he appears daily again [as] a sacrifice in your bloody, murderous hands so many thousands of times? [Much] more the. Apostle, he appeared by his own sacrifice; how then may ye say he is your sacrifice? Your own cowardly, wanton, harmful body, that, that shall be your sacrifice, you Baalite sacrificers.

(18) Last of all, you hear that he appeared to take away sin; did he then, with his one sacrifice, take away the sins of many, that is, the elect, and accept them; what then are you doing, deceiving so many poor souls with so many desperate blasphemous masses? Do you not hear, you sinners, not [sin]lifters: "As it is appointed unto man once to die, and after that to be judged, so Christ is offered once to take away many sins"? What do you think you are doing with your sacrifices? Christ has taken away sin with his one and only sacrifice, which is himself, what do you want with your sacrifices but sin?

1) Before "it" we have deleted "he".

2) Deployment - Deployment.

Sowing and planting, and overflowing the world with disbelief and all vices, as you have done?

(19) You have turned people away from the faith in the one sacrifice of Christ on your sacrifices, you have pretended to be sacrificers consecrated for this purpose, so that you have almost taken all the world's goods to yourselves; and so that this would not come back to those who have to win it with their sweat, you have renounced marriage; besides this, you live in all dishonesty, so that the world does not have your equal. For this purpose you condemn and persecute the word of God, so that through it your most abominable seduction, deceit and shameful life will not come to light. This is what your sacrifice of the Mass must preserve and defend. Therefore it is undeniable that with your sacrifice of the Mass you have showered the world with sin. If it were not for this mass alone, when you live in such insolent excess, common respectability would not have tolerated you for a long time, let alone let you come to such good and power, by which you oppose everything that is divine and respectable.

Therefore, let him who has heart and mind, and does not despair of his salvation and all good, flee from this most blasphemous and pernicious error, as from hell and the most pernicious poison, by which all faith and godliness perish, keep to the holy apostolic words [Heb. 10, 12]: "Once Christ sacrificed Himself for sin, this is forever"; and "with this," as it is also written in Hebr. 10, 14, "He has perfected for eternity those who are sanctified," that is, the elect whom God has chosen for Him from the world.

21. And if someone wanted to say that the epistle to the Hebrews was not considered by the ancients to be equal to the more certain writings than the four Gospels and other epistles of Paul, as Eusebius and Origen report, I say that, as they both, together with elements of Alexandrino, who did not live long from the times of the apostles, well testify, that among the Latins, who never reported divine things highly, this epistle was not counted among the other epistles of Paul. And another scribe 1) is remembered by Eusebius, whose name was Gaius, who also reports only thirteen epistles of Paul; but the ancients, from the times of the apostles, have always undoubtedly considered them to be an epistle of Paul. But they confess unanimously that it was first written by Paul in Hebrew, and then, as some think, by Lucam Evangelistam, as others [think], by Clementem m Greek tongue.

Interpreted. Of it read in the 3rd book Eusebii Cap. 3. and in the 6th book Cap. 11. and 18:

(22) But let all this be as it may; which the epistle to the Hebrews sets forth is nothing else than the content of the whole divine Scripture, which shows that through the one death of Christ, when he once offered himself for us, all the elect are cleansed and made blessed. Is. 53, 6. f.: "We have all strayed like sheep, each one has gone astray in his own way, and the Lord has laid on him all our unrighteousness. He went, even willingly, and opened not his mouth; as a sheep he shall be led to the sacrifice of death 2)." And afterwards in the same chapter [v. 10. f.]: "If he shall set his soul for sin, he shall see a longsuffering seed, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. Because his soul hath had trouble, he shall see [his pleasure], and have enough; by his knowledge he shall justify many of my servants, and their iniquity shall he bear."

23. In these words we see clearly that Christ accepted the sins of the elect by his death, being offered up like a sheep; but this happened only once, and no scripture says that he should often afterwards be offered up again, but the prophet says that the favor of the Lord in his hand, that is, by his power and spirit, because of his having once offered up his soul for sins, should succeed and go happily afterward; and in his knowledge, which he gives to the chosen servants of God, by which they recognize and believe that he thus once died for them, thereby he makes them righteous. Which is nothing else than if he gives us to remember his death and believe [that he suffered death] 3) for us, by which we are adopted as children of God, then we become righteous and blessed before God, and not by a re-sacrifice. This is not thought of in all Scripture with a single word, that ever, as reported above, where otherwise there would be no indication, should be exceedingly enough to flee the abomination of re-sacrifice as the worst find of the devil. For the Scripture has all good things, from which [it follows that] must certainly come from the devil and be vain poison of faith, which is brought in beside it. Which is also the case with the fruits of this abomination, which are described above a little.

2) In our German Bible correctly: "to the slaughter". We have put "to the death sacrifice" instead of "to the dead sacrifice".

3) In the old edition: "and faith suffered for us."

1) "Schreibers" put by us instead: Schreibens.

is sacrificed to us and is eternal. In this we are to proclaim the death of the Lord, to give him praise and glory, and to exhort one another to all love and goodness, that we may celebrate one bread and one body in Christ.

(29) He who does not want to be quarrelsome, and also reads the Old Testament, Tertullianum, Cyprianum, and others with an unadulterated heart, will confess that he has this opinion; but to him who wants to quarrel, we say that he brings forth are men whose speech shall ever be of no value, where God's word has another.

30) But that 1) some bring forth from the prophet Malachi 1:11. That when the name of the Lord becomes great among the Gentiles, a pure sacrifice should be offered in all places, is prophesied of the sacrifice of the body, which faith and the knowledge of the divine name offer in all places and among all people; This is not only proved by the words of the prophet himself, which prophesy of the rejection of the Jewish people and the acceptance of the Gentiles, but it is also proved by many other writings, of which Tertullianus *libro primo adversus Iudaeos* lists many.

31. So it is now clearly and publicly proven and preserved by the bright Scriptures of God that no man nor angel can be able to oppose 2) the opinion and doctrine of offering his body and blood again in the night meal of Christ, is an abominable and most harmful discovery of Satan and of the true Antichrist, to kill and destroy the faith and all that is good in the most abominable way, and thereby also to preserve and strengthen the most harmful servants for the destruction of all respectability and persecution of the children of God. Since we have been graciously gifted by God with this knowledge, we must by no means tolerate such an abomination, preach against it, and tear it out of the hearts of our listeners with the powerful words of God, among whom no one is considered, for only in such an abomination should God be heard and feared. Therefore, we have no doubt that all those who have not been rejected by God will secretly be pleased with us, and that this will henceforth, when they have heard our reason, not be called an innovation, but a necessary salutary reformation and restoration to the old and eternal, and that they will praise and thank God the Father with us for such graces and knowledge, and that they will also instruct and admonish us manfully to do so. May the Lord grant this! Amen.

Reason and cause why the lift is turned off.

(32) Since we are so certain and pleased by the bright word of God, to which all things must yield, and must finally be told that it is an abomination to think that the body and blood of Christ are offered up in the supper, we must of necessity also gain an abhorrence of everything that has served and strengthened such abomination and error. Among these, the setting aside of the bread and cup of Christ is not the least. For with the lifting up, it is as much as testified and indicated that the priest offers the body and blood of Christ to God the Father, as is also proven by the words that the mass servers have used in their canons before and after the lifting up.

Some think that such lifting came from the Law of Moses, in which it was commanded to lift some of the grain offering and the fat in the sin offering, which was then called Trumah, as is read in the 3rd book of Moses, in the 2nd and 4th chapters. I find, however, that the Romans in all their ceremonies, of which they have invented so innumerable, have imitated and followed more the pagan customs than those set for the Jews by God, as the divine Scriptures have never been held in high esteem by them. From which idolatrous customs they have also taken the burning of candles, light mass, so many processions and various festivals, the priests' plates, strange clothing, death pomp, and the things without number, which are not only not drawn from the law of Moses, but even contrary to it. It has been reserved for this people to obscure and reverse divine statutes before all the world, therefore it is rare that they have taken their actions from the Scriptures, but against the clear prohibition of God in the 5th book of Moses, in the 12th chapter, what they did before to their idols and idolaters, they have subsequently turned to the service of God, but that it has been profitable for them in every way. So, although I do not want to quarrel with anyone about this, there is no doubt in my mind that it also happened with this annulment.

(34) And because nothing like this can be done by salvation and correction, except by faith, so that it may be known and understood that it is right and pleasing to God, we have diligently preached the Word and the Scriptures before and before we put away such abrogation, along with other things that are done without the Word of God, but are external things, through which alone such knowledge and understanding must come.

1) In the old edition: that.

2) "dawider" put by us instead of: "da weder".

In the meantime we have also taken up the bread and the cup, and have used garments and some other papal things, but we have always said and testified that these things remain for the benefit of the weak alone, and that we needed them until they were well reported by Word, that it would be much better to refrain from such things and to put them away, And we exhorted them all diligence, when we took up the bread and the cup of Christ, that they might then remember how Christ was taken up for us on the cross and offered up once to the Father, and by no means thought that by such taking up we should first offer up again the body and blood of the Lord.

(35) Such our waiting some have highly perverted us, and therefore have written us out as double papists, who, however, never before, which would have occurred to us, have admonished better things. We know that we have been made free and free from the meager elements of the world, that is, statutes of outward things, through the death of Christ, as Paul proves superfluously to the Galatians and also Colossians, therefore all things are pure to the pure, as he writes to Titum, 2) may thus and ought freely to serve the neighbor with all things; some let the others practice, as we may realize, that it may shoot them to the better. Paul did not like to circumcise Timothy for himself out of any faith, because he knew that one was free from all such outward statutes, and that they were of no use for salvation; he also preached such freedom and knew that one had to attack it also with works, and set good examples to the weaker ones; While this freedom was still unknown among the Jews of Lystra and Iconium, he had Timothy circumcised for the sake of those Jews, no doubt to keep them well until he instructed them in all things by the word, and so won them, as he writes of himself, 1 Cor. 9:22: "I became all things to all men, that I might save some of all things." For the same reason he also took a vow of discipline, and therefore 3) circumcised himself in Kenchrea, Apost. 18, 18, and accepted the Jewish purification. Apost. 21, 24.

36 And whether our counterpart wanted to say that Paul would have given in to the weak in the reported pieces, but they would have been pieces.

which God commanded beforehand, so that the Jews had a reason to be attached to them; but the things which we pretend to tolerate for the sake of the weak were thought up and instigated by the Antichrist, in which no one had any reason to be attached. Answer: This speech would be well if the weak also knew that such things had arisen from the Antichrist. But if they can tell as little as those Jews that their bodily ordinances should be abolished, and think it no less contrary to God if such ceremonies should be discontinued than those where they had not kept their bodily ordinances, I do not see why we should not yield to our weak ones who cling to human ordinances, which they think have flowed from the Spirit of God, just as Paul did to his own.

It is also evident that after the beginning of the kingdom of Christ, that is, after the public preaching of the gospel, it was just as superstitious 4) to consider the bodily ordinances of Moses as necessary, as if they had been established by a man. Therefore Paul Col. 2, what was commanded in the law of Moses concerning circumcision, food, and such outward things, reproaches the commandment and doctrine of men, because now that we have died to Christ, they no longer wanted to keep God, but only men. For in both, the freedom delivered to us by the blood of Christ is denied and obscured, so that only one thing is necessary, namely to hear and accept the gospel of Christ. Our afflictions and theirs are one, namely, that they do not yet fully understand Christ, for if they knew that he alone does all things, they would keep all other things alike, even if they had been commanded by the pope or Moses; even in Paul's time, the commandments of Moses were to them as few of God's commandments as those given by the pope.

Therefore, it was no less a denial of Christ, who would have considered them necessary for salvation, than now one of the 'Pabst's statutes for it, although those had come from God, so these have sprung from the Antichrist, therefore Paul also Gal. 4. calls them weak meager statutes. In the origin is probably greater difference of the ceremonies of Moses and the pope, still so the weakness of faith is the same, because the weak in the times of Paul considered them necessary for salvation, which is not

1) From this we see that Bucer also takes the name "two-faced papists", which Carlstadt gives to those who retained the elevation.

2) In the old edition: may.

3) "accordingly" put by us instead of "nevertheless" according to § 41 of this writing.

4) So put by us instead of: "just as superstitious, which" 2c.

The same is true of many a kind-hearted person who is now opposed to the papal statutes.

39. As Paul well knew that circumcision and other ceremonies of the law were of no use in himself, but rather harmful, so that people soon trusted in them too much and Christian freedom was accepted all the more slowly, and yet he had Timothy circumcised, a disciple highly praised in the faith, and he himself, who had of course now come far in the faith, held several ceremonies at times, so that he would not repel the weak from him until he had made Christ fully known to them: We believe completely that we have had cause for our waiting, with the holding of several ceremonies, which we have done for the benefit of the weak, and that we have not particularly sinned against it, even though we do not want to excuse ourselves. For though we are not conscious of anything ourselves, we are not justified in this. The measure is also hard to take in this, therefore we ask with David, Ps. 19, 13: "Who notices the faults? Make me clean from the secret ones." But we hope that we have not yet given cause for being called double papists. We would like to promote the honor of Christ alone. We cannot accomplish this in any other way than through the Word. In order that we might preach the same pleasantly, we have tolerated some ceremonies for the weak, which, although they have already arisen from papists of the worst opinion and have caused great harm and damage to the faith, are still external things, and therefore free in themselves, where they are not used out of unbelief or with annoyance.

40. In the house of idols and eating of things sacrificed to idols had arisen from the devil and was used for the destruction of all that is good, nor does Paul confess, regardless of the fact that this was forbidden in the law of Moses, that it is free for Christians and that they have its power, because the idol is nothing, so the sacrifice to idols is also nothing, only that this is done without having an evil fellowship with the idols, and that everyone should take care that he does not fall by it; But first of all the apostle teaches that it happens without offense to the weak, that is, to those who do not yet recognize such freedom, and yet eat with it, against their conscience, thereby sinning, so that they eat with it, with a corrupt conscience and no faith. From this it undoubtedly follows that if he had hoped that he would have eaten of the sacrifice to idols in an idol's house, that he would have had all the better place to worship the Gentile Christ.

He would have gone, of course, as he allows the others to go, as long as it is not a cause for the weak to eat against their conscience, and thus to sin, and [that he] also had Timothy circumcised, so that he would have all the more place to preach to the Jews. Thus, although the Antichrist has invented the abolition and used it to corrupt godliness, that he has thereby confirmed his blasphemous error of the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, still because we know that such sacrifice is nothing, as the idols and their sacrifices were nothing, and we Christians have all power, as this is beautifully demonstrated in 1 Cor. 8. and 10. by Paul: no one may condemn us for having tolerated such sacrifices for some time, along with other ceremonies, for the sake of the weak, to make a way for them to preach the word of God.

(41) Here I hear you say, "How? Are you afraid that the word of God will be a hindrance to him? The word enables all things to be done according to the word of God among Christians; if you do this and stop what is done without the word, are you afraid that you will make a hindrance to the word? the sheep will know their shepherd's voice well. Answer: This objection might also have been made to Paul when he had Timothy circumcised for the sake of the Jews, or when he made a vow of discipline, and accordingly circumcised himself in Cenchrea. Would it not have been possible to say, "How, Paul, you have no word that you should first have a Christian and such a famous brother circumcised, but the word only instructs you to depart from the weak, meager statutes; follow it, pay no attention to what the Jews say, the Lord knows His own well; there can be no hindrance to the word, act according to the word.

But Paul would have answered: Dear brethren, it is true that to act according to the word may bring no hindrance to the word, but we also observe what is acted according to the word; knowledge puffs up and love corrects. It is true that no one should do anything that he has not been taught by the word. Therefore, if the matter concerned only me and my dear son Timothy, who understands Christian liberty, I would not for a long time have him circumcised, nor would I also circumcise myself; but the word also teaches me that I should love my neighbor as Christ loved me, and be ready to love and serve him, to do and to leave all things; more I have a word that the earth is the Lord's, and what is in it; therefore all outward things are for us Christians also.

The pure have all things pure, therefore circumcision, making vows and shaving off hair are also free to me.

43. far be it from me that I should undertake such things, that I should count them expedient unto salvation in themselves; but because they were made free unto me by the death of Christ, I know myself guilty that I may use them where I hope it will be profitable. I know that the Lord knows his sheep, and they know him and his voice, and that he himself must preach his word to them, and that he will do as I do; and if I am to be his servant in this, and a faithful and wise servant, whom he has set over his servants, to give them meat in due season, I must also keep myself as a fellow worker, servant, faithful and wise servant, and keeper of the divine secrets; And like my Master Christ, not crushing the broken reed, nor quenching the burning wick, but kindly receiving and bearing [the] weak in faith, loving and serving him, and leaving that which is not contrary to God's law in himself, that which is not contrary to faith or love; such as pruning and shearing, and what is like them.

44 My Master and Lord Christ would convert whom he would even without my preaching, nor will he use my ministry for this purpose, but rather with works than with words. Therefore I do not act without a word; the word makes outward things free to me and makes me use them for the betterment of my neighbor, and therefore, though I am free from everyone, I have made myself a servant to everyone, so that I may gain many: to the Jews I have become a Jew, to the weak a weakling, and to everyone all things, so that I may gain and save some, 1 Corinthians 9.

45 Who would condemn Paul after such an answer? Therefore, it is our hope, that we also do not have mischief, although we have already become papal with the papists in some respects, and have for a time tolerated the abolition, together with some other things, which are well used evil by the wicked, but are free in themselves, for the service and favor of such, as has been said, rather than used it, until we made Christ better known to them and thus won them over. One must always act with the word before those whom one wants to win; it does not say: faith comes from the deed, but "from the preaching of the word", Rom. 10, 17. Josiah was a king and had full power, nor did he do anything else.

He did not stop the abominations and idolatries until he had read the book of the covenant in the ears of all the people, and had restored the covenant with the Lord, and all the people had entered into the covenant. Read in the other book of Kings, 23. If one is to begin with the words, one must indeed keep oneself as much as possible with God, so that one may have listeners. Although God must draw them all, yet we must serve Him in this; He must also teach them all, yet we must preach and be wise, that we may rightly divide the word of truth 1) and distribute it, giving milk to the milksop and strong meat to the strong.

46 And that which is read in Moses is to be understood and directed according to what Christ says: "I give you a new commandment, as I have loved you, that you also love one another"; in the little word: love your neighbor as yourself, all the law is fulfilled, Galatians 5. In the law of Moses it was commanded that they should tear down the altars of the Gentiles, overthrow their pillars, burn their idols with fire. Read in the 5th book of Moses Cap. 7. Even Paul, when he came to Athens and saw that the city was so idolatrous, his spirit was enraged within him, but he never pulled down an altar or burned an idol, but he preached to them and pointed out that they were far too superstitious in all things. For one must also take heed [to] all the commandments circumstances, distinguishing the temporal from the eternal. Those people were given into the hands of the Israelites to exterminate them, but the apostles were commanded to convert the Gentiles to Christ; therefore, as they did with their hands, so they should do by word. So also we; where there is superstition, let the name be what it will, one is called Jew, Gentile or Christian (it is not that we are called Christians, but that we are), 2) one must begin with the word and do this until one learns Christ in such a way that the putting away of human sin promotes trust in Christ and does not deter from the word, for only the stumbling blocks and harnesses of divine wrath never come near.

47 In this, although the right measure is poorly taken, yet he who trusts in God, practices and drives the word with all seriousness, and takes care of Christ's army, the Lord will show him not to deviate too far from the right measure. For those who are the children of God are led by the Spirit, Romans 8, and He will teach them to do all things with the Lord.

1) In the old edition: cut.

2) These brackets are set by us.

Works, which they teach by words. First, they will teach that one should trust in the one Christ; they will immediately repay this with works and place their trust in no other thing. Secondly, they will teach that one should not do anything to serve God that he has not taught himself, which they will do; they will not practice any ceremonies to prove something pleasing to God. But because they also teach that the Christian is the Lord of the Sabbath and of all outward things, they will also prove this with their works and never allow themselves to be bound, but will show that all things are pure to the pure. And more, if they also teach that one should do all things for the love and service of one's neighbor, that one may please him for good, this must then also be repaid with the works, that one may do what is external and in himself neither unbelief nor displeasure of his neighbor, for a time to please and build up his neighbor, having no complaint.

If God would have all those who reproach us by default, as by such works and ceremonies, and who want to attack all things immediately with deeds, to first of all bravely take hold of their old Adam's hood, to show the crucifying of their flesh and the exercise of brotherly love with deeds and a little more diligent good works, then, if God wills, there should be more peace and unity and the word should be blasphemed less. 1) O Lord! How hardly do we come to the point where we do not please ourselves, but, like Christ, desire only to please others for the good. So answer them that think we have tarried too long in abjuring the abrogation and other papal ceremonies. I have shown the reason for our faith in this, hoping that the godly will be satisfied with us. I have also made it more extensive because there are not a few who do not want to understand that love is the fulfillment of the law, Romans 13, and that all things are pure to the pure, who insist firmly on the words of the law where it concerns other people and outward ceremonies, to which a Jew and Turk can just as well be hostile; but where it concerns their old Adam, there they are somewhat milder interpreters of the law. May the Lord teach them and us to keep the right measure in all things.

(49) Now I will explain the reason and cause of our faith, that we have put away the suspension of the bread and cup of Christ. First, because we, having known Christ, have hitherto had such a

1) An excellent rebuke of Carlstadt!

If we have tolerated the abolition of the law for the sake of the weak alone, so that they would not be deterred by the word about innovations that they could not yet approve of, it must follow that now, after the word has been preached to them sufficiently, we must also prove by deed that one should serve God in spirit, with true faith alone, and with no outward ceremonies, but practice what is ours, for the service and piety of the neighbor, also testify outwardly by deed what we believe in our hearts. More, to beware not only of evil, but also of all evil appearances. If lifting up has been considered necessary as a ceremony for the service of God and as a sign that one is offering up Christ, the most pernicious error, it must be an abominable thing to all the godly, even though it is in itself an outward thing and in itself neither evil nor good, which they would much rather avoid than tolerate. Just as they tolerate it for a time, until the people are told of the word and also gain an abhorrence of such things, so, as soon as the same are told of the word, so that they somewhat confirm the faith of the words with the example and increase the abhorrence of all ungodly things in them, they immediately discontinue what such a thing is.

(50) And how can a Christian not be disgusted and abhorred by that which has certainly arisen from the devil and has caused so much harm to poor souls, whatever it may be in himself? An ox that kills a man God commanded to be stoned and not to eat its carcass, in the other book of Moses Cap. 21, although an ox, as without reason, is considered blameless in such. So, even though the sacrifice itself is an external thing and not evil, nor is great murder of the soul caused by the fact that it was thought that the priest was sacrificing Christ, and therefore there was no better work that could take away sin and make us blessed, just as if Christ had not done enough with his one sacrifice on the cross: it is ever right and just that such an abolition, which has been so shameful, though it did no more harm, should be discarded and rejected, where it may be tolerated without deterrence from the word. We are to avoid the blasphemers, if they have been warned once and again, and have nothing in common with them, for why would we use the same ceremonies with them, which, as we have found out, have been annoying in so many ways? So even though Paul confesses that the sacrifice to idols, like the idol, was nothing, and that he, as a Christian, had power over all things, yet, lest we should give the devils

1) If the Gentiles would like to be respected, or even become, he kindly draws them away from the sacrifice to idols. "I do not want you to be in the company of devils," he says. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of the devil at the same time. You cannot partake of the Lord's table and the devils' table at the same time. Or shall we defy the Lord? Are we stronger than he? I have it all power, but it is not all useful. I have it all power, but it does not improve everything. Let no man seek that which is his, but let every man seek that which is another's," 1 Cor. 10:20-24. Behold, he saith, I have all power, even as he permitted them afterward to go unto the sacrifice made to idols: but if it were hurtful, he would much rather that they should abstain from it: how then should not we also abstain from the sacrifice made to idols, and make ourselves strange?

51. who hath not said, when they have taken up the bread and the cup of the LORD, they lift up our LORD GOD, I have seen our LORD GOD; to the immeasurable offence of the Jews and the Turks? The Scripture is clear, and John testifies: "No one has ever seen God, but the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared it to us. One must hear about God, one may and should believe in God, but seeing is reserved for this world. That is why God said to Moses: "No man shall live who sees Me", in the 2nd Book of Moses in the 33rd Cap. V. 20. Why else does Paul call him the invisible God? Had it been said, "The bread, the cup of the LORD," as the Spirit of God calls it in Paul, saying, "As often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup," 2c., 1 Cor. 11. nor does he call it otherwise in this or Cap. 10. where he also reports it, as in [the] histories of the apostles and John 13. And if one had received and eaten such, as the Lord is called, in remembrance of Him, and had refrained from lifting up and worshipping, much error and superstition would have been avoided, so that many a poor soul is now perishingly imprisoned. How could Christians tolerate such abolition, when it could otherwise be stopped without great harm?

52. of Thoma Apostolo, when he put his hand in the Lord's side and said "my Lord and God", the ancients write: the men-

1) In the old edition: "meaner". "Meaner" - what community have.

He saw them and he believed in God; and here the disciples and teachers of the pope themselves write that one sees only the form and the color, and they have tolerated that men have said against all Scripture, against all old teachers, yes, against their own teachers: One lifts up our Lord God, I want to see our Lord God, and the like. Hence also such luxuriant theidings and words have been practiced by themselves, the masses, together with other loose people of their kind, that there have been priests who have taken the bread and said, "Come on, boy, you must become the Lord," and such blasphemies not a little. But the error has been profitable to them, they have then pretended to be God-makers, and have placed themselves far above the holy Virgin Mary, that she gave birth to God only once, but they make him daily, yes, blaspheme and revile him, more than anyone on earth.

53) Further, when this bread and the cup were taken up, the people worshipped it as their God and Christ, present in the flesh, with some strange prayers, which must have been much stronger than at other times, since the true healing presence of God and Christ, through true faith, is invisible. Otherwise God is around and around and fills heaven and earth. Thus the Pharisees, who crucified Jesus, also saw and touched him in the flesh, but it did little for them. Therefore Paul writes: "Even if we have known Christ after the flesh, we know Him no more", 2 Cor. 5, 16. For truly, as Christ Himself says Joh. 6, 63: "It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh is of no use. The words that I speak are spirit and life: So in the Lord's supper we should have taken the words into account and believed that the body and blood of Christ was offered for our sins on the cross once, which is eternal and completes all who are sanctified, and for the confession of this faith we should have eaten the bread and drunk the cup in remembrance and thanksgiving of this redemption, as Christ said, and should have refrained from lifting it up and showing it, which he did not say.

54 If the people, the masses, had been as concerned about the poor souls and the integrity of faith as they were about their bellies, as they read in their fathers about St. Thomas, that he had seen another and believed and worshipped another, seen man and worshipped God, they could well have said here: Another one sees, another one believes, another one

Other things are worshipped; the bread and the cup are seen, so it is called by the Holy Spirit, who knows best how to call it. That the body and blood of Christ were sacrificed once on the cross for our salvation is believed, yet recognize as useful and divine; But now every one but God alone is to be worshipped. For this reason Christ also pointed all the way to the Father, even though he is one with the Father, so that no one would remain attached to humanity. Therefore he also called himself a way and said: "No one comes to the Father, but through me" therefore Paul also calls him a mediator between God and man, but according to mankind, because he says: "There is One God, and One mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus", 1 Tim. 2, 5. So, if they had been true servants of Christ, they would also have pointed from the carnal outward things to the spirit and to God.

55. The Lord has called this bread to be eaten and the cup to be drunk, and immediately led from the bodily to the spiritual and commanded to remember it, so they, the popes, by their lifting up of the concern of the death of Christ, therefore this supper alone is appointed and should be kept, 1) they have also been drawn from enjoyment to bodily seeing and worshiping, thereby spoiling 2) the people, if they had once seen and worshipped the bread and cup of the Lord during the day they would have happiness and salvation during the day as they also lived; But I am silent about many superstitions, which have been torn down with some little prayers, which, spoken at the time of the lifting up, are said to have miraculous power, as is reported; also those who thought, if they offered a penny between the lifting up of the bread and the cup, that this would be good in one place for the fever, in another for the toothache, and much more unbelief and idolatry has grown up here; as then found by all men: Where the root is useless 3) and idolatrous, what good would come from it?

Therefore, to conclude this article, since in the Christian community all things are to be done for the better, and we know that the abrogation of it cannot itself be better, since it does not teach the Scriptures of God but has hitherto, when used by the papists, also brought untold harm and ruin to souls, and from us, from the time that the Lord enlightened and sent us to preach His holy gospel, only the original gospel is to be preached.

1) In the old edition: je.

2) spoiled - brought to the delusion. Should not perhaps "spoiled" be read? Cf. § 119 of this writing.

3) So put by us instead of: shall.

The reason for this is that the weak crowd, before they are informed by the word, may not be deterred from the word by rejecting it as an innovation that they could not yet recognize as useful and divine; But now every one that may have a good hope otherwise has so much report by the daily preaching of good, that in Christian fellowship one may and ought to put away all man's deeds, especially when such are found to have been used by the antichrists to so great and marked an annoyance, as has been done with this abrogation: We, with God and by faith, did not know how to tolerate this abolition any longer, so that we would not be considered as if we wanted to have fellowship with the Antichrist, and at the same time drink the cup of the Lord, and at the same time be partakers of the Lord's table and of the Antichrist, which cannot be possible, 1 Cor. 10, 21.

(57) It behooves us also, who are ministers of the Spirit, always to teach that the Spirit quickeneth, and the flesh is of no profit, to lead men from all things corporeal unto the right faith and love of the Spirit. Therefore, if the Lord has not instituted in his supper anything corporeal, but only eating and drinking, and that for the sake of the spiritual, namely his remembrance, and we have yet seen that many have not wanted to pay attention to either the bodily sensation or the spiritual remembrance, but, as before, have allowed themselves to be satisfied by sight and bodily worship, which two things have also hitherto been much more esteemed than the word of God: It is to the advantage of such weak and indolent Christians, who always need examples of works and deeds in addition to words, that we want to remove from their eyes the physical things that have not arisen from God and have therefore been used in such a harmful way, in order to lead them to the spiritual. As we have seen with idols and images, many people's minds have fallen away from them after they have been removed.

(58) Therefore let the reason and cause of our faith be given, for which we have laid down and set aside the setting aside of the bread and the cup in the supper of the Lord. Whoever lets God be the Lord and His word the best, will heartily please Him; but whoever wants to please Him more than the words and statutes of God through a human finding and superstitious abuse, we must let him go as a blind man. One must obey God more than man; indeed, for the sake of God, one must hand over, deny and hate father, mother, wife, child and everything.

Cause, why the papal clothes are abgethan.

In the past, during a mortal sin, the saint had to wear a strange garment. First of all, a linen cloth on the head, which must have a placket like a delicious robe, and two long ribbons to gird it around him, a humeral they called it. Then a wide linen dress, which must be much too long for the person to be measured, so that he then would like to skirt it up, also with a linen belt, and has the same dress at the end, below, behind and in front, but of delicious garment, silk or other good cloth must have two square shields, also similarly on the sleeves on the hands of the same cloth a covering, and this dress was called the alb. Over all of this, a long, narrow strap of delicious garment must be placed around the neck by the masseur, and the ends must be crossed at the front over the chest, and attached on each side under the belt, so that the alb 1) is girded, so that it stands at the chest like a Burgundian cross, and this is called the stole. A similar strap, but shorter, the ends of which should be stitched together, he had to hang on the left arm, and was called the maniple, or the hand fan. 2) On top of all this, he must hang an outer garment of exquisite cloth on his neck, without sleeves, with a main hole at the top, and open at the sides, wide at the back and front, cut partly pointed at the bottom, partly round, and must be somewhat shorter than the alb, and have a cross in the middle at the bottom, and a placket at the front, both usually of exquisite embroidered work and pictures.

(60) This is the glorious armor of the rulers, which I have thus described, that I have no doubt it shall be brought to pass in a short time by the word of God, that an understanding Christian shall not soon be persuaded that there ever was such foolishness among Christians, if he shall hear it. However, I did not want to report the bishops' armor, which is more foolish, also the Levites, as they call them, and other such things, so that the reader would not be stopped from doing better by such foolishness.

(61) Now this armor we have used for the supper of Christ also hitherto, for the cause reported, that we kept the people good-willed until they took the word, and then such with

other papal ceremonies with benefit and improvement. For before the word of God is heard and believed, such things cannot be of any use. All things are unclean to unbelievers, as all things are clean to believers. So we hope, since we never considered such clothing necessary from the time the Lord made his word known to us, nor did we think we were showing God any favor by it, but only for the sake of the inexperienced, so that we would not frighten them away from the word with an unmeaning innovation, and thus in such outward appearances and for ourselves we served the means, we shall be excused from it by the godly.

(62) But if, for the sake of the inexperienced alone, until they had learned and known the divine will through the word, we tolerated such clothing, and now, after so much preaching, all the sheep of Christ have heard and recognized the voice of their shepherd, we had to set an example for them to follow and obey it alone. For this reason we have laid aside all the above-mentioned clothing and do not need any special clothing for the Lord's Supper, but only a choir robe, as well as for the preaching of the Word, with which, since no special care has ever been taken, nor have we been consecrated, we want to serve the foreigners and also those who ever think that there is something proper with us, in the hope that no one will be harmed by such bright and diligent preaching of the divine Word.

But that mummary, which they considered highly necessary for the mass, we do not have to tolerate any longer after such diligent and now long practiced proclamation of the holy gospel, as we have not known anyone to prove more useful services with it. Since we may not doubt that such clothing has come from pagan, idolatrous use and human imagination, for divine Scripture does not teach it. Since we are not to use anything in worship to serve the idols or to be invented by ourselves, in the 5th book of Moses, chapter 12, it follows that we are not to have anything to do with such clothing. Further, as it has not had a good origin, so it has been used to manifold harm by the sacrificers. By such consecrated clothing, they considered themselves holier and better than others; for if one forgot a little piece at mass, it was considered a sin; 4) therefore, it was something gross.

1) In the old edition: "to gird".

2) d. i. Hand flag or Handfähnlein.

3) Means - adiaphoron, which in itself is neither good nor evil.

4) Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 1490.

It must have been a great sign of respect for God, who with washed hands, his proper prayers, with the removal of his rifle, combing of the hair, along with other spiritual attentiveness and reverence, adorned himself with such clothes. Therefore also, if a Christian might be baptized and ordained by a common priest, only a bishop might bless the chasubles, so they were held high. And, the most abortive to the faith, such clothes indicated that the maker of the mass offered up Christ, that God acted and walked; whom all Scripture praises unchangeably. That is why it must have been so delicious and such a good work, who made it or gave something to make it; therefore it also made the mass-goer, 1) even if he had already been a public fornicator, miser, blasphemer and a basic soup of all vices, so holy that whoever would not have bowed down before him and fallen on his knees, would not have had to be a Christian.

64 All these are detestable and abominable superstitions; no holiness may ever be in things that wear out under hands through custom, about which no one should make a conscience. Col. 2: The Lord rejects outward cleanliness and adornment; the faith of the heart alone is valid before Him, Matt. 23. But that it has been pretended that the mass servers sacrifice Christ in their mass is a pernicious error, just as it is indicated that a Christian should certainly have an abomination in everything that has served for it or is used for it in some way. For he that loveth Christ aright, and hath pleasure in his law, may not suffer nor tolerate those things which are the enemies of antichrist, used for the destruction of the faith, further than the love and concern of the weak constrain him. Therefore, where things can be stopped without the detrimental displeasure of others, it is the highest desire of every Christian to stop them; just as no one who is faithful and loyal to his Lord can tolerate or suffer what is done and used by his enemy to his Lord's displeasure, no matter what it may be in himself. Therefore every true Christian is like David, who says: "I hate lies and abhor them, but I love your law. But lies and vain imaginations are everything that does not flow from the word of God, for if all men are liars and vain, as the Scriptures show in all places, what else can be devised by them but lies and vanity?"

65 Now Weiler but the measuring clothes are not

1) In the old edition: dem Meßlinge.

For after people had been persuaded that a high church service was to maintain such mass ornaments, everyone wanted something of such service, as we are by nature of the law of the Lord on falsehood and error, and thus highly harmful and detrimental to the purity of faith, but also prevented brotherly love and handouts to the poor, and at the same time promoted splendor and hope. For after people have been persuaded that it is a high service of God to maintain and increase such mass ornaments, everyone has also wanted something of such service, as we are by nature inclined to deviate from the law of the Lord on lies, that is, people, from the beginning of the world. Hereby it has happened that many little think that the Lord will say to the goats on the left side in that day: "Depart from me, ye that are bruised, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. I have been hungry and you have not fed me, I have been thirsty and you have not watered me, I have been a guest and you have not sheltered me, I have been naked and you have not clothed me, I have been sick and imprisoned and you have not visited me." And if they say they have not seen the Lord suffer things, he will answer them, "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have not done it unto one of the least of these, ye have not done it unto me." Yes, this terrible judgment of Christ is little considered: what is to be given to the least is regarded as if it were lost, which alone is given and pleasing to the Lord; and in the meantime golden pieces, velvet, damask, and other silk, with all kinds of precious cloth, are given, that the worshippers may disguise themselves with them, so that boys may be taken for saints, and the superstition, avarice, and wantonness of the Antichrist may be entertained and strengthened.

(66) Yes, it has come to this, when great courtliness, splendor and debauchery are practiced by lords and children of the world, when they make chasubles out of such tools of the devil, that is, when they serve for spiritual wickedness and blasphemy, then it is already thought that all things are paid for and worn out by God. Then a shield is hung on it, so that one can see from whom it was given; these are then decoys, as Adam's children are greedy for glory, so that every fool follows after, also gives something; if he can no longer, then he gives something to a chasuble for the tax, that one only lets him put his shield on it; so that the generations have their anniversaries, one must hold the office in their chasubles. And who could explain all the follies, superstitions and aversions?

that sprang from such mummery and were thus preserved? The planting is not from the Father, how could it have brought forth good fruit?

67. If then all things are to be better among us, that is, to faith in the one Christ, that we should expect all good things from him alone, and to love, that we should love and care for our neighbor as ourselves, and it cannot be denied that the chasuble clothing is harmful to both faith and love and is annoying in many ways, we have stopped it, since now the divine word is only known to those of us who are not otherwise so blinded by God that they do not even want to hear it, so that whoever is now deterred by such a stopping of the word must of course be of the goats and not of the sheep of Christ; therefore on his account nothing of this kind is to be tolerated or abated.

68. no one may here oppose the clothing of the high priest in the law, of which one reads in Exodus 28. "For we are no longer to handle shadows, if we have the right body of Christ," Col. 2. so we are no longer to adhere to the bodily statutes, Gal. 4. col. 2. who are to serve God in spirit and truth, Jn. 4. Christ is our high priest, signified by Aaron, and as he did not enter into the holy things made with hands, which are an antitype of the true [things], but into heaven itself, to appear before the face of GOD, Heb. 9:24. So his priestly garments, and all of us who are one with him through a right faith, and therefore also priests, will also not be made with hands, but spiritual garments, as truth, judgment, and righteousness, and all things that are in Christ; for all who have been baptized have put on Christ, Gal. 3:27.

But there is also a great difference; the Jews had priestly garments as well as priests, or more sacrificers, and that by the command of God, and in addition only Aaron with his sons and then their descendants among all the people: so with us so many unrighteous people have pretended to be sacerdotess, that is, sacrificers, and have devised strange garments for themselves, of which God knows nothing. About this the Scriptures teach us everywhere that with us shall be spiritual and eternal what the Jews have had bodily and temporal. Therefore, as they had Aaron, a bodily temporal sacrificer, who sacrificed with bodily adornment and also bodily, entered into the bodily holy 2c., so now we have a spiritual eternal high sacrificer, adorned with the garments of salvation, righteousness, and glory, who is

sacrificed himself once, and this is for ever, to complete all that are sanctified; with whom therefore, if we be in the faith, we are also sacrificers, because we are one with him, and through one another. "In Christ JEsu there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, but all at once One," Gal. 3:28. But that, as He once offered Himself, we also offer our bodies for sacrifice with the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving. For this one must not have any bodily adornment.

70. Of such sacrificers, that is, of all true Christians who are a beloved sponsor of Christ, David sings Ps. 45:14. thus: "The king's daughter is all glorious within, her garment is wrought gold; they shall be brought to the king in embroidered garments," for if the inward man is rightly adorned by true faith and love, the gold of divine wisdom shines forth from without, together with all manner of graces and virtues; and this is the wedding garment which all who come to Christ's wedding must have, or be cast into utter darkness. We should all aspire to this adornment in the same way, as we are all one in Christ and God's sacerdotess, that is, sacrificers, and leave the outward appearance to the children of the world. What was used in the Old Testament was only an image and shadow of the true things, of which read Heb. 7 and 8.

Finally, what one does in the Christian community should be done in such a way that one is taught to despise physical splendor and adornment. Now, everything must be adorned with gold, silver, precious stones and silk, so that such vanity was the more respected. The pagans have recognized that such adornment is more of a disgrace to God than we indicate, as if God, like us, had an addiction to gold and the like folly, which is a spiritual eternal good, and also endows His own with heavenly eternal treasures and adorns them with spiritual ornaments.

In sum, to conclude this article, the Lord's Supper is nothing less than a sacrifice, as sufficiently indicated above, and a ceremony of the New Testament, where all things are to be directed to the Spirit. Therefore the ornamentation and adornment of Aaroni does not rhyme with it at all. They have all been only images and shadows of spiritual things, which we are now to deal with. Christ held his supper in common garments, and so did his dear apostles; why then should we need much adornment and ornamental clothing! So, let us hope, it will please all the elect of God that we have put an end to the papal mummery, which has brought no benefit and much harm.

Why the prayer and offerings, so the mass makers need to find turned off and changed, even the table they call altar, crazy.

73. The missals have many prayers and words, especially that they are called the minor and major canon, which often speak of sacrifice, as if Christ were being offered up by the maker of the mass, which is such a terrible, pernicious error; In addition, such seductive and poisonous words have been kept far above the holy Gospels and what was read from divine Scripture in the Mass, that it was a great sin if one had omitted something or had not told the words properly one after the other; for the sake of the Gospel and what should have been read from Scripture, there was no need, as it was not read, but was superimposed. Therefore, since such prayers and words are in themselves false and seductive, and have only led to superstition and contempt of divine words and truths, as is evident and no one can deny it, and since we are not to speak anything in the Christian community that is not better, we have not used the same canon before, and what prayers are not according to divine Scripture. How ungodly, seductive, that is, words that are not in accordance with the holy scripture, the canon of mass along with other mass prayers contain, may well be recognized by anyone who knows Christ, if he only reads them himself. However, the highly graced Ulrich Zwingli, the Zurich apostle, has also done this superfluously in a booklet, which has recently gone out in print from this canon. 1) Therefore, I will not say more about it.

Many strange gestures, including bending down, making the cross, kissing, beating the breast, raising and lowering hands, turning away from and toward the people, and the like, have had to be used at mass until now, so that it has not been considered a small sin if someone had omitted or not formally practiced such gestures, which they themselves call umbrella gestures. Therefore, the young altar boys had to learn them with not little work; the one who knew them well 2) was considered a devout spiritual priest before others, to whom the old mothers gladly sacrificed and assigned to say mass. In whom, however, both the faith and the

of love, that is, of the whole Christian life: of faith, that one has meant, against all Scripture, to prove service to God with such jugglery, for where it should not have been service to Him to hold such, it should not have been sin to omit such, or not to hold it so properly.

This is contrary to what Christ says in John 4: "The Father is a spirit, and wants those who serve him in spirit and truth. For if Christ says that one should worship and serve God in spirit, these say that one must serve and worship him with bodily gestures, and if he wants those who worship in truth, they teach them to mock God with mockery and assumed manner. For who does not consider it a mockery if someone assumes great love toward him with sweet words, laughter, embracing and the like, and yet knows that such a one is hostile to him in his heart? Who does not ridicule it as a mockery when women take upon themselves great lamentations, weeping, wailing, wringing their hands together over their heads, acting as if they wanted to faint with sorrow, and yet they are not sorry for their hearts? So, what is it but a loud mockery and jiggery-pokery that the mass-makers make over the altar: there they fall on their knees, look up to heaven, clasp their hands together, beat their breasts, let out a roar as if they were all full of remorse and pain over their sin; and in the same lamenting, weeping and bending, they may look after frivolous women, give them signs, [since] the others have all their mind and thoughts on the sacrifice; and what need is there of words? By all their life and conduct, words and deeds, which they do before and after mass, men can see how serious they are. A miserable lump of money alone can bring such devotion and repentance to them. Now what man would tolerate one who made such a jiggery-pokery before him, from whom his heart would be so far; how should not such ghosts rather be a disgrace and high annoyance to God, who is the eternal truth, who cries out against glittering everywhere!

This is true, where the heart is full of devotion, love of God or repentance, it will also show itself with outward gestures, 3) but as that of each devotion, love or repentance itself will give. As little as I may prescribe to another how he should laugh and leap for joy, who has no joy in his heart, so I may not teach anyone how he should rejoice for joy.

3) So put by us instead of: eignen. Probably "eugen" will be found in the original.

1) Luther, too, had a writing Against the Canon go out: "Vom Greuel der Stillmesse, so man den Canon nennt." (On the Abomination of the Still Mass, So Called the Canon). Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XIX,

2) In the old edition: gekennt.

The most part of them have no godly love or repentance. Therefore, the statutes and teachings of such practices, which all should practice in the same way, but not in the same way; indeed, the majority have neither godly love nor repentance, may do nothing but nothing but mockery, jiggery-pokery, and mockery of God; therefore, where Christians want to be, they should completely abstain, and leave the spirit of each one free to confess and stand, after his heart is kindled in devotion and repentance, and it may be better for God's community. Otherwise, what else should God say to such mocking showmanship of the wicked, but that he said to the same mockery of the Jews: "If you lift up your hands, I will turn away my eyes, and if you increase your prayers, I will not hear"? Is. 1. So he also says through Joel that they should rend their hearts, not their garments, which was also a vow of the penitent, but practiced with false hearts by many. God is truth, therefore He wills that nothing but truth be done, and that we be in earnest in all things. So David says: "I will go into your house, to your great goodness, and worship in your holy temple, in your fear", Ps. 5, 8. Where God's fear is, who kills liars and hates all glorifiers, no one will dare to make such a mockery of God, but will speak with David, and that in truth: "I will thank you with all my heart in the council of the upright and in the congregation", Ps. 111, 1.

So it is found that the celebration of Mass, the bending down and squatting, looking over and under one another, striking hands from one another and together, and other gestures, is detrimental to the faith in three ways: [First, that so many poor mass-makers are persuaded that they are doing a special favor with such a gesture, when it requires only the spirit. Secondly, their consciences are bound with such meager elements, that is, outward statutes, that they confess them and fear sin. Thirdly, if they do such things without all heart and with vain pretense, and thus hardly revile and mock God, they do not fear sin, but think they are doing God a service.

It is also more detrimental to love that the simple are deceived by such apologetics, and are led to believe that, to the detriment of the poor, some loose bellies not only live in a cowardly life, to the annoyance of a whole community of God, but also reign and splendor. So such gestures are harmful and of no use,

Indeed, they are not possible to keep without a mockery of God by males, as males may not have the same devotion, love and repentance, they cannot and may not be kept by Christians as before. Since we have been redeemed from such outward statutes by the blood of Christ, that no one should be conscience-stricken about them, even those whom God Himself commanded, how can we tolerate such poisonous, false, unchaste little fetters, not only without the Word, but also completely contrary to the Word of God? And therefore we have to stop them, and also set an example to serve God in the only thing He has commanded, and that in spirit and in truth.

79 And if anyone thinks that the making of the cross is such an old custom that Tertullianus wrote 1300 years ago, that Christians used to mark their foreheads with the cross, which they did or began to do, read about it in the book of the same teacher, *de corona militis*; and therefore one should not stop doing this. Answer: The death of Christ, suffered on the cross, is our redemption, therefore such a remembrance and sign to remind us of it, so that we may stand firm in faith toward God. Therefore, such remembrance and signs, which remind us of it, so that we may stand firm in faith toward God and become all the more hearty in carrying our cross, are by no means to be rejected. But what signs are, let them be signs, and do not attribute to the signs that which alone belongs to that which is signified. So if anyone, as in the times of Tertulliani, made a cross on his forehead or otherwise to all things he began or attacked, remembering the death of Christ, that he did or left all things in free faith to God, thinking all the way how dearly he was bought of sins; that he might be able to put sin to death in all things, even so to put himself under the cross, that he said with Paul: Far be it from me to boast, but only of the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world is crucified to me, and I to the world, Galatians 6:14. 6:14: for indeed he would not be punished at all, as the ancients, no doubt, in order to remember the cross of Christ and to make it pleasant for themselves, marked themselves with the cross, so that they would not be ashamed of it, but would freely take up their cross and bravely follow the Lord, for which they were required daily.

80 Now the sign has been given special power: [It is supposed to drive away devils, to bless all things, to give a happy beginning to all things, all of which the death of Christ alone accomplishes for believers. Therefore

It has come about that one worships the wood, which is spent for the cross of Christ, puts it in silver and gold, lets the people kiss it, to earn great indulgences. After that, many other crosses have appeared, that one bled, that one came from heaven, that one from purgatory, in which all kinds of superstition and trouble are caused and maintained; I am silent about so many superstitious blessings and sorceries that are performed with the holy sign. All this is due to the fact that too much importance has been attached to the sign, and because of this, the sign we have used, that is, the death of Christ, has been left out of our hearts, so that we would have increased in faith and would have desired to become like him.

But since we did not know what Christ's cross or ours was or was capable of, God, for our great ingratitude, decreed that we should fall on the sign, and let go of the right one, which signifies the sign to us, and accepted the shadow for the body, and used both Christ's cross and ours to expel it. For if we are redeemed, sanctified, consecrated and blessed by the cross of Christ, that is, by his death alone, the sign of the cross, made with hands, has had to do all this; especially where it has been made by priests or great legates; so that the knowledge and power of the cross of Christ has been completely destroyed. Likewise, if God has laid a cross upon us, sickness or otherwise, or if one has otherwise stood in blessing, but one has made the sign of the cross to drive away such a cross of the Lord, one should have admonished oneself at such a sign to courageously bear the cross that the Lord has laid upon us or wanted to lay upon us. Now to such abuse and superstition 1) of this sign, of which there are so many that it is not possible for anyone to tell half of them, it has helped considerably that one has made a ceremony out of it, and thus actually prescribed where and how many signs of the cross are to be made; hence it immediately arose that one was afraid of sin where one did not make the signs of the cross most diligently. This then gave rise to the further error, as if the sign had a strange power, namely because it should have been used so seriously for the mass and all blessings, and thus one superstition grew out of the other, until no one knew any more what the cross of Christ or ours, or for what such a sign was first used and should still be used, who wanted to use it differently.

Because such ceremonies are performed without words, and have given rise to so much superstition, we have also dropped them, but if someone wanted to use such a sign, as an external thing, it must be left free; but that one needs such freedom only for the betterment of God's community, we have taught how he should use it Christianly; of which a little is now also reported above. We hope, therefore, that since Christian freedom as well as other good things must be exemplified - for many often think that they have no attachment to such things, and yet cannot leave them without scrupling their consciences when it comes to the meeting - all the godly will have us to their credit that we have also made a change in the way we say masses and make crosses, which the mass-makers themselves, as they are nothing but mockers, call pranks. For if we were all so full of faith that we had no need of such an example, if we knew how to use all things freely; nor, if such showiness is ever a mocking devilish thing, coming from no good origin, having strengthened so much unspeakable error: how could it not be an abominable thing to Christians who seek in all things the sincerity of faith and what may promote it?

83 In addition, in some of our churches, when the occasion required it, we had tables set up so that when the Lord's supper was being served, the minister would turn his face toward the people. This was done for this reason, that in a Christian congregation all things should be done in an orderly and proper manner, and that what is prayed for and given thanks for in the congregation is best done in such a way that everyone may say Amen to it, 1 Cor. 14. For this reason we have ordained that all things be sung and read in the church in the German language, of which the following is said; Therefore, since the occasion required it, that all words of prayer and thanksgiving might be heard only by men, we have used Christian liberty in such things, and the more gladly, that the superstition of consecrated altars, which the bishops alone have had to consecrate at great cost, might be the more powerfully dispelled, when we have but one altar, and but one sacrifice, and one offerer, all of which is Christ, and Paul reports one table of the Lord, and no altar, 1 Cor. 10. 10 Because the altars have also served to the detriment of both faith and love, because the more useless costs have been applied to them, which should have been given to the poor, then they have been consecrated with

1) In the old edition, probably a printing error: Aberben.

Of course, every Christian will gladly help and advise to do so. It has also been said [among the papists] that it is necessary to pray toward the sun's exit: if, however, one prays in spirit and truth, since no place or time is considered, then one should respect it and know that it is the same wherever one's face is turned, if only one's heart is turned toward God; therefore, we believe, it could not be useless to prove such freedom by deed.

Why the night meal is held only on Sunday and together with some of the congregation.

84. Lastly, it was customary to measure many times a day, 1) especially when money was involved, if no one wanted to share with the measurer of the Lord's table; But since we know that the Lord's supper is like a covenant of Christian fellowship, through which, like Christ, we have all things in common, in and for His sake, we have it only on Sundays, on which the whole congregation of God is accustomed to come together, and also so that some of the congregation receive it with the minister. Christ ever kept such things in his church, and commanded them all the bread and the cup, to which he also said, "Drink ye all of it." So Paul also taught his Corinthians to keep the Lord's supper when the church came together. In 1 Cor. 11 and Cap. 10 he says: "The cup of dedication which we celebrate, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the fellowship of the body of Christ? For we many are One Bread and One Body, inasmuch as we are all partakers of One Bread."

In which words it is clearly seen that the Lord's supper is not to be kept for one, but is to be kept by all the disciples of Christ in the church. In which they consider that they are all equal sinners and condemned for their own sins, but are redeemed by the giving of Christ's body and the shedding of his blood on the cross; that they therefore confess nothing of their own, but all have Christ in common; by which they also have true fellowship of the body and blood of Christ, are one body and one bread; from which it is ever evident that, as all Christians believe in common, they are redeemed by the giving of the body and the shedding of the blood of Christ.

and therefore spiritual and secular eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ, of which John 6 says that they should also be partakers of the table of Christ, which is a memorial and thanksgiving of such redemption, so that faith in God is strengthened and love toward all people, and especially toward the household of faith, is kindled and refreshed.

Since by the word of God we do away with all feasts except Sunday, 2) the reason for which I will give hereafter, and thus the whole congregation comes together only on Sunday, we then also keep the Lord's supper alone, so that some of the congregation together with the priest may receive the bread and the cup of the Lord. For it is not a good work nor a sacrifice for the congregation that one should perform, as the papists have lied, but, as Paul calls it, a fellowship. Which name has remained with the Greek and Latin, the last collections also commonly all sounded on it, nor has the deception of the Antichrist been able to do so much that it has nowhere been considered less. Yes, if one has already had brothers and sisters who wanted to be partakers of Christ's table, they have made their mass completely over, as if the laity should have no part in it, and have then given them only the bread of the Lord, and not the cup; so that they, as much as in them, have also deprived them of the communion of the blood. For, as Paul says, "the cup which we bless is a communion of the blood of Christ."

Now there are some men who are well versed in the Scriptures and truly godly, who would much rather that the Lord's supper were kept all the more seldom, and that then the whole congregation of Christ would keep it with one another. These have good reason for their opinion from the places indicated in Scripture. For the Lord himself kept it this way; he made them all drink from the cup, and so, no doubt, he also made them all eat the bread. And if in such a supper the death of the Lord is to be considered and thanks are to be given to him, why would not all Christians keep it in common, since they commonly confess to be redeemed by it?

(88) For the reason that people are afraid to be partakers of the Lord's Table, it is because they are afraid, out of old insanity, that they think they are not skillful and worthy enough, but they are not skillful and worthy enough.

2) In the old edition with wrong punctuation: "Sintemal wir denn durch das Wort Gottes, alle Feiertage ausgenommen, den Sonntag abtreiben" 2c.

3) "nowhere for less" put by us instead of: "nienen for less".

1) i.e. to hold mass.

The only purpose of this supper is that a person believes that he has been redeemed by the death of Christ and desires to be strengthened by God in such faith and love toward his neighbor. Every Christian has this mind and opinion, which is why he is sent to the Lord's supper as often as it is held. If one does not have this mind and opinion, he is not a true Christian, and if he nevertheless joins the congregation of Christ and wants to be considered a Christian, he nevertheless despises the body of the Lord, of which he wrongly presents himself as a member, or at the least, as he has far more Christian spirit than he has, so that he nevertheless becomes guilty of the body and blood of Christ, since he is with other Christians in such remembrance, and wants to be considered as such, who also believes that the body and blood of Christ was given for him. Furthermore, they think that it would be good for the whole community to have the Lord's supper in common, so that the Christian ban might be lifted up again, so that those who prove themselves unchristian in their deeds would be kept from the supper, and thus from all Christian fellowship, until the Lord would give them repentance and grace to live unrighteously.

So we confess that it would be much more in keeping with the Christian institution and the use of the first church, and would also be useful in other ways, how all of us who want to be considered Christians should be One Bread and One Body, so that we would not be afraid to share One Bread with one another; and as we all consider ourselves to be those for whom the Lord has given His Body and Blood, so that we also commonly make an effort to do this through the fellowship of the Last Supper. But still, 1) since keeping the supper is an external thing that is not necessary in itself, we have not known how to urge people to do it in a more serious way, lest the former superstitions be strengthened or new ones be planted, as if such a supper made one pious or blessed. Again, if there have ever been some who have desired to keep such a supper with us, we have never been able to turn them away from it (whether the fault is ours or their weakness in faith, God knows); but we have taught them the proper use of it most diligently.

90 Since the time of the apostles, when the congregation of Christ was gathered together, the night meal was also held, we also have it every Sunday, but with some instead of the

We have undertaken to keep the church for this time, until the Lord brings us further by his word and reforms us completely. For if it is an outward thing, without which one may be saved, we have not known how to refuse those who desire it, nor to drive others away, but as the ancients tolerated and taught for and for those who had not yet come into the fellowship of baptism. 2) So we praise God that He has given our multitude a heart to hear His word, which is the best and most necessary, and which will undoubtedly tell them all things right and well.

91 But that in the beginning of the church the supper was kept by the whole congregation, had three occasions for it more than we have had. The first, no one was baptized and received into their church, except those who had completely surrendered to the word of Christ, as many in our church hear us preach, but have not yet completely and truly surrendered to the word, but are only just born to Christ. Secondly, they had the ban, so that they excluded from them those who lived or taught in an obnoxious way, so that we would still have to let them go in confusion. Thirdly, the Christians at that time were not deceived by any error against the supper of Christ, so that now many of them have been poured out by the papal servants, so that the most salutary thing would be to start preaching the gospel and to turn people away from it for a while, if it would be justified, until they learned the right use of it through the Word.

(92) So I have now also shown the reason why we never keep the Lord's supper alone, and therefore on Sundays. Whoever desires further of us, namely that we should not keep it but with the whole congregation, and at the same time practice the Christian ban against those who live angrily, let him pray to God that he help us in this and in that and make us perfect, and let us take credit for the fact that we nevertheless, until the whole congregation, of which the brethren want to be respected, come to such a common attitude of the Christian supper, serve those who desire it now and keep it with them instead of the whole congregation. It is not strange that not everyone receives a clear report of the external things and can be brought to the correct use of them, since the apostolic church sometimes stumbles very badly in such matters.

2) The meaning of this sentence is: We have acted with the Lord's Supper as the ancients did with baptism. They also tolerated those who had not yet come to the fellowship of baptism, and so they taught for and for.

1) "nevertheless" put by us instead of: "denneht", which may be a provincial secondary form for the "dennocht" also found in Luther.

93. But the reason for our doing this is that we do not want to violate Christian freedom in the Lord's Supper, as in all outward things, nor give anyone cause for false gleaming, for doing what is not for his heart, and so we wait and do not force anyone until God will give all a heart and soul to be constant and loud in the apostles' teaching, and in fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayer; in the meantime we practice this with those who desire it; For to force them to wait for others would ever be contrary to Christian freedom. But to keep it for ourselves would be contrary to its institution, manner, use, and name. As such abuse has arisen from the Antichrist out of devilish error, as if the same supper were a good work and sacrifice in itself.

Which night meal is now held.

So far I have indicated and explained the causes of what we have changed and stopped at the Lord's Supper, such as: the name of the Mass, the suspension, the vestments, the strange offerings, and the making of many crosses, the use of the consecrated altars and those turned by the people, and that we do not keep it alone, but always with some, and that in the gathered congregation of God, and therefore on Sundays alone. Now I will also briefly indicate what we still use, and also explain our reason for it; for not a few people lie about it.

When the congregation comes together on Sundays, the minister exhorts them to confess their sins and ask for mercy, and confesses to God instead of the whole congregation, asks for mercy, and proclaims the remission of sins to the faithful; upon this, the whole congregation sings a few short psalms or a hymn. After that the servant does a short prayer, and reads to the congregation something from the apostles' writings, and explains the same in the shortest possible way. Then the congregation sings the Ten Commandments again, or something else; then the priest preaches the Gospel and does the right sermon; after that the congregation sings the articles of our faith; after that the priest does a prayer for the authorities and all people, and especially for the present congregation, in which he asks for increase of faith and grace to keep the memory of Christ's death with fruit. He then exhorts those who want to keep Christ's supper with him to keep it in remembrance of Christ, to die to their sins, to bear their cross willingly, to help their neighbor, and to be faithful to Christ.

To love in truth, to be strengthened in faith, which must happen when we consider with a believing heart what unmeasured grace and good deed Christ has shown us by offering up his body and blood on the cross for us to the Father. After the exhortation, he proclaims the Gospel of the Last Supper of Christ, as described by the three evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Lucas, together with Paul, 1 Cor. 11. Then the priest distributes the bread and the cup of the Lord. The priest then divides the bread and the cup of the Lord among them and partakes of it himself. The congregation then sings another hymn of praise, after which the minister blesses the supper with a short prayer, blesses the people, and lets them go in the peace of the Lord. This is the manner and use in which we now keep Christ's supper on Sundays alone.

Our reason and cause from Scripture is this. The beginning of Christian life is to confess that all our doings are sins. That is why John the Baptist, Christ and the apostles began their sermons by saying, "Correct yourselves"; and in the assemblies of God, confession of sins has always been the first thing, which among the ancients also preceded baptism, for it was the intelligent, not children, who were commonly baptized. That is why we begin our service with a common confession of our sins and prayers for mercy. "For this," says David in Psalm 32, "all the saints will pray before you in due time."

97 Paul says more in 1 Corinthians 14: "When ye come together, every one hath a psalm, every one hath a doctrine, every one hath a tongue, every one hath a revelation, every one hath an interpretation of this and of that. [In the] which this apostle ascribes to the Corinthians in the reported chapter, we are told that when the congregation of God comes together, there is teaching, praise, and prayer. And therefore we ordain that in our assemblies doctrine, that is, law and gospel, both be taught and urged with exhortations; and at the same time psalms and hymns, to the praise of God and strengthening of faith, be sung; and thirdly, prayer for the authorities and all men, according to the teaching of the same apostle, 1 Tim. 2:1 f.

Lastly, we keep the breaking of bread and the fellowship of Christ's table according to the teaching of Paul in 1 Corinthians 11, which we conclude with thanksgiving, since the Lord Himself has decreed His supper in this way, Matt. 26. In all this we would gladly follow those of whom it is written in Acts 2: "But they continued in the apostles' teaching, and in the breaking of bread, and in fellowship, and in prayer. 2: "But they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and in fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayer."

99 Here I think it is good, since through D. Carlstadt and others the question: whether in the supper of Christ there is only bread and wine, or also the body and the blood of Christ bodily? has come back on the track, the reader will also wait for something definite from us here. Although our brother and co-worker, Wolfgang Capito has given it in a booklet with the title: "What one should think and answer about the division between Martin Luther and Andreas Carlstadt", 1) I want to talk a little bit about it, because some are too afraid about such a question, others want to fall too much on such a question.

Therefore all lovers of Christ know that we would like to make an effort to lead people from the flesh, from bodily elements, to the spirit and spiritual exercises, so that faith is strengthened and becomes active through love and good works. For as God is a spirit, so he wants those who worship him, that is, to serve him in spirit and truth. Thus Paul says 2 Cor. 3, 6: "GOD has made us competent to be ministers of the new testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit." So we admonish people who have died to all bodily ordinances through the death of Christ, and have received from the Lord only two bodily ceremonies and signs, baptism and the supper of Christ, that they should pay more attention to why he has instituted them for us than to what they are in themselves.

101) Did not the Lord say in the Lord's Supper (we will speak of baptism later), when he took the bread, gave thanks, broke it and gave it to the disciples: "Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of me"? The same also when he gave them the cup: "This cup is a new testament in my blood; do this, as often as you drink, in remembrance of me"? Shall we then eat the bread and drink the cup in remembrance of Him; why then should we quarrel much over the bread and wine, and not rather, to signify the death of our Savior, enjoy it with simple faith? Paul writes: "As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you shall proclaim the death of the Lord," and we want to start a quarrelsome dispute about the bread and the cup?

102) As if a father had left a golden head 2) to his sons at the end, and commanded that they should drink from it as often as they drank, that they should remember him and what good he had taught them,

1) The preceding paper, No. 9 in this volume.

2) head - drinking vessel, cup; English and Low German: eup.

that they lived one at a time and honorably, and they began to quarrel about the head, of what kind of matter it was, or how delicious, until they fell into each other's hair: would not these be ungrateful and wicked children, who would be better off if they had never received the head? Or, that I may give another similitude, it is just a thing to raise a quarrel of the bread and wine of the Lord, which is to be used for the strengthening of faith and the greatest unity, as if a great lord had given his servants some special garments and ornaments, and commanded them to wear the same in honor and remembrance of him, by which they might obtain high reward from him, and keep them good friends one with another: And they left these things, and began a quarrel about the gift, that they might provoke the Lord to anger, and separate themselves: 3) Were not such men foolish?

(103) Now it is the same with those who seriously quarrel about the bread and cup of the Lord. The bread and the cup, whatever they may be, may be of no use to them, except that they may consider the death of Christ with faith, and thereby faith and love be strengthened, and they may spiritually enjoy the flesh and blood of Christ, and thus have eternal life; and they leave all this, and let it be to them a matter of disunity, which is to be an alliance of the greatest unity; thus they become truly guilty of the body and blood of Christ, and make it fatal to them, which is to promote eternal life.

104 Christ says John 6, when he said many things about his flesh being food and his blood being drink: "It is the Spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no use. Why then do we quarrel about the presence of the flesh? The words of the Lord, when he says, "Take, eat, this is my body; take, drink, this is my blood," or, as described by Luke and Paul, "This cup is the new testament in my blood," let them be true, as they must be true, and only consider that he says to both, "Do this," that is, eat and drink, "in remembrance of me." If one will do this, and if there is. If this is done, and if there is faith, no other physical thing is done, except to eat the bread and drink the cup, and immediately come to the spiritual, to signify the death of Christ. Which memory will be so great in every believing heart, without any doubt, that there will not be a moment's delay.

3) Walch explains this word by "schadeten". Whether this explanation is (formally) possible, we do not know. If not, it will have to be understood by Anrichten of a divorce.

The whole heart and all the powers will be inclined to proclaim, praise and extol such death as His redemption, and also to become like Him with mortification of sin and manly bearing of the cross, and also heartfelt love toward all men.

(105) This is what the Lord willed, and not that we should remain in the flesh. For that the Lord said, "Do this in remembrance of me," Paul explains by writing, "As often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall proclaim the death of the Lord, until he come"; that it has not the opinion, as some say, "Do this in remembrance of me," that is, turn 1) thus bread into my body, or the like. He had commanded to eat the bread and drink the cup, and the same was that they should do in remembrance of him; as the words of the Lord themselves clearly enough testify to every one that will not be contentious.

If D. Carlstadt had wanted to take such words of Christ into account, he would not have started such a quarrel, and in several parts a dispute over words, about these external things, but would have been more diligent in pointing from the physical to the spiritual. For this purpose, as he is well read in the Scriptures, he would have had enough reason left over, and would not have been allowed to force and torture the words of the Lord with unfounded causes; 2) as if the Lord, when he said, "Take and eat, this is my body," had indeed commanded the disciples to eat the bread, but had pointed to his natural body with the little word "this," because the bread was not crucified for us.

107. in the words which the Lord spoke concerning the cup, when Lucas and Paul described them, it may not be denied that "this," in Greek xxxxx, signifies the cup, and not the bodily blood of the Lord. For he says, the drinking vessel, or cup, in Greek τούτο **τό πο-τήριον**, is a new testament in my blood, and yet neither is the same cup or cup shed for us. It is well known that the one true body of Christ is given and crucified for us, and the one true bodily blood is shed once for us, and not bread nor wine. But therefore it is not permitted to do violence to the words of Christ, but to teach,

That the bread may be eaten and the wine drunk, that the offering of the body and blood, once made, may be righteously remembered, so that the flesh may be eaten and the blood drunk spiritually and truly.

(108) The words themselves give this, when he is called to remember him and his death. And is also to be taken from the words he spoke to the cup, which Matthew and Marcus describe thus: "This is my blood of the new testament"; Lucas and Paul: "This cup is the new testament in my blood. Now these two speeches must have one meaning each. Since there is no doubt that when he says, "This is the new testament in my blood," he is speaking of his natural blood, once shed for us on the cross, through which the gracious new eternal covenant was established between God and us, of which all Scripture, and especially Jeremiah Cap. 31, that He is our Father and we are His children, of which Paul writes much in Romans 8, Hebrews 8, 9, and 10, along with many other places: so the same blood must also be meant in the words that Matthew and Marcus have, namely, badly: "This is My blood"; likewise, when He says, "This is My body."

And as when he says, "This cup is a new testament," it must be understood that it is a sign or figure of the new testament, which is spiritual; why then, when he says of the bread, "This is my body," and in Matthew and Mark of the cup, "This is my blood," should not the same bread and the same cup also be made a figure, a memorial, and a sign of the true one body and blood of Christ, which are no longer to be with us in bodily form? "I tell you the truth," says Christ, "it is better for you that I go away"; and Paul also no longer wants to know Jesus after the flesh, 2 Cor. 3. We have the same speech in the first book of Moses, Cap. 17, where God calls the circumcision "His covenant" between Him and Abraham, and such a "covenant sign".

(110) And if any man would say, I would well understand, because the Lord himself saith, Do this in remembrance of me; and Paul, As often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall proclaim the death of the Lord; that this bread and this cup are the figure and sign of Christ's sacrifice once for us. Bread and this cup are a figure and sign of Christ's sacrifice, once offered up for us; but the dispute is not about this, but whether this bread and cup are a figure and memorial of Christ's death, whether it be his bodily body and blood, or only bad bread and wine.

1) In the old edition: transform.

2) Note with how apt a judgment Bucer dismisses Carlstadt's method of explanation, and yet accepts Carlstadt's result. How he justifies it, we see in § 109 ff.

Answer: You hear that Christ says: "The flesh is of no use"; why do you ask about the flesh? If you could recognize this as a figure and sign, with righteous faith, considering how he once gave and sacrificed his body and blood on the cross for your redemption, you would truly enjoy the true body and blood of Christ and have eternal life. But if you do not receive and need the bread and the cup for this purpose, you will be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, whose glorious memory you thus dishonor. That which is bodily may not help thee; but if thou couldst lay hold on that which is spiritual, it would bring thee eternal life.

Therefore let questions remain; the words are true: "This is my body, this is my blood. So also the Spirit of God speaks rightly in Paul, saying, "This bread, this cup." Let both of these be true and right; but see what you eat, that you eat it in remembrance of the Lord, so that through faith you may spiritually eat the flesh and blood of Christ, that is, believe completely that through such a sacrifice you have been redeemed from all evil and have become a child of God. God will reveal to us what further knowledge may be of use to us.

Summa Summarum is: Keep the words of the Lord and do them no violence; only remember that the flesh is of no use, and that everything corporeal here refers to the spiritual. The Lord calls you to eat and drink, that is, bodily, but only because you remember him who gave his body and blood for you, believe him, give thanks and obey him. Whereof Ps. 22:27: "Let the poor eat, that they may be filled; and let them praise the Lord that ask after him: let your heart live for ever." This is where everything must come from; this is what all the divine Scriptures refer to; Martin Luther also directed everything he ever wrote about the spirit and faith; therefore Carlstadt would have spared his pointed, envious and light words against him.

But God grant that there are not also in this part those who please themselves too well and think that it is shameful for them to deviate somewhat from an opinion once preached, thereby subjecting themselves to act violently, and entangling the poor consciences more than they entangle them from error. Praise be to God! The reputation of the person has fallen greatly: one no longer wants to believe immediately that my doctor, preacher or pastor has said it. If you do not have clear writing, go ahead, it will no longer be believed.

persuasion. And if God wanted that, as D. Martin Luther admonished us in Strasbourg, 1) everyone would be careful to fast the main things, then we would easily become and remain one in such external things.

(115) For some to come from the law and the prophets to explain something in the New Testament in the words and works of Christ, that is, to learn by the shadow how the body sees, and to recognize from the hidden face of Moses the brightly revealed face of Christ, and to make the present truth known by the figures, is ever perverse. Moses and the prophets testify of Christ; but Christ who discovers the face of Moses and the prophets and transfigures them. Therefore, if some will let the words of Christ in the evangelists pass away, and will overbear the ceremonies of the law, that is, will set fire to the sun, they do no more than to drive men away from them, and to strengthen them in their opinion.

(116) So, if you will come here: In the law they did eat of the sacrifice that offered, and were of the altar; so must we also eat of our sacrifice, which is the body and blood of Christ; and therefore the bread of the Lord must be bodily his body, and the cup bodily his blood; would not Carlstadt then say, We shall eat of our sacrifice; yea, "whoso eateth not the flesh, and drinketh the blood of the man child, may not have life in him," John 6. 6 Now these words of the Lord are spirit and life; this must be done spiritually, by faith; the flesh is of no use; and it will not follow for a long time that I must partake of these things bodily in bread and wine; for the law is spiritual, and is fulfilled in spiritual things, not in bodily things. Read the epistle to the Hebrews; one figure does not fulfill the other, but the spiritual truth is the fulfillment of the figures. That we still have these two ceremonies, baptism and the evening meal, is something legal; just as we are still partly under the law, insofar as we are clothed with the sinful body. What actually belongs to the New Testament, attested in the Law of Moses and the Prophets, is a spiritual thing; as there is the baptism of Christ by the Spirit and fire, and the spiritual partaking of the flesh and blood of Christ.

(117) Therefore I exhort in Christ all who think it necessary for them to write or preach in this matter, that they may remember,

1) In his letter "To the Christians of Strasbourg" of December 15, 1524. Walch, old edition, Vol. XV, 2444.

that they should be servants of the spirit, and that they should not want to please themselves, but should present the reason for their faith with gentleness and fear in the most sober and certain way, and that through the bright words of Christ. Otherwise, they will only confuse the consciences of the simple, who now also read the Scriptures.

Our faith is to let the words remain in their natural order, but at the same time to turn our and our hearers' minds from the corporal, which the Spirit of God in Paul calls the bread and the cup of the Lord, which is to be freely followed, to the spiritual and eternal, namely, the one sacrifice of Christ, so that those who are sanctified may be perfected forever; and to exhort manfully, since the Lord himself says that the flesh is of no use, so that they may not cling to the flesh and externals, much less quarrel with anyone because of them. Do not cling to the flesh and outward appearance, much less quarrel with anyone because of it. And we also know how to stand before the gates of hell, which neither Carlstadt with his multitude nor some of his abominable ones are able to do. But undaunted, "there must be divisions, so that those who have stood the test may be revealed," the gospel must be contested and tested, as it always is, on both sides, by enemies and supposed friends. Each one prays to God with David: "Turn away mine eyes, that they see not the vain; make me alive in thy way."

From baptism.

(119) The anti-Christ also obscured baptism with his feet, although not as much as the evening meal. The most serious thing is that people are under the illusion 1) that mere baptism makes the child blessed, and that if it dies without baptism, it will never see God's face. In addition, he brought chrism, oil, salt, bread, candles and consecrated water into such esteem that the baptism would not have been perfectly respected if the pieces had remained a little. All this was enough to disgrace and diminish the death of Christ, by which we are sanctified at once, as all Scripture teaches.

(120) Therefore, as Christ's witnesses, we must preach "that through His name all who believe in Him should receive forgiveness of sins," and have taught of baptism, according to the Scriptures, that there are two kinds of baptism, a baptism of water and a baptism of the Spirit. With this baptism Christ alone baptizes, with the baptism of water John baptized.

1) "verwähnt" i.e. brought to delusion. In the old edition: verwehnt.

the apostles and all others who baptize. The baptism of Christ, who baptizes with the Holy Spirit and fire, cancels sin and makes children of God; water baptism is an outward sign of the same. So John says: "I baptize you with water for repentance, but he who comes after me is stronger than I 2c., he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire", Matth. 3, 11. and the Lord Himself, Apost. 1, 5. "John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

(121) Let no one be disconcerted that I regard the baptism of John the apostle and ours as the same, for we baptize with water, as did John and the apostles. The other baptism, of the Spirit, Christ reserved for him. And as John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people that "they should believe in him who was to come after him, that is, in Jesus, that he is the Christ," Acts 19:4. 19, 4. So it is also with the apostolic and our baptism. For Peter, Apost. 2:38, says to the Jews, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," that is, confess that ye are in need of repentance, and be baptized in the name of Christ, that is, with one faith to obtain remission of sins through the name of Christ, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Behold, this then is the baptism of Christ, wherewith he baptizeth.

And if any man would say: Did Paul baptize again those who were baptized with John's baptism in Ephesus in the name of the Lord Jesus, Apost. 19. how could John's baptism and the apostles be one? Answer: These were not baptized with John's baptism, but were baptized into John's baptism, or into John's baptism. For in the Greek it says: εἰς τὸ ἰωάννου βάπτισμα; otherwise they would have had more knowledge of Christ and his baptism, which is by the Spirit. But now Lucas writes there that they said, "We know not whether there be also a Holy Ghost." But John had told everyone how "after him would come one who would baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire."

In the 18th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles it is reported about Apollo, who alone knew about the baptism of John. Lucas writes that Aquila and Priscilla interpreted the way of God to him even more diligently, but it is not reported that they baptized him again, as we also do not read about the apostles; yes, Christ, who wanted to fulfill all righteousness and receive the baptism of the New Testament, had enough of baptism.

John's death. With this he testified to his suffering, by which the sins of the world, which he took upon himself, even though he was without sin for himself, had to be washed away. So that he did not only confirm the outward baptism, but rather indicated what it was for and what would follow if we accepted him with faith and the fulfillment of all righteousness. For the Holy Spirit certainly comes upon us; the Father recognizes us as his beloved children. But in a moment we will have to go through trials, trials and sufferings, until the sinful body is completely accepted. It is not read of the apostles that they were baptized with another outward baptism. Thus it is known that the twelve men at Ephesus, because they knew nothing of the Holy Spirit, that is, of the true baptism of Christ, were not baptized with the baptism of John, but only, as the text says, with the baptism of John, as if the baptism of water itself were to help them. Therefore the apostle had to point them to Christ, and that is why he had them baptized into him.

Therefore we know only two kinds of baptism. One is with water, with which John, the beginner of the New Testament, baptized the apostles and all Christians. The other is that with which Christ baptizes by the Holy Spirit and fire, which is the very Holy Spirit that burns out sin and cleanses and purifies the inner man like gold. And the outward water baptism is nothing but a sign of the inward and spiritual. Therefore it is given in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that it may point to the faith and hope of inward baptism, which Christ, even the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, perform as long as this life endureth; for so long are we in sins.

For this reason Paul also says in Romans 6, "that all who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into his death, even buried with him through baptism. For he that is baptized aright confesseth that he is a child of wrath, wholly unclean, -but believeth that Christ shall make him clean from all sin. This is done through the death of Christ, whom we must become like by the daily death of our old Adam, that is, of our whole nature. The baptized person has surrendered to this; therefore the death of sins will also have to be completed in him; and because of the certainty of faith he is already counted as dead and buried with Christ, so that he now only waits for the new and eternal life. Because of this certainty and assurance the apostle also says

Gal. 3: "As many of you as were baptized have put on Christ." Now we are still clinging to much filthy rags and tatters of the old Adam, as long as we live here, and are still far from Christ being our garment: yet, if we believe this, it will come to us, if we are baptized into his name, it will certainly come to pass. Therefore it is by faith that we now have it, as the Scripture says.

It is clear from all this that outward water baptism is nothing but a sign of inward spiritual baptism, that is, of the cleansing from all sins that we must believe, which the Spirit of God works in us as long as this life lasts, and is the right repentance and correction, which faith those of understanding perform through baptism. 1) And therefore the forgiveness of sins cannot be added to external baptism as anything more than a sign. For the forgiveness of sins is the baptism of Christ, which he works in the elect by his Holy Spirit.

Therefore, when Peter said, "the water in baptism makes us blessed," he immediately explains himself and says, "not the putting away of filthiness from the flesh, but the covenant of a good conscience with God through the resurrection," 1 Petr. 3, 21. 3, 21. So also Paul Eph. 5, 26, when he says, "Christ has cleansed His church through the water bath", he adds: "in the word"; thereby faith, the effect of the Spirit, is indicated, that is, the inward baptism. Likewise he writes Tit. 3, 5: "He made us blessed by the bath of regeneration and renewing of the spirit", since he indicates water baptism by "the bath". But the fact that he adds "the regeneration and renewing of the spirit" indicates the baptism of the spirit, without which water is water and baptism is a miracle. The flesh, and that which is bodily, is of no use in itself.

Therefore, what is read of grace or forgiveness of sins to be given to baptism, is to be given to the baptism of Christ. Thus, when Ananias said to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, and call upon the name of the Lord," he did not direct him to water baptism alone, but rather, through it, to the baptism of the Spirit, which washes away sins and gives joy in calling upon the name of the Lord. Therefore, a disgrace to Christ and a corrupting obscuration of His true

1) We suspect that there is an error in the text, but we are not able to resolve the difficulty. It seems to us, according to what Bucer teaches about baptism, that it should be read: which [inward] baptism those of understanding perform by faith.

spiritual baptism, say or think that outward water baptism makes one blessed, or, if this does not happen, that therefore a child cannot be blessed. The Lord says, "He who believes and is baptized will be saved, but he who does not believe will be condemned," but he does not say, "He who is not baptized will be condemned. God does not bind His grace to water.

He intended water baptism to be a sign, confession, practice, and admonition of his internal baptism. Therefore no one should despise it. But one should not rely on it, but only on the baptism of Christ, through which we are watered and baptized with the waters of salvation, that is, His Spirit, John 7. Therefore it is superstitious folly to want to baptize children before they come out of their mother's womb, or otherwise to hurry clumsily with baptism, as if 1) our salvation were in mere water, as is often done by women in dangerous births. It is even more nonsensical that they have been taught to despair of the salvation of unbaptized children.

130. So our chief reformation in baptism is to teach by the Word that we hold outward baptism to be a sign of Christ's true baptism, that is, of inward cleansing, regeneration, and renewal; by which they are to be esteemed and held by themselves and others as devoted to Christ, and to obtain such inward new birth; and that the washing away of sin and renewing of the mind are all imputed to Christ alone, who by his Spirit cleanseth, believeth, and sanctifieth the elect. Which is called his baptism because he earned and acquired such a Holy Spirit for us through his suffering.

131/ The other reformation or innovation in baptism is that we do not respect nor need to teach chrism, oil, salt, bread and candles. The cause is that they are little feet of men, made without word, which have served to much superstition. Hence came that such chrism and oil may be blessed only by a bishop, and only on the Green Thursday. For this reason, many children were not allowed to bathe, because the priest would have first de-esterified them for a penny or kreuzer, that is, washed off the chrism and oil. Such trickery is unacceptable to prudent, understanding Christians who only respect and follow their Lord's word.

They do not have a word about it, and it is not better to do so, as has appeared to be the case so far.

Therefore, after a brief explanation of what baptism is and means, we also pray in common that Christ will baptize the child by His Spirit and cleanse it from all sins, baptizing the children without such ostentation, and commanding them to the fathers and other brethren to love them as their members in Christ and, as soon as possible, to lead them to Christ through sound doctrine. We have reason for this in the Scriptures, and nothing more. Since the Scriptures teach all that is good, we know not to burden ourselves or our brethren with further ceremonies, which would not bring any improvement to our fellows, but might well be an offence.

Now those who think it quite necessary should also make the third reformation and change here, namely, not to baptize infants; think that we have neither word nor example in Scripture to do so. For Christ commanded his disciples first to teach the nations, and then to baptize them; so also the apostles baptized only those who had 2) repented of the faith.

(134) We do not agree with these, nor does it follow that they claim that the apostles were sent by Christ to bring people to faith, which had to begin with teaching and preaching. For who else would have baptized himself or his children? No doubt every apostle would have said, as Paul did, "Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Therefore, they must have dealt primarily with those of understanding; therefore, what they did with those of understanding is described primarily, as the fruit of their preaching may be seen in them.

135 Nevertheless, as often as we read that the apostles baptized whole houses, as Paul baptized the household of Stephana in Corinth, the household of the purple maid and the jailer in Philippi, Acts 16, and the household of Cornelius in Peter, not all of them will have had the right knowledge of the faith. 16; Peter, the household of Cornelius: of course, not all of them would have had the right knowledge of the faith, namely the jailer's household in Philippi, who had only heard preaching for half a night. Thus it is proved above that John's baptism and the apostle's baptism is one. Now John baptized many who had not yet had much knowledge of Christ, but the apostles, who had other baptisms, had baptized many who had not yet had any knowledge of Christ.

2) "to rejuvenate" - to say yes to something, to confess.

1) "stünde" put by us instead of: "sonder", and immediately afterwards "im" instead of "am". Bucer had a terribly bad handwriting, as we can see from the facsimile from the last sheet of the second part of Neudecker's "Merkwürdige Actenstücke".

John 4, even had a childish faith. Yes, he and the apostles baptized many who never had no faith, as Simon the Sorcerer, Apost. 8, with many others.

We are to pray for all men, 1 Timothy 2: and since God does not look at the person, and we do not immediately know who are chosen or rejected by God, we are to provide better for everyone; and if baptism is an outward thing, not to deny it to anyone whose ungodly life is not well known to us, so that we can no longer consider him a sheep. So, since we do not know of children whom he has rejected, but know that the children of the faithful are holy, 1 Cor. 7, that is, now numbered among the household of God; more, that our Lord Jesus says that such is the kingdom of heaven, he also wanted them to come to him, he welcomed them, laid his hands on them and blessed them, Marc. 10: Why then would we not give them baptism, as among the ancients they were circumcised? for baptism is to us the same as circumcision was to the Jews.

137 And if thou wilt say, But the Lord did not baptize the little children. Answer: You will not show me an old man whom he baptized, for he did not baptize for himself, Jn. 4. And if you would seek a remedy in the fact that the Lord says "such a one" and not "this one" is the kingdom of heaven, as if he meant that the kingdom of heaven is for those who humble themselves as children, it will nevertheless be enough for me that he has blessed them and blessed them, and Marc. 9. said that whoever receives a child in his name receives him, and whoever reproaches one, it would be better for him to die in the sea; and their angels see the face of the Father. All this shows that the children are so precious to God that they are baptized; the water is already lost in some, it was also lost in Simon the Sorcerer, and in many others.

In sum, you can go wherever you want, so you must leave baptism, as an external thing, free to me, which God has not bound to any time. For as the Scripture does not refer to any time, so it also does not refer to any time. So then it cannot be denied that it is a comfort to parents that the church of Christ accepts their children and intercedes for them, and that baptism given to children is also a cause for parents and others to teach the children, as soon as they are able, Christ, as they are devoted to Him in baptism: so it follows that baptizing children is also better, I am silent that one should forbid such a thing.

(139) And though you give many examples that those who believed were baptized, I say that those who did not believe were also baptized, as proved above. There was no need to write much about infants, since they wanted to report what fruit the apostle's preaching had brought, which could not have happened to unbelieving infants. Yes, even if you wait a long time to baptize, you will still baptize many unbelievers, and by such waiting you will make the young people of Christian life negligent. They will say, "I am not yet a Christian; now when I become a Christian, I will become devout.

So let us trust God more for our children, to command them. The Scriptures so often report that he cares for his own from the womb, even [before] they are born: why then should we esteem them unholy? What do we care for so much water? Shall we ask God for all men: why then shall we not also command him our little children, to whom Christ himself has been so kind? If we already baptize some goats, which Christ does not want to baptize by His Spirit, so much water and prayer is needed. The apostles also failed, because they did not baptize all believers.

It seems to me, however, that the devil would like to divide us over outward things, which he does not know how to divide in the main. Therefore, brethren who have the commandment of the word, think that the devil does not celebrate. Consider always that the sum of the law is love of a pure heart, a good conscience, and unfeigned faith, and do not let such outward things be so hard for you. Paul says that Christ did not send him to baptize, but to preach the gospel; That ye also wait, and seek more that the baptism of Christ by the Holy Ghost may be well known, than that ye should much quarrel about water baptism, trusting that if we baptize them out of the opinion of how the holy fathers circumcised their children, confident that they shall be holy and children of God, thereby giving us cause to teach them Christ the more diligently, and also, as soon as they come to their understanding, to follow such doctrine the more earnestly: do not want to condemn us so much. Do not condemn us in this way, for you will not prove us wrong by any scripture, just as we do not act contrary to faith or love with such baptism. For we testify with all diligence that water baptism does not make

1) In the old edition: but.

blessed, but only the spiritual baptism of Christ, which this signifies, and for which one should pray.

And if God would have you admonish us and yourselves in other matters, which are far more important than this baptism, with such seriousness not to do anything of which we do not have a word from God or a written example, then more patience, discipline and love should certainly appear among us. Read the Histories and the Old Scriptures, and you will find how, from the beginning of the Christian community, the enemy of unity has caused all divisions and separations, most of them from unnecessary wars of words, or external things without which one might be saved. He watches and walks around like a roaring lion. Let us also be valiant and take good care that he never falls in. Let us diligently study the teaching of Christ and the apostles. How little you find there of the supper, how little of outward baptism, but how much of the spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, and of spiritual baptism, that is, of faith, mortification of sin, and a new spiritual life! So, if we are to die to worldly outward things, let us also set all things on the spiritual, that is, right faith and true love; and always have in our hearts: "The Spirit gives life, the flesh is of no use"; and never let this be out of our minds: "Knowledge is a stimulant, and love is a corrective; but if anyone thinks he knows something, he does not yet know how to know. But if anyone loves God, he is known by Him." 1 Cor. 8, 1-3.

143. But if anyone would ever persevere with baptism, and would keep those with whom he dwells without destroying love and unity, let us not therefore be divided with him, nor condemn him. Let each one be sure of his own mind. "The kingdom of God is not like food and drink, nor water baptism, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. Whoever serves Christ in this," says Paul Rom. 14:17-19, "is pleasing to God and worthy of men." 1) Therefore I conclude with the apostle in this place: "Let us pursue that which is for peace, and that which is for the betterment of one another." So much for baptism.

Why we abort the holidays.

144. besides the Sunday, one has noticeably many days, to the glory of God, His angels and dead saints, at the ban and Christian

1) In the old edition: bewerth.

Obedience, commanded to celebrate, that is, to go idle on it, and where someone would have worked bodily, out of necessity, something on such days, such has been severely punished, so eating, whoring, gambling, and everything what the devil teaches, has not interrupted the celebration. Thus the simple-minded people were persuaded that the celebration of bodily labor on the aforementioned days was a great service, but on such days no one but the devil was served, partly by many superstitious works, such as masses, unintelligent chants, strange prayers, indulgences, and the like; partly by all kinds of riotous and carnal works, with which the rude people never angered God more severely than on the feast days.

145 Paul writes Gal. 4, 9-11: "Therefore, if you have known God, or rather are known by God, how do you turn back to the weak, meager statutes that you want to serve anew? You keep days and months, and feasts and anniversaries: I am afraid of you, lest perhaps I have labored with you in vain." Behold, the apostle regards keeping days as much as turning away from God and apostasy from the faith, because he fears that he has worked on them in vain, that is, [that] his preaching to them has been in vain. How many thousands then are those who keep the feast days as a necessary and meritorious service, which is a certain apostasy from the faith! For Christ has freed us from all such outward ordinances: all time, place, food, and whatsoever is of the thing, made all things free, for love and the betterment of our neighbor, to serve in and with such; as Paul proves very closely in all his epistles.

(146) Therefore, just as Paul seriously rejects such superstition of days, by which one day is thought to be kept before another, as we see in the place now mentioned, as also Colossians 2, we are not to do this with less, because in our times people hang on to days much more vexatiously. They thought that because God commanded some days to be celebrated through Moses, it would be fair to keep them, and erred only in that they did not recognize that Christ had redeemed them from such ordinances and that he was working their salvation, not they through such outward ceremonies, for they were not yet fully informed of Christian freedom; But ours have fallen into days which only men have commanded, and have drawn much of theirs from heathen customs, contrary to the bright commandments of God; by which, they think, they are doing God a great service, when they are only doing some church ceremonies, and after that they are not doing God a great service.

Much more than in other days, they defile themselves in all evil carnal works; and not only do they want to serve God with such, but rather the Mother of Christ and the saints, but there is much innumerable error mixed in. And because of this error they hold harder than to so many divine necessary commandments, regardless of the fact that Christ and the apostles have so diligently warned us against such human doctrines and commandments, and we also see and grasp that the holidays give cause and room for all evil. How then should a Christian, who should always be inclined and ready to promote the destruction of sins and the end of righteousness, even with the loss of his life, not have an abhorrence of holidays and use all possible diligence to drive them away?

147 And if someone wanted to say that the superstitions should be driven away, that the Christians keep one day as another, do not think to earn anything with celebrations for God, nor to honor the saints in a Christian way, that they also stop all idleness and carnal works on such days, and hear the word of God instead, with practicing the works of brotherly love. Answer: If we 1) already want to bring about everything through the one word, without examples, so that the abuses of the holidays would cease (which may not be possible, if one already bears witness to the words with examples and breaks the Sabbath with Christ, since those who let themselves be led by the word are the lesser part), what cause should there be to change the days, to make useless celebrations, without one word of God? If you want to reproach people to whom you can prove a favor by doing so, know that you must please people only for the good, Romans 15, so that it may bring them improvement. He who would otherwise please people would not be a servant of Christ, as Paul writes, even as he speaks of holding such outward ceremonies, which many people have often held to their own detriment.

Therefore, if one first begins to preach the gospel in a place, and until such a time as it is preached, tolerates the holidays, so that they will not be deterred from the word by their untimely departure before they have heard it, this would serve the people well and do them a favor. Of which much has been said above. But where people have heard the gospel long and much, and may well understand that one day is to be kept like another; whoever there would tolerate 2) holidays for the sake of the people, would please them unjustly,

1) In the old edition: me.

2) "there" put by us instead of: there itself.

because he strengthens them in the superstition of the time, or to great respect of the enemies of God, whose one may then enjoy, and thus shuns them more than God the Lord.

For how would one who has no special food, and yet would gladly feed his wife and child, keep so many holidays, if he were sure that such is not pleasing to God, nor to all the godly, and that some wicked people, to whom Christian liberty is irksome, do not shun it for the sake of benefit? Whichever of these two is the cause, it shall be of no account, and such weak ones shall also be strengthened with examples of Christian liberty.

(150) Others are those who want to adorn such evil deceit of the unbelieving heart by saying: All external things are free, why do I not want to celebrate or work for my pleasure? If indeed either superstition or unchristian timidity of wicked people keeps them at the holidays. These should consider that Paul says: "I have it all power, but it is not all useful; I have it all power, but it does not improve everything. Let no one seek what is his, but let each seek what is another's," 1 Cor. 10:23 ff. So for your own sake you are free to celebrate or not; but if you are not to live for yourself, but for your neighbor, and do nothing that is not better for another: how then will you keep the holidays, which have arisen contrary to the word of God, and so may not be better? For what may be good and better, the Scripture has everything clear and abundant.

But what may it say? It is understood that the holidays have been among the most harmful of all the ordinances of man; for they do harm to faith and love not only for themselves, but that many foolish people think that they want to earn much from God and His saints by their idleness, and that they often want to do good to their neighbor on such days, and should do so, as the Lord has taught by words and deeds. For the Sabbath, which God has commanded for the sake of man, is a day on which one should do good to one's neighbor; I am silent about our holidays, which God has not commanded and for which no one has to judge us, Col. 2. Thus, in their opinion, they may not do it in the case of mortal sin, but they have also promoted and strengthened all other error, superstition, blasphemy, along with all kinds of carnal sins and vices. When have false prophets deceived people more than on feast days? When have the mass-goers been more free from their blasphemous masses and made them more delicious than on the holidays?

Holidays? When have indulgences, howling and crying been more valid than on holidays? When was the worship of saints, together with all superstitions, more practiced than on holidays? And, coming to the outward vices, when is there more courtliness, splendor, gluttony, drunkenness, unchastity, murder of souls, than on holidays? It is obvious and cannot be denied that on holidays all good is destroyed and all evil is planted; by which evil poisonous fruits manly good may see that this planting is not from the Father, but from the enemy of all good, the devil.

If God has set us to establish such things, we have used all diligence, and still Christians keep one day as another; but to celebrate God every day is to let him work and make them, and to give them themselves serenely into his will. And although some have long said that the abuses should be abolished by this word, and that the holidays should be left, experience has shown that the Scriptures also demand that one bear witness to the doctrine with examples. Paul ever says, just as he speaks of holidays, "Be like me, for I am like you," that is, I am with you who are without law, as having become without law, yet now you also be like me, free Christians, who set their cause on the one Christ, and on no outward things. Therefore, if we are to preach that one day is like another, why would we ourselves do otherwise? We should teach that birth, circumcision, death, suffering, and resurrection should be considered every day and that we should thank God for them, and we should select special days for this purpose? so that we would give cause for gloating to many who did not want to be the most wicked, and their hearts would be shaped as before; thus God would be more angered and reviled, and respect and difference of days would be caused and maintained.

If we do not have the word of God everywhere, how can we be wise? Wise is he who becomes wise from other people's harm: and we do not want to become wise through our own harm. We cannot deny how bad it was for the ancients, who set aside a few holidays for the sake of those who were too attached to the world, so that they might also hear the word of God. And we experience daily how frightfully the devil destroys all piety and respectability on the holidays: and we still please ourselves well, and may pretend to keep some holidays for the benefit of the servants, or I do not know whom, may bring benefit.

But whether anyone would say, "So do away with Sundays. Answer: It does not follow. In the Ten Commandments, we commanded that the seventh day be observed, so that the servants and servants might also have their rest, as is read in the other book of Moses, Cap. 20 and in the fifth [book] Cap. 5. Now, love does not like to be deprived of such rest, therefore one should work six days, as the commandment of the Lord says, and rest the seventh. Since a Christian prefers to keep all ordinances that are not against God rather than to make ordinances, and since he is always more willing to serve than to be served, there is no reason why Sunday, which common Christianity has celebrated for the seventh day for so many years, should be discontinued. If one is to celebrate one day out of seven, as love requires, then Sunday is as good as another; and if one rests physically on it, then it is also wise to have Christian fellowship on it, to practice the word of God, prayer and the Lord's supper. For this purpose, no special feast or superstitious service was held on Sunday, as on other holidays. But since the celebration of Sunday has also been abused, it must be stopped by the word of God among the elect, and by the good order of Christian authorities among the rest of the people; this will be easier to do on the one Sunday than on so many holidays.

Thus it is that brotherly love requires the celebration of Sunday, but not of the other holidays at all; but, because they are as harmful to the neighbor as they should be, it cannot tolerate them at all. Therefore we have reason to put an end to these, but to keep the celebration of Sunday, and to put an end with all diligence to the abuses that have arisen there. But that love, which then requires the Sunday celebration, may be the master of directing and keeping it, as it may be useful to the neighbor; That it be always proved that the Sabbath is for man's sake, and not man for the Sabbath's sake, who then with Christ is Lord of the Sabbath, and if he may profit any man, he ought to know how to use Christian liberty, and not, as the Jews and their descendants, the Papists, think, if it should happen to do anything useful to one's neighbor on Sunday, to break the observance thereby. -

(156) Wherefore, if any man said, In the law were more feasts than, First of Easter, the first and last of seven days, in the which unleavened bread must be eaten; the day of firstfruits;

the first and tenth days of the seventh month, and seven whole days of the feast of tabernacles, in which they shall rest and give thanks for the good deeds of God: might not the free love of God and of one's neighbor keep, besides Sunday, the celebration of Christmas, the circumcision of the Lord, Epiphany, and Ascension Day?

(157) Answer: Christians should daily remember the divine good deeds that are supposed to be commemorated on such days, and never, without all Scripture, give such commemorations a time of their own; otherwise the simple-minded crowd will immediately be led back to the shadows, images and meager statutes of external things, and will be accustomed to think more of one day than another; which love, which does nothing, cannot tolerate, unless it brings improvement. But nothing can bring improvement that is done without a word from God. Thus the law does not report that the holidays declared by Moses were set aside in addition to the seventh day, for the rest of cattle, servants, and servants, so that love must set the same holidays for us Christians 1).

But if it is preached daily that the masters should do likewise to their servants, and think that they also have a Lord, there will be no lack of it; the servants will have as much to celebrate as those under the law. Many trades have half a holiday every week: if the servants are generally free with us, they may well impose as many holidays as they want on their rulers, so that love really does not require any more holidays; and they may not tolerate such holidays as are called Christmas, New Year's Day and the like. For by such celebrations the error would still be preserved as if one day were more valid than the other; in addition, their festivals are none, they have special superstitions and obscenities attached to them.

When, at Christmas, one rings the bell, there must be water wine, eats and drinks after the three measured meads, and drives the holidays out of all splendor and opulence. On the circumcision one gives, in pagan way, the good year with many superstitions. On Epiphany they make kings and hold Saturnalia. On the Ascension Day they cut up the hammers. And who would tell all the superstitions and pagan abuses, of which every place has its own? Therefore, love requires a reason to put an end to them.

160 Do you then say: Let the abuses be driven away by the word. Answer: They do not all accept the word, but it is to the greater good.

1) In the old edition: see.

It is necessary to stop the abuses of the reported days among them, so that the days are indeed stopped. For this purpose, among those who accept it, there are many weak ones who also need examples, so that they may be torn away from the superstition of such days. If then the godly do not need set days to consider divine good deeds, and we cannot deny that such days are harmful to the great multitude, which must be governed by statute and order, and which knows how to use the freedom from bodily labor only for lavish idleness: Why do we not want to do away with such holidays one by one, which have been set without a word, and have brought much hindrance to the word, and great damage to all respectability, which cannot be resisted even by the word, which the smaller crowd accepts? We preach here every day *zwiret* [twice], often *dreistet* [three times; would God that the seriousness were so great that we would have cause to preach more, the work should not weigh us down. For this purpose, the rulers are exhorted to keep their servants friendly and to demand divine things, which can be better obtained through the word, because the servants, 2) the young and large crowd, make good use of the holidays.

Since there is no reason at all why one festival should remain and the other go away; nor can it be denied that they have all done harm, and the greatest the most, we will be content to celebrate the one Sunday that brotherly love alone requires. And God grant us grace that we may drive away the abuses by the word, on which the fewest have reigned. And so, that we may put aside all other holidays, we have no doubt that we are doing what our ministry requires, which will be pleasing to God and highly useful and beneficial to God's community. There shall be no lack of preaching, which some accuse of quarreling, and yet do not otherwise esteem. And to whom no contentiousness or superstitious regard for the days vexes, he will also recognize and receive it. Let every man look to himself; our hearts are not just, though they seem to us to be quite just: all their wickedness is known to God.

Cause, therefore the images should be turned off.

We have also preached against idols and images. Among them, an examination has been made by an honorable council, and in the noblest temples all the images that are in use have been removed.

2) In the old edition: Gesinge.

but had been held in honor. The congregation of Christ, which I served, has removed all idols and images from their temple, because they were unanimous about it, and have not been hindered by any congregation or other obnoxious authority, as some other parishes have been. That this is Christian and well done, and that it would be even more Christian if the idols and images were all removed from all temples with justification and silence, has been abundantly shown by the leaders of the congregation of God at Zurich in clear writing, so there is no need to mention much about it here.

The first commandment of God among the ten is clear enough, for he says: "I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. You shall have no other gods beside me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness, either of them that are in heaven above, or of them that are in the earth beneath, or of them that are in the waters under the earth: worship them not, neither serve them." From these words, which are the reason for everything else that is read back and forth in the Law and the Prophets about idols and images, everyone who seeks the truth may well understand that God has also forbidden making idols and images; but that is so that no one would give them honor, 1) hold anything against them and serve them, so that the one true God would be despised and handed over.

Otherwise, the idol in itself is nothing but a mere work of human hands, like other things that are made by the skill that God gives. Therefore, where there is right faith, they may also be had; as Solomon had lion idols made on the steps of his king's throne, cattle idols on which the poured sea stood, and other things more, roses and the like.

Therefore, in all places where idols and images are forbidden, it is found that they are forbidden because they are not honored, because one does not want to serve God by them, so that the heart falls from true faith to outward appearance. This is an abomination in the sight of God, which is why idols and graven images are commanded and preached against everywhere in Scripture. Now no one can deny that our churches make idols and images as things pleasing to God; they are worshipped, that is, one bows before them, discovers the head, falls on one's knees before them; which is the name of the Hebrew word that is interpreted here as "to worship. One

2) goes to them, one sacrifices to them, one decorates and adorns them, builds them houses and cages. And what may it say? what has ever happened to idolatrous images, happens also to these. Therefore, they are no longer idols to many, but abominable idols, in which the people corrupt themselves and take an abominable offense at faith and love.

For this reason, all Christians should spare no possible effort to be converted, especially by the word out of the heart, and then also out of the eyes, for the sake of the weak and simple, who, let it be said and preached as strongly as one may, still have a superstitious regard for idols. We have preached here with all diligence for a long time that one should serve God in the spirit and not in idols; not in the dumb images of men, but in the living images of God, our neighbors, turn to expenses and prove good deeds. Even when, by the order of an honorable council, the most annoying idols, to which the foolish people had burned and served the most candles, were discarded, there were not a few of them who thought that they had nevertheless grasped the word, who had a heartfelt complaint about such image-devotion, but who now, through such a deed, along with the word, have fallen away from idols and images altogether. So deeply has this superstition and respect for images taken root, and in many people it also wants to have active examples of the word.

167 Which, unless there is good permission in the church, is due to the authorities as a remedy for external grievances, and not to any particular man, as we do not read of any prophet or apostle how much they preached and wrote against idolatry, that any of them ever actually removed an idol. In the days of Jeshua, Jeremiah and all the prophets, there were many idols in Jerusalem, against which they preached fiercely, but they never removed any with their own hands.

168 For he that is not set over other men ought to teach only by words, and to confirm them by his own example; nothing else may be due, but to them that are set over others. Therefore, as John preached freely to Herod, that he should not have Herodiadem, his brother Philippi's wife, yet he did not go to her with his appetite, and took her from him, and stoned her, as the law commandeth to punish adulterers. Why? He had no command and did not carry the sword. So, do you see one in front of an image

1) In the old edition: "verbiete", which may well be set for "erbiete".

2) "Promises" - makes vows; "goes" - goes on pilgrimage.

kneel and offer him honor: according to the law he shouldThe disobedient, the unholy 2c. are not exempt; but to the die; but as little as you dare to do the same, because yourighteous there is no law, 1 Tim. 1, 9. Wherever there are do not bear the sword, are not set in authority, so little isChristian communities, they should plead with their it your duty to overthrow or take away his idol. authorities for the abolition of idols and other things that

And if you would reproach me with Moses, who withoutare contrary to sound doctrine, because there are many special command slew the Egyptian, who did violence toweak people who really need active examples to speak. the Hebrew; or Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, who stabbedFor although everyone would know that the idol is nothing, Zimri, a captain of the Simeonites, when he whored withand no one would be offended by it, which, alas, is not, the harlot; or Eliam also, who strangled the sacrificers ofand appears daily: nor, if we have only One God, who is Baal, I say, Behold the Scripture of all three of them, noneinvisible, and whom no man has ever seen, also only One of them did this without special command. Moses hadChrist, who is indeed a man, but has put his human and already been appointed by God as judge and avenger ofbodily presence out of sight, as useless to us: then we the Israelites, as Stephen testifies in Acts 7. 7. Likewise,should serve God in spirit and in truth, turning all expenses before Phinehas performed his deed, God commandedand good deeds to the poor, as the Lord says: "Sell that everyone should slay his captains for the sake of theeverything you have and give it to the poor"; how should it harlots, Deut. 25. Likewise, Elijah had the consent of allnot be an abomination to us to tolerate so many idols and the people, who also attacked the sacrificer of Baalimages, which come from many idolatrous fables, contrary himself, 1 Kings 18. to the word of God, in our churches, where the one word

(170) But truly, the authorities who want to beof God is to be taught and kept?

Christians, as is their due with the pious Jofia, must first It is true that idols must first be torn from the heart, and make the law of God known to the people and re-establishthat by the word, then they do no harm. But of course, to the divine covenant with them. They are to be ministers ofwhom they are out of the heart, he will not like to see them God and rule in such a way that the people gather to Godaround him, because he knows that divine honor has been and he is the right ruler, as David ruled, Ps. 7. So thenproven to them, and is still being proven by many. And if one cannot deny that idols harm faith and love; faith, thatthey do so little harm, why then has God, who is ever the one hopes to obtain grace and help from one image morewisest, and has commanded or forbidden nothing in vain, than from another, and also thinks* it is a pleasing thingforbidden them so horribly everywhere in the Scriptures? to God to make, adorn and honor idols; of love, that soDo you say: We are free from the law. Answer: Yes, the much expense is expended on them, which should be laidsmall group of the elect; the other, the great group, must to the poor, also that the idols are used as decoys, so thatbe governed today, as well as in the times of Moses, by the more is given to the useless shorn multitude; I amlaw and sword; and the commandments concerning faith silent about many great superstitions, sorceries and falseand love, such as the Ten Commandments, in the first of miracles, which go on to and fro, especially wherewhich idols are forbidden, must be practiced and kept by pilgrimages are made, which are not to be counted: Trulyman everywhere.

it follows that Christian authorities should put a stop to And what else would the images bring, than they have such aversions and hindrances to the kingdom of God, forever brought, great trouble and harm, as all things do, they are to be feared in evil works. contrary to the word of God? Therefore, whoever is a

And even if this is not to everyone's liking, they shouldChristian and knows that he should judge all things for the think that other things, which they set Christian andbetter, and do away with what is annoying, will recognize honorable, are not pleasing even to the greater multitude,that it would be highly beneficial and salutary if the idols which should not 1). The authorities are the servants ofand images were removed everywhere. May God grant the law, from which the unrighteous are not,

that it be done. With the word of God one should teach the layman, not with dumb blocks, stones and paintings, as with the ancients the idolatrous work did not stand for long. It is a carnal, flying devotion, which does not arise except by looking at the images. If you are a Christian, listen; this

1) i.e., which is no good.

Word will be left enough to move you to all good.

I have to answer for one more thing: In the parish church, in which I serve in word, to St. Aurelian one calls it, we still had an idol, a coffin and grave, in which St. Aurelia, a virgin of the so-called 1) 11,000 maidens, who is said to have died of fever, when the same bunch passed by Strasbourg, and to have been buried in the reported grave, of whose sanctity one reads two miracles. One: that at one time some soldiers wanted to seek good in her grave, and were therefore made insane by St. Aurelia, that they themselves ate off their fingers and hands, and thus died. The other: Some have dug glues on their day, and because they have not celebrated their day, 2) the vengeful virgin has fallen prey to them. 3) Eleven hundred years she is said to have lain in the grave; but in a hundred years her grave was raised only when it was hoped that she would gain. The journey and the running to the grave are even more recent. A lot of trips were made to the grave, usually for fever. People ate the ground from it; an idol stood on the altar, which was decorated and adorned, and shirts were hung around the grave as decoys.

All of which is contrary to faith and love. And that is why, after a sufficient report of the divine word, the parish church 4) removed the same grave; the legs that were found, very large and unequal, so that they could not have been of one body, that is, of a virgin, were removed from the eyes of the people. God is to be invoked with faith in all places, and not the dead saints; for there is no word of God, so no one is more merciful and more inclined to help us than our God and Father. Now, by polluting this tomb, many a man has sought his help and God at the tomb from afar, and has given his gifts, which he was supposed to give to the poor, to the wooden idol and legs.

First, the shirts and other decoys were taken away, then the idol. The tomb in which the grave stood was no longer opened to keep people away from such annoyance. All this did not help:

They have pushed in their shirts and jiggery-pokery through the grave, which they did not want to grant to the naked Christ in so many poor children and others. Then the congregation of Christ, so that no foreign God would be sought among them, removed the tomb altogether and hid the tomb; just as they, as Christians, could not have suffered such a fabulous work, which had become so annoying.

177 No one may reproach that the legs of the saints were also kept large among the ancients, or that great miracles took place at their tombs. The ancients could also have erred, just as in the times of the apostles many errors occurred, according to the apostolic writings. Thus the ancients held the tombs of the martyrs in high esteem only so that others would be exhorted to the same masculine confession of faith, and not so that one should seek special help there. But soon the devil got involved with the false miraculous signs, of which it is read in Matth. 24, that many foolish people sought their help and comfort at the graves of the dead 6), which must come from the one true God; they then gave much to such places, which one will get on 7); as one knows, whores and boys bring the best booty from it, except what is laid and hanged on stone, iron and wood, or burned in oil and wax.

Of course, he who loves Christ will help and advise that such idolatries, superstitions and pernicious abuses, which have arisen and been practiced against the Word of God, come to an end. The true miraculous signs occur for the confirmation of God's word and the establishment of God's unified glory, as is evident from Marc. 6 and from many other places in Scripture, and not to confirm such idolatrous superstitions of seeking more grace and God's help in one place than another, for the sake of a basket full of 8) legs; legs are legs, and not God.

Why chants and prayers in church changed.

179. there has been much orderly chanting and prayer in the masses and sevens for the sake of money, and still is, the Chri-

5) This word is not found in Luther. Perhaps: framing, latticework.

6) So put by us instead of: "by the dead graves".

7) In the old edition of Walch: "that one becomes on", "become on" - get rid of. The meaning will probably be: one gets rid of this giving to whores and boys by putting away the false sanctities.

8) In the old edition: full legs.

1) In the old edition: "called by the 11,000 maids".

2) "have" put by us instead of: have.

3) "verfellet" in the old edition is probably as much as "gefällt" i.e. killed. 2 Kings 19:7.

4) So put by us instead of: the parish common.

The people do not yet know the stumbling block, which in many places is drawn from the Scriptures and from fables: Collects and prayers of St. Barbarians, St. Catherine, St. Christopher, St. Margaret, St. Gorges and many others; in addition, they sing and read such in Latin, which the common man does not understand at all, and they themselves often understand little. They are also bound to time, place, and number, as opposed to the kind of prayer and divine praise that is supposed to be voluntary.

Now, since we know that only the Spirit of God can know divine things, 1 Corinthians 2, and that the Scriptures of God contain all good things, 2 Timothy 3:16 ff, we do not use any song or prayer in the church of God that is not drawn from divine Scripture. And because what is done in the church of God should be generally better for everyone, we do not pray or sing anything except in the common German language, so that the layman may commonly say Amen, as the Spirit of God teaches, 1 Cor. 14, 16.

181. The Latin language, which everywhere contains nothing good or useful that is not written more artfully and better in Hebrew and Greek, be it divine or natural; and [which] like the ancient Romans, so much more the new papists, has served highly to blind other nations and to bring them into servitude, and to keep them in it, we do not know how to do the honor that with such the church of God is stopped, and only from it to interpret what is better for the layman to know.

Furthermore, because it is a reproach to God not to pray and sing with the heart, we in the church do not allow this to be bound to any time, "nor written with any statutes, but voluntarily on Sunday, when one keeps the supper of Christ, something is prayed and sung with brevity, all drawn from Scripture, which is indicated with its cause above. Likewise, at the time of vespers, since the bodily celebration is to be used for the betterment of the soul, one sings a psalm, two or three with a prophecy, that is, an explanation of a chapter from divine Scripture; thus also, daily before and after the sermon, a psalm is sung by the whole congregation.

183) In the assembled congregation, nothing is done without the sermons, but each one's spirit and devotion is set apart to pray and praise God in his heart without ceasing, so that we do not, contrary to Christ's teaching, give cause to make many words in prayer, Matt. 6, or with pretense.

and glorification of God more than praise, where such would be done without heart.

184 And in this we know that we are following the teaching of the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 14 and elsewhere. Col. 3, 16. Paul also writes: "Let the word of God dwell in you richly, in all wisdom; teach and admonish yourselves with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," in grace, "and sing to the Lord in your hearts." Likewise he also said to Ephesians 6, with all our strength we should love God, why should we not also sing to Him, as all the saints of the Old and New Testament have done? only that such singing should be done in the heart, not with the mouth alone, but that it should spring and come from the heart; which the apostle means when he says, "and sing to the Lord in your heart." For his opinion is not to sing without voice, otherwise how could the others be admonished and corrected, or we talk with one another, which he writes to the Ephesians ?

Therefore, those who reject the singing in the church of God know little, neither about the content of the Scriptures, nor about the use of the first apostolic churches and congregations, which always praised God with singing. For this purpose, the Psalms are especially used; we read of this not only in the writings of Paul and our Histories, but also in the writings of the Gentiles, especially Pliny secundi. In the same way, Christ himself concluded his supper and last sermon with a hymn of praise, Matt. 26. But there are some who have such a love that nothing is very pleasing to them, so they approach it. So we have now also shown reason and cause for the change with prayer and song, in which, of course, the godly may not bear any displeasure. God help the others, that he himself may please them and his word, so they will also get along well with us.

Other things, such as not burning a candle in God's church during the day, not needing salt and water for consecration, and leaving the dead in God's hands after burial, have been changed, as the spirits of all believers are in his hands. Such and such reformation is the cause, which is now often indicated. Scripture does not teach such things, which all good teaches; they have been used to the detriment of faith and love, therefore Christians should be idle.

187 Therefore, we ask all lovers of the Gospel to consider our stated causes of the things that have changed among us, along with other writings of God, with faithful, simple eyes.

and in outward things of Christian liberty to use free it may always be in himself, unless also better. For themselves in such a way that in every way what may be we shall ever live to others, and not to ourselves. Also that better and useful may be pursued; also to take to heart we, who are guided by. One Spirit should be guided in all that, although idols are nothing, all outward ceremonies things, both external and internal, to be of one mind, are free in themselves, that nevertheless there are very mouth and use, according to the word of God, so that few who recognize such things as nothing and free in the Christian freedom is not violated, no human statute is truth, even if they have long said so. For of course, if such established, but the divine law is lived by, to the praise of things were recognized as nothing, since they have done God and to the blessed improvement of our neighbor. much harm and are still today a stumbling block to many May God grant this. Amen.

Some also think that they do such things for the sake of Christian freedom, since carnal freedom, which shuns the cross, prevents them from laying themselves against the wicked and meeting the weaklings seriously. How often does it happen that we pretend to the weakness of the people, since we really drag them behind us out of our own weakness? Nothing is to be done rebelliously and with rumor; therefore, whoever wants to rush into something without previous diligent preaching, before the elect have approved it, we would not recognize him as one of us; just as not those who do not direct their preaching to faith and love in the first place. On the other hand, we cannot praise those who pay so little attention to outward things, that they do not only shun idols and ceremonies, which they say are blind, are not nothing to many simple-minded people, but are highly harmful, but may also let splendor of dress, cowardly, wanton revelry, and often grosser things creep up on them. May the Lord grant that his word be preached loudly everywhere, which is then powerful enough to drive away everything that has not arisen from him, and therefore is not good, in a salutary way, and without any rumor.

189. The content of this booklet is our common faith, which we find in the service and command to preach the Gospel publicly here in Strasbourg, who, according to all divine Scripture, direct all our preaching so that faith in God and love for our neighbor, which then give birth to true discipline and constant patience, be planted, increased and strengthened in our listeners at all times, and that everyone make use of the outward ceremonies, such as the Lord's Supper, baptism and others, for the promotion of faith and love, as described in this booklet. And therefore, what of these and other things described herein may be taught or printed improperly or contrary to what has come forth from us, let no one impute to us; for it will have been done without our knowledge and understanding 1) and therefore we will not answer for it. But what is taught in this and other books, which have come from us, we offer to give its manly sufficient reason and cause from divine Scripture, whoever desires it; and our names are: Wolfgangus Capito. Caspar Hedio. Matheus. Cell. Symphorian Pollio. Theobaldus Niger. Joh. Latomus. Antonius Firn. Martinus Hag. Martinus Users.

1) i.e. without our being unanimous about it,

II. writings against Zwingli and his followers.

a. Zwingli's dispute with Joh. Bugenhagen.

11. Ulrich Zwingli's opinion of the night meal of Christ, remembrance or thanksgiving ,

translated into German by three unnamed persons. *)

April 1525.

To the reader grace and peace from GOD. To live praise and service truly and piously from the heart, Dear in God brother. We have hurriedly translated the to have mercy on our neighbor, yes, to love as ourselves. opinion of the table or supper of Christ, which we call the Ueppige honor is an evil herb, and not everyone knows remembrance or thanksgiving, because one or two could it. Therefore one should keep only the main things, as not have prepared it in time enough from the Latin stated in Matt. 23, and let them shout and fight until they Commentary, which Huldreich Zwingli let go out in the have had enough. Now men know well that before too middle of March, in the hope that our work will bring no many scriptures, neither too few, go forth; yet this one is small fruit to all faithful Christians. For we see that the devil so well established, and so conformable to the faith, that is looking at us with stubborn heads, which, [as] one has we have regretted that it should not long be kept in the supposed, stand by the Gospel; but when the truth comes Latin language. Understand it, dear reader, in the best forth, and not through it, they begin to storm, throb and way, and strive to learn the truth in the light of truth, not rebuke, that it may not well be deepened in nonsense 1). in fighting books; and may God, who gave His Son, grant For this now this well-founded and diligent piece from that we may understand His word according to His will! Zwingli's Commentario will be well. The main and right Amen. burden of faith and Christianity are: Faith, piety and mercy. Of the night meal of Christ, commemoration or thanksgiving. Everyone should keep these, and not let the quarrels of the scholars interfere with them. For in that they quarrel, there is no salvation; but in that we have a right trust in From Huldreich Zwingli's Commentario faithfully translated. God, in that we trust in him.

1. we have two years ago, among the 67 articles in the eighteenth, 2) of the Eucharistia,

1) In the old edition "verließt"; "Verliesen" here seems to mean as between Zwingli and papist opponents (in front of 600 people), to much as dulden, leiden.

2) On January 29, 1523, a solemn disputation was held at Zurich which Zwingli brought 67 the-.

*This "opinion" is compiled by three unnamed persons from two of Zwingli's writings, namely from Zwingli's Latin Commmtar äs vera et kalsa rsligioue, which went out in mid-March 1525, and from the Latin book "Antibulon" written against Emser. The full title is: "Von dem Nachtmahl Christi, Wiedergedächtniß oder Danksagung, Huldreichen Zwinglius Meinung, now described in Latin Commentario and hastily brought into German by three faithful brothers. Whether God wills for the good also of the German nation." This translation was done "hurriedly" in order to bring the book to the people at the Easter Fair in Frankfurt am Main. This Easter fair begins on Wednesday after Judica and lasts 21 days. In 1525, therefore, this fair took place from April 4 to April 25. We give the text after the old edition of Walch.

That is, of thanksgiving, written as we have written much, driving more of the time than of the matter. 1) For even Christ cannot praise enough the faithful conductor and minister of his word, who in due season put food before the Lord's servants, Matt. 24, saying in great amazement, "How great and excellent is the faithful and careful conductor, to whom the Lord has entrusted and commanded his servants to give him food in due season! For this reason 2) we have also resolved to distribute the word in this way for all time to come. [So that we may give and receive much fruit to our Lord.

(2) For who would not chase away such a servant, who in the cold wintertime would dare to plow the ground and throw seed into it? In the spring 4) such shall be done. So we also have abated much at the same time, admitting the stupidity and hardness 5) of those to whom we have written; but all for this cause, that we might build. And after the example of Christ we have now kept behind and hidden, now brought forth and opened. Who also, when he made this thanksgiving, said that he had yet many things to say unto the disciples, which they could not now understand: for which cause he counted it expedient 6) to hold his peace until the coming of the Holy Ghost.

(3) Wherefore, devout reader, if thou shalt find any things herein, which thou hast not seen in the former of our scriptures; or here some things perhaps clearer 7) and more pure, than elsewhere, even some things different from before, wonder not. For we do not want to present food at the wrong time, nor do we want to throw the pearls to the swine.

4 Also, we did not want to present such a thing at that time (although we could have done it without any danger), since no one could understand and grasp it. And therefore improve and as much as

We revoke here in this place that which we have said before, not that it is false, but in such a way that this, which we are now writing in the 42nd year of our age 8), is far superior to that which we wrote in the 40th year. For at that time (as mentioned above) we wrote more to serve the time than the cause in itself; and that by command of the Lord, who calls us to build and establish in such a way that the dogs and pigs do not tear us apart when we first begin. It is to be feared that they may shamefully err in honoring and worshipping one true God, 9) that this may be done in the abuse of thanksgiving. If it had been used in the right way and according to Christ's order, such terrible vices would not have crept into God's people, the Church.

5. run, if we are all more excreted, be, 10) that we touch the sanctified things, have around us and with us, yes, made holy by our own power (publicly [*aperte*] I say it), which perhaps were not holy (for who does not know how much cost is put on the bones of the saints, so that honor may be done to them?), for that we would become holy and pious, it has come to that, that we wood, stone, earth, ground, shoes, clothes, rings, helmet, swords, belts, leg, teeth, hair, milk, bread, plate, table, wine, knife, jug, and what the pious people ever only touched, honored, adored, embraced and kissed; Yes, even more foolishly, we thought we would be blessed if we only looked at these things; then we were promised the remission of sins, yes, happiness and salvation would meet us everywhere.

(6) But the true mercy of God, which is nothing else but innocence, flowing from love and filial fear of God, we have so departed from; that even common righteousness, that is, human righteousness, is held worse by the heathen than by Christians. We thought we were doing great things when we spoke highly of holy things, which we had made holy, even when we could speak politely of them; and in between we were so full of the filth of all vices that we passed over, like the consecrated 11) graves, trusting in God, living piously and innocently, that is, being a Christian.

7 Therefore no one, if he will hear us speak of the thanksgiving and supper of Christ 12),

8) "Hulderich Zwingel" (that's how he used to write himself) was born on January 1, 1484 at Wildhaus in the county of Toggenburg.

9) "geirret" - to err.

10) have looked his" - have had our attention from the fact that this happens that 2c.

11) In the old edition: geweißgeten.

12) In the old edition: talking.

The eighteenth article reads: "Christ, who was once offered on the cross, is eternally sufficient for the sins of all believers. The 18th article reads: "Christ, who once offered himself on the cross, is the sacrifice which is eternally sufficient for the sins of all believers. From this it follows that the Mass is not a sacrifice, but a memorial of the sacrifice offered on the cross, and, as it were, the seal of the redemption accomplished by Christ."

1) driving" - serving, as follows from § 4.

2) In the old edition: and.

3) "eeren" - arare, to till, to plow.

4) In the old edition: Glenz.

5) In the old edition: Zarti.

6) kommlich - fitting, befitting.

7) In the old edition: klärerer.

that he must therefore accept that Zwingli has spoken and keep it that way; whether perhaps some have sworn in a man's word that way, of which we think there are few or none.

(8) On the other hand, let no one reject what he will see brought forth from the well of God's secrets, for the sole reason that he who brings it forth is small and inconsiderable, for we see that one falls into both of these. Therefore let each withhold his judgment until the matter is decided, and we may actually see what is to be judged 1).

9 The night meal of the Lord was called thanksgiving by the Greeks, who in the right knowledge of God, in faith, and in right art, far surpassed the Latins (we say this without envy), as their books and writings clearly enough prove and testify. They gave it this name without doubt because they understood by faith and by the power of the words of Christ and the apostles that Christ intended nothing else with such a supper than that they should remember it with joy and rejoicing, publicly giving thanks for the good deed that he has poured out for us so abundantly and so mildly 2). For Eucharist is a thanksgiving, that he who would be present in the common and open thanksgiving, would show himself to the whole church, to be of that number who trusted and believed in Christ given for us; from which number to utter, to withdraw, and to alienate (it would be by falling away from the faith, or by impurity of life) is a high unbelief.

For this reason it is also called by Paul, 1 Cor. 10, a union or a common; from where then also the ban or exclusion and separation from this common comes, if one does not allow someone to go into such a common of believers for the sake of his life.

11) So now we understand from the name what Eucharistia is, what the Lord's Supper is; namely, nothing else but a thanksgiving, a common rejoicing and joy of those who proclaim the death of Christ, that is, proclaiming, praising, rejoicing, 4) and excelling.

12 Because the deep and difficult sermon of Christ, John 6, is not understood by many in the right way, although it is also drawn elsewhere by those who do not understand it, it has given us the right to know it.

It seemed good to put before all things the right and natural sense and opinion of the same place, so that those who force all scripture, willingly or unwillingly, to serve their opinion, may not, from such a place, protect their insanity.

(13) Christ, when he saw that those who came to him were inclined only to the belly (to fill it), took occasion (as was his custom) to speak of the matter; now those who were recently satisfied by him with bread, he addresses with such speech: You come to me for this reason, that you may be satisfied with food and fed. But I did not come into this world to feed the body, but the soul. You have great work, and labor after me for the food of the belly. You clumsy ones! Work the food that may not spoil; for the food you seek until now spoils with the body.

014 But the food which I give you shall never perish, because it is spiritual; therefore it shall not perish, but abide forever. For my Father hath sealed me, that is, confirmed me, that I should be a sure salvation, and a sure pledge of life. 5)

015 The Jews therefore, not understanding what Christ meant by these words, when he commanded them to work a meat, that is, to seek that which should not spoil, say: What shall we work, that we may work the works of God? supposing that he spake of some outward work, which he would have them do, Jesus answered them, saying, This is the work of God, that ye believe and trust in him whom he hath sent. Here we see what the work is that God requires of us; none at all, but that which Christ here indicates, believing and trusting in the Son of God.

(16) Here also is seen what is the meat which he hath prepared above, saying, Work ye meat that perisheth not. So we find no other, but to trust in Christ. Therefore the food of which Christ speaks here is faith. Here you have the first sign by which we may understand that those who think that Christ speaks of sacramental food in this whole chapter are quite mistaken. For he means to seek food that does not perish, and this is nothing other than the work of God. But the work of God is to trust in the Son whom the Father has sent. And therefore the food that is called seeking Christ is nothing else than trusting in the Son. So faith must be the food of which Christ speaks so powerfully and bravely in this whole chapter. Therefore the Jews speak:

5) In the old edition: shall.

1) In the old edition: to give.

2) „fürmild“ - especially mild; Latin praelarZuZ.

3) Disgraceful - shamefulness.

4) verjähren - to say yes to something, to confess.

What sign do you do, that we may know to trust you and believe you? What do you do, in that we recognize you to be God, to whom alone God gives our law to adhere? It is not hidden from you how our fathers ate bread rained down from heaven in the wilderness; for this is also described in the Psalms by David: He gave them bread from heaven. Jesus answered them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, Moses did not give you bread from heaven, for even though it fell from above, it was not heavenly; but my Father gives you the true bread from heaven, for it is the bread of God which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world. The bread of Moses contained the bodily life, but the bread that my Father gives, feeds and sustains the soul, is also so superfluous and powerful that it gives life to the whole world.

017 But because the Jews did not understand the words of Christ (which were nothing else than an interpretation and explanation of the gospel, for by eating bread he understands nothing else than to believe in the gospel), they said to him, "Lord, give us bread for all our needs. Then said Jesus unto them, I am the bread of life; whosoever cometh to me shall never hunger; and whosoever trusteth in me shall never thirst. When the Jews heard that Christ said, "The bread that comes down from heaven gives life to the world," they desired that such bread might be given to them always. But Jesus, perceiving that they did not understand the meaning of the Gospel, explained to them what the bread was that gives life, saying, "I am the bread of life; whoever then comes to me, whoever is implanted in me, whoever accepts me, will never hunger. But that "come" is used here for "accept" is clearly indicated by the following words, when he says, "He who trusts in me will not thirst. From this it follows that faith alone replaces and quenches all hunger and all thirst but what hungers, or what thirsts? Of the soul. Only faith and trust in Christ satisfies and waters the soul, so that there is neither hunger nor thirst.

018 Christ saith further, But I have told you, that ye have seen me, and have not believed, neither have ye trusted. - But what is this saying, that ye marvel that I have said, Whosoever cometh to me shall neither hunger nor thirst any more, seeing ye are now present with me, and are no less subject to hunger and thirst? But this is because you have me well with the flesh.

But I speak not of seeing, nor of coming to me in the flesh, but of the light of faith. They that have the same shall want nothing henceforth; they shall not covet; they shall not seek by night whom they love, and to whom they shall confess their anguish and their distress; they shall not wander to and fro through all things, for they know that he whom they have embraced is a true sponsor and spouse of the soul; they shall thirst for that 1) one precious treasure, and for no other. You do not have this clear light of faith, because you do not trust in me. Therefore you may not understand in what way I am food, that is, a hope of the soul. But the cause of this blindness of yours, lest I speak a rougher word, is that my Father has not drawn you to know me, for otherwise you would accept me. For all that the Father gives me comes to me. What therefore comes to me, I do not cast out. For I am not come down from heaven to do my will, but the will of my Father which hath sent me.

You think that I have a will like other people. It is true, I am a true man, and according to human nature I also have a special will, but much more obedient than you; because your will is repugnant to the will of God for the thickest 2) time, my will is always pleasing to the divine will. So then I have not come to do my will, but the will of Him who sent me. But that ye may know what is the will of him that sent me, know that this is the will of my Father which sent me, that all things which he hath given me I should lose nothing of them, but raise them up at the last day. But in order that you may understand what I mean by this word "the Father gives me" and "the Father has given me," and what you are to realize, I will say it even more clearly: This is the will of him who sent me, that everyone who sees (that is, understands, recognizes, and trusts and believes in) the Son may have eternal life, and I will raise him up on the last day.

20. See what food Christ is talking about here. God sent His Son into this world that we might live through Him. But who will live through him? Only those who put off my grace. But how will they put off His grace, since they know Him? Therefore Christ said: Everyone who sees the Son,

1) "your" put by us instead of: "the".
2) "for a thicker time" - usually.

that is, understands why he was sent into the world, and trusts in him, putting his trust in him, he will have eternal life.

(21) Here the flesh (the Jews) thinks that Christ is taking on too much, when he says, I am the bread of life. For immediately before this he said: The bread of God comes from heaven and gives life to the world; from which it must follow that he is the bread that came from heaven.

022 Against these things murmureth the flesh, saying, Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then saith he: I am come down from heaven? Therefore JESus answered them, saying: Do not murmur among yourselves; have you not heard that I have now said: All that my Father giveth me cometh to me? Your unbelief, which is the source of your lack of understanding, forces you to say the same thing many times. So it has a form: No one may come to me, that is, no one comes to me as a special pledge of salvation, except my Father who sent me. But whom he will draw to me, that is, whom he will agree with me by a right faith and trust, him will I raise again at the last day. It is a wonder that my words always seem so strange and foreign to you, when I say nothing or little that is not written in your own prophets or in the law. Now this also is written in the prophets: They are all taught by God, Isaiah 54 and Jeremiah 31. Why then does it seem so strange to you when I say: The Father will not lead you into my knowledge (of your unbelief), when your own prophets write that such things must be taught by the Father?

(23) But more plain and undisguised things cannot be said, except what I am about to say. And this I will say unto you, that ye may not justly complain, that I spake it before in these words: What the Father has given me will come to me; or in these words, Let no one come to me, let my Father draw him. Now I will speak this in other words that are even clearer. Understand it thus: He who has heard from the Father and learned from him, he comes to me as the certain salvation. Not that anyone has seen the Father; lest perhaps you think that "hearing" and "learning" are here given to the outward senses and to the bodily things 1) that are present: No, no! hearing and learning

1) In § 40 of this pen, the term "sensitivities" is explained by: "face, taste" 2c.

Here, the inner enlightenment of the mind and intellect is encountered. No one has ever seen the Father (although he works within; and that he wills, we hear and learn), for he alone, who is of God, has seen the Father.

024 Therefore I say unto you, as truly, truly, so also plainly, plainly, that whosoever will trust in me hath everlasting life. Now you have the whole sum of this doctrine of mine, yea, the sum of all the doctrine which is commended unto me, that whosoever trusteth in me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life, whose power, virtue and nature I have declared to you from the beginning of this discourse. No one denies that our forefathers ate the bread of heaven in the wilderness, but they died. Whoever eats this bread, me (I say), that is, whoever trusts in me, has eternal life. This is the bread which came down from heaven, that whosoever eateth thereof should not die.

(25) Here it must be seen and perceived in one process that Christ has two natures, divine and human. But only because of the divine nature, which comes down from heaven, Christ is salvific for us; not because of the nature, which he took from the immaculate virgin Mary, and was born man; although he had to suffer and die according to the human nature. Nevertheless, if he had not been the Son of God who died, he would not have been able to save the whole world. Therefore this is the other sign, that in this chapter Christ understands by the bread and meal nothing else but gospel and faith, so that everyone who believes that he was sacrificed for us, and is confident of it, has eternal life; and that he does not speak here at all of the sacramental meal. For that he might the more clearly signify and understand this opinion, he saith again, I am the living bread which came down from heaven: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.

(26) But lest I tease you any longer, I will explain to you in a few words what is the cause of my salvation to the whole world, or how it comes about: The bread, of which I have spoken so much, and which I will give you, is my flesh, which I will offer for the world. Now this is the third infallible sign, that Christ does not speak here of the sacramental meal; for as much as he died, so he is salvific to us. Now he alone may be killed according to the flesh, and be healed according to the Godhead alone. So then Christ is

2) "at a process" - first of all.

the soul's food, if the soul sees that God did not spare His only begotten Son, but gave Him into the most terrible death, so that He made us alive again: then it will be sure and certain of God's grace and its salvation. Let no one here be subtle in his reasoning: Yes, Christ said that his flesh was given for the world; so Christ alone must be salvific for all men after mankind; for he said that his flesh was given for the life of the world; so it must make the flesh alive. This sophistical objection must therefore be countered: As the one Christ is God and man, so also, if he is killed according to the flesh (for who would want to kill God?), and his death has become a life for us, it happens that, for the sake of the union and unity of the two natures, to the one is given at times that which belongs to the whole Christ.

27 Now after this saying, when he spake: The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will lay up for the life of the world, the Jews were not taught, and that because of their unbelief and hardened hatred; for they did not understand the mind and meaning of Christ's words, namely, that Christ would not be salvific to us if we ate him, but if he were killed for us. For the human mind does not become certain of the grace and mercy of God until it understands and believes that God has not spared His only Son 2c. So the Jews murmured in displeasure, 1) and as much as they were unrepented of, so much more sacrilegiously and challenged 2) they murmured, saying, How can he give us his flesh to eat? For they still clung to the flesh that was before their eyes; therefore it was not unreasonable for them to shun and be afraid, even though our theologians do not shun the flesh of Christ.

028 When Christ therefore saw that he had subdued and tried in vain all that he would have them know, he dealt with them as Isaías said before in the sixth chapter, where thus saith God the Lord: Go, and say to the people, Hear, and understand not; and see the visions, and know them not. Blind the heart of this people, and afflict their ears, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand in their heart, and be converted; and I heal them, and make them whole. So, I say, when Christ saw that he had made nothing with them, he made their ignorance to be a thing of the past.

He said, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you will have no life in you. He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up on the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed: understand, the flesh of Christ, as much as it was given in death for our redemption, and his blood, as much as it was shed for the washing away of our sins, as is clear from the above.

29 For since they did not want to understand the hidden secret speech, but which he so clearly revealed. For since they did not want to understand the hidden secret speech that he had so clearly revealed to them that they should no longer have desired it, he struck them even harder, made them even more blind (for they were well worth it, and these are the judgments of God); and on top of all this he added: "Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me, and I in him. This is spoken to harden the unbelievers, but to instruct the believers. And this is the fourth sign, by which it may be perceived that Christ is not speaking here of the sacramental meal, but of the meal of faith. (For there are unfortunately many who eat the body of Christ sacramentally and drink the blood sacramentally, who are neither in GOD, nor GOD in them, for as He is in an elephant or in a flea).

(30) Therefore, whoever believes himself redeemed by the gift of the body of Christ, and washed away by the blood of Christ, remains without doubt in God, for he surely and without doubt places all his trust in the Son of God, and does not direct his hope elsewhere; for whoever sneezes at the highest good may not thirst for another good. (But here I call noshing as much as a mortal man 3) takes it here in time; not as the theologians speak of needing and noshing; for the rejecters of God also noshe God in this time; although this is hidden from all those whose inward mind [does not] burn in divine love).

(31) God also abides in him, for no one can come to Christ except the one whom the Father begets, as was evident from the words of Christ above. Whoever therefore learns from the Father (who teaches inwardly), in him without doubt is God; so that whoever abides in Christ, in him also abides Christ. For to abide in Christ is nothing else, but through love (that Christ has given himself for

1) "in Unwürß" - gruff.

2) In the old edition: grumbling.

3) "a mortal man" put by us instead of: "a mortal man."

has stretched out to us) stiffly cling to God. But love is God Himself, 1 John 4: Whoever therefore abides in the love of God, in him is God, and he in God. But love (as much as human reason may understand) follows after faith; from which it follows that faith (by which we trust in the grace of Christ) is that by which we abide in GOD, and he in us.

But that this is the meaning and the opinion is clearly indicated by the words of Christ, which immediately follow, when he says: "In like manner as my living Father has sent me, and I live for the Father's sake: so also, without doubt, those who eat me, that is, those who trust in me, will also fashion themselves after my example. In vain would be your apes, that is, in vain shall it be, that ye should be like one another, 1) as believing; unless it be that thereby ye also change the life. I came not only to redeem the world, but also to change it. Those who now trust in me will also be formed according to me. This is the bread that came down from heaven, and it is evident from its effect. For he that eateth this bread shall live for ever: but he that eateth the bread of the flesh shall not live for ever. And this you may understand from the fact that your fathers ate the bread which came down from heaven, and died; from which it is clear enough that no bodily food can keep a man in everlasting and eternal life.

(33) This speech offended not only the enemies of Christ, but also some of his disciples, who said (lest they speak more rudely): This is a rough, hard speech; who may hear it? For they were still in the visible flesh, as were the enemies of Christ. When Jesus therefore perceived that some of his disciples also murmured of it, he said unto them: Are you angry about this? What would you say or mean if you saw the Son of Man going up to the place where he was before? You do not understand my speech, for you do not believe that I am the Son of God. But what will you say then, if you see me going up to heaven by my own power? Will not such a deed force you to confess that I am a son of God? Therefore, you do not trust me, because you do not believe that I am a son of God. The cause of your unbelief is that you do not understand all that I say. I have commanded you by parables, by lovely lovely strange sayings, 2) to bring to your understanding the heavenly things that I have said.

But you will always be dragged along by the heavy burden of unbelief.

(34) This I speak of is spiritual, not in bodily things, but the Spirit instructs the spirit; yes, the Spirit of God draws the poor spirit of man to Him, so that it may unite, unite and change in itself as much as in itself completely; this feeds the soul, makes it joyful and certain of salvation. This making the soul sure and joyful, what is it but food? or by what equation can it be expressed and understood more comely 3) and skillfully than by food? For in the same way as the hungry stomach becomes cheerful by receiving food, and the consumed spirits, heat and strength are renewed, strengthened and replaced, so also the hungry soul becomes cheerful and courageous when God opens up to it; yes, not only does it become cheerful, but from day to day it increases more and more, becomes stronger and stronger, and is formed according to God, until it grows into a perfect man. And therefore the food of which I speak is spiritual; for the Spirit alone gives it, if he alone draws and feeds the mind of man to him.

35 Your thoughts are unwise, if you think that I am talking about the flesh, which is made up of veins and nerves, or wood wax, 4) and is put together and intertwined; the same flesh is not useful. How long will you be without understanding? I tell you this in plain words: I do not speak of my essential flesh and body in such a way that I will publicly testify to you that my flesh is not useful at all.

(36) And this is the fifth and most expressive sign, by which we may understand that Christ did not speak here of the supper and sacramental food at all. Yes, not only do we learn the same, but also that Christ, as much as by a law, willed to occur and prevent us from niendert 5) thinking of any flesh. For if Christ says that the flesh is of no use at all, let no man's iniquity be so presumptuous as to dispute or quarrel about the flesh as it is eaten. And if you say that there must be a different meaning and opinion, for even if the flesh of Christ is of some use, since we are redeemed from death by it, we reply, "The flesh of Christ is almost, indeed, unspeakable.

1) gleichsnet - gleinerisch stellet.

2) "Agreements" - figurative, figurative speeches.

3) d. i. more appropriate.

4) The word "Waldenwachs" is used to describe the sinews. In German: "Haarwachs".

5) niendert - nowhere.

1) But not when it is eaten, but when it is killed and slaughtered for us. Then it has been useful to us, because it has delivered us from eternal death and saved us. But if one wanted to eat it, it would be of no use. This has spoken the truth, otherwise it may not be. For the Jews also disputed how one should eat his flesh, and not how it should be killed and sacrificed: so the speech of Christ, being present to them, must also be to this effect.

(37) However much and almost the theologians may dispute and quarrel about the essential body of Christ, or about the flesh of Christ, they may gain and conquer nothing from it, except that they thereby show themselves to be much more incomprehensible and sacrilegious than the Jews have ever been, and that against all diligence and friendly instruction of Christ, our Sustainer and Savior. For the Jews, being always in the visible flesh, would forsake Christ before they would understand the kindly Teacher; though he (as befits a loving Teacher) openly shows them their error, lest they perish therein, saying, The flesh which ye look upon is of no use.

(38) But the theologians do likewise, as if they said, O Jesus, thou must not give us such explanation and declaration; we understand the opinion well, for we perceive well that thou speakest of a flesh which is touched with the hands; the same flesh must we eat, if we would be saved otherwise. Thou, who knowest the hearts and minds of men, art in vain careful, when thou sayest, Thy flesh is of no use: for we, who are mightier than thou in our kingdom, will easily conquer, that every man with words uttered shall be barred, they eat thy flesh. Yea, we will bring it to pass, when they eat it, that they must speak, they feel sensitive, that they eat thy flesh, and drink thy blood. And therefore, Jesus, repress and refrain from speaking your words (the flesh is not useful) until we surpass the Jews (who wanted to depart from him who knew the hearts of all men, before they wanted to flatter them into thinking that they understood the words correctly, as Christ meant them, but which they did not understand) 2) in ignorance, so that we conquer them, that they must commonly understand, believe and feel, which they have never understood, believed nor felt.

39. and do you see, JEsu, the berengarium, the

1) In the old edition: geseyn.

2) Here we have erased the word "we" which is too much.

We have forced to confess and publicly confess (as in spiritual rights in the Decret **de consecratione, distinet. 2. cap. Ego Berengarius**), that as soon as the priest speaks the words about the bread, the true bodily and substantial body and blood of Christ are present, and that the same body and blood are not a sacrament and sign, but the fleshly body of Christ truly and sensibly handled in the hands of the priests, broken, and ground with the teeth of the faithful 2c. So let us also compel others all who may now speak against it. But wilt thou, JESUS, ever stand stiffly upon this word: The flesh is of no use, and if ever thou hast said it, we will depart from thee: for ever it is more grievous to us, 3) We depart from thee, lest any of our profit and gain should fail us.

40 You do not want to be hurt here, Christian reader, with this rude 4) and pointed mockery; because soon after you will realize why one must act in such a way with such incomprehensible sticks, which have also forced the external and internal senses and feelings (as the face, taste 2c.) to rejuvenate, which they have not found.

41 Since Christ has clearly taught that this food is eaten with the spirit, not with the mouth, therefore the flesh is not useful, he continues: "The words that I speak to you are spirit and life. Here this little word (*verbum* in Latin, Hebrew *dabar*, in German *word*) is taken after Hebrew manner for the whole trade, for the whole history. This is common in the holy scripture everywhere, as namely Lucae at the 1st: All these words have sounded through the whole mountain of the Jewish country. Here "all words" means the whole trade, how the angel appeared to Zachariah, how he became mute, how Elizabeth gave birth 2c.

(42) Therefore Christ is to be understood here as saying, "This thing and this transaction, which I have explained to you and told you in many words, is nothing but a heavenly spirit, and brings life to those who believe and hold to it. But that so few of you understand and accept it is because the greater part of you do not believe. This is as much as a conclusion of the whole discourse. I preach the gospel to you, the good news, but you do not believe it. But the gospel

3) "wegerer" - more profitable, a better WW; this is a double comparative, instead of "weger". Cf. § 45 of this writing on "weger" and § 3 "klarerer".

4) ratchet- hard.

And the glad tidings are nothing else, but I myself; though I have made myself known modestly from the beginning, and with hidden words, lest I should be suspected of pride or iniquity: yet thus must I speak that which my Father hath commended unto me, and which he willeth. I have therefore told you that I am he whom my Father promised to the fathers, a food for the soul, a sure salvation, and an unfeigned pledge of hope. Whosoever therefore trusteth in me, comforting and keeping me, is now and ever saved and blessed: for he perceiveth in himself, as soon as he putteth all his trust in me, that his conscience is made joyful and sure, as his mind is lifted up from despair into a certain possession of salvation.

(43) We have gone a little further, for the contents of this sixth chapter (as far as thanksgiving is concerned) have been drawn out; yet, as we think, not without fruit. For (as we hope) [it] will become clear from this, that all that the theologians and of spiritual law reported 1) hitherto from this chapter to the supper of the Lord, or to thanksgiving, was forced and bent, either from iniquity or from ignorance; 2) therefore their reputation is to count for little, where their word is not founded in truth. And whether thou reproach for and against their doctrine and writings, as a shield that may not be broken, I say not otherwise than that faith itself must declare and say that this is the right understanding of the place; unless I am almost mistaken in faith, if I stubbornly believe that there is only one way to heaven; if I firmly believe that the Son of God is an infallible, untrustworthy pledge of our salvation, and trust in him to such an extent that I do not admit any bodily, sensitive thing to obtain salvation.

(44) But whether anyone would ask me impertinently, why I have interpreted and explained this part of John so diligently and anxiously, I answer, For the sole purpose of bringing the truth to light. But if we have lacked any part of the truth, it must be proved by the testimony of the Scriptures, not by any man's accusation. It was easy to accuse Christ before the judge with false and fabricated lies; but when the judge asked, "What evil has he done?" they produced no testimony, but acted with murmuring and shouting. So now we are to look at the pab-

We must not rage against the harmless truth (which is Christ Himself), for we would be like the godless enemies of Christ.

45 If this is the right natural meaning of this place, let no man (be he what he may) prevail in reputation or authority, let no flesh ever again prevail to make any man's reputation or authority prevail over the truth and be held in higher esteem; yea, let no man's wisdom prevail over divine truth. All that is now taken from this chapter, whether in papal laws, or in the teachers of the holy Scriptures, or which is sung in temples and in the streets, which in another mind than that which the Lord has given to understand through us, is otherwise bent and forced, shall therefore count for nothing; that we should all think it had been much better, and otherwise, 3) that those who did such things had never acted and touched the righteous truth, but that they had thus defiled it with their iniquity.

046 What then can their power and renown do, how great and high they are? for higher and more excellent is the truth. To the others, who thus break forth: Methinks thine opinion is, that the flesh of Christ, and the blood, are not in the sacrament; we answer them, saying, Speakest thou this of thyself, or hast others told thee? If you are a believer, you know where salvation lies, and then the word of God has so much power over you that you do not inquire about the flesh. But if others have told you that we are of the same opinion, I say to them that in this I mean the same thing that the church of Christ means. The same allows this question niendert 4): whether the essential body of Christ is bodily and essential in the sacrament of thanksgiving? For if you bring and introduce these elements to the world, it will reproach you with this buckler or shield: The flesh is not useful. If then the flesh is not useful, what dost thou dispute about the flesh? And though thou shalt cry, O heavens and earth, yea, even stars and waters, I will not speak otherwise than this: The flesh is of no use at all. Why then art thou (actually to speak) thus more forward than careful? This is supposed to be a brazen 5) wall: The flesh is of no use at all. Go now, and bring in all the weapons, 6) banker's rooks, counterbloods, cats and all kinds of projectiles! Still so it is so impossible that you

1) So put by us instead of: "report".
2) So put by us instead of: "gethan hqben".

3) Compare the note to § 39.

4) i. e. nowhere.

5) In the old edition: ehrine.

6) "Gewerf" - projectiles; the following words are provincial names of various kinds of guns.

the wall umwerfest that you do not like them now bidmen 1).

(47) Therefore, this sacrament must be spoken of or held differently, neither theologians have yet recognized, whose opinion has been contradicted by all sensibility, reason, and understanding, as well as by faith itself. For one should not dissolve here 2) those who hear speak: I have always firmly believed that in the sacrament I eat the essential body, or the bodily and sensitive flesh of Christ. As if by such speech they might persuade someone to think that he feels what he has never felt. But when they speak: All things must be done with faith; therefore it may not be denied, but firmly believed, that we feel the flesh of the body. To this we give this answer: We know well what faith is, and what feeling is: but if thou knowest not this, or thinkest that we know not, thou dost not bring darkness to our light. Faith is made in our hearts by God's Spirit, so that we feel in it; 3) for it is not a dark thing, namely, that it is a relative of the mind: although we do not feel it with the sensibilities 4).

48 But now they come, and if they think that faith is a free turning of our minds to every impossible thing, they pretend that we believe with unmoved faith that here is the sensitive flesh, but they are mistaken in two ways. First, they think that faith comes from the judgment and election of man. 5) Here they are thus deceived, that though faith is a hope and confidence, and reaches things 6) which are altogether far from the sensibilities, yet it does not come from our judgment or election, but the things to which we put our hope, which make us have all our hope in them. For if we would believe by our choice or counsel, all men by their own power, even the unbelieving and ungodly, would believe. But if faith does not come from emotions or reason, nor is it based on

If a person is not sure how to do something, he can easily learn how to do it the other way around. 7)

(49) Secondly, they err in drawing faith even to sensible things, saying that it brings certainty through them, which is not at all necessary. For things that are felt with the senses owe nothing to faith; for how can anyone hope or believe that which he sees? Now these are sensible things, which, if they are added to the sensibilities, are felt. Let us now see how these two opinions may stand with each other. We believe by faith that here is the bodily and sensitive flesh of Christ. And by faith one trusts in things that are far from all sensibilities. Now all bodily things are so sensitive that where they are not felt, they are not bodily. Therefore it must follow that believing and feeling strive against each other to the highest 8).

(50) Therefore, notice how clumsy it is to say, "I believe that I eat the sensible and corporeal flesh. For if it is corporeal, there is no need of faith, for it is felt; and the things that are felt have no need of faith, because they will certainly know it by feeling. But again, if you believe that you are eating flesh, what you believe may not be flesh or sensible. Therefore you speak nothing else but a miraculous speech. Here theologians pretended that the sensibilities do not feel, namely, that the bread was flesh; for if it were, it would have to be with sensibility, not with faith; for faith is not of the things or in the things that belong to the sensibilities.

(51) We also think that those should not be heard who understand that this opinion is not only gross, but also contrary to God and without reason, and yet recognize or judge in this way: We eat the bodily and true flesh of Christ, but spiritually. For they do not yet understand that they cannot be one body, uno, eaten spiritually. For flesh and spirit stand thus contrary to one another, that [if] thou takest [one of them] 9) for thyself, the other may not be. If that which is spoken of is a spirit, it must certainly follow that it is not* a body. But if it is a body, he who hears the speech is sure that it is not a spirit. Dannenher

1) i.e. to make quivering.

2) "one should not dissolve them" - one should not listen to them.

3) Marginal gloss: Here, to feel is not taken to mean to comprehend, but to become aware of.

4) Marginal gloss: Sensations are taken for the five senses.

5) Side note: Theologians do not know what faith is.

6) "Things" put by us instead of: "a thing".

7) In the old edition: erring.

8) In the issues: ströben.

9) Thus put by us instead of: "neither thou takest for thyself"; neither - which of the two.

Eating the flesh spiritually is no different than saying firmly that what is one body is also one spirit.

52 I have introduced this bouquet from the philosophers' art or fountain against those who have made philosophiam (which should be avoided, as Paul warns in Col. 2) a master and teacher of the divine word, so that they may see clearly how well they consider their judgments. In short, faith does not force sensibility to miss, to feel what it does not feel; rather, it draws to invisible things and imprisons all its hopes in them. For faith does not walk or graze in sensible things, nor does it have anything in common with them. Dearly beloved, observe what blessed or happy thing may come of it, if thou thinkest that thou eatest here the bodily and sensible flesh of Christ; or, as others say, thou eatest the bodily flesh spiritually, thou shalt no doubt understand that nothing else comes of it, neither entanglement, awe, and (that I may speak freely) suspicion, which therefore also begins to doubt of the other certain and most holy things of faith. Although the clever fellows also say that this miraculously incomprehensible eating of the sensitive and bodily flesh would be a fortification of faith, and they also put it forward as a miraculous sign, which no one felt. Dear, who has ever thought up such a mockery? and that before the eyes of those who adhere with their minds to the highest and true God? who also, as soon as they remembered their faith, saw that there was no need for such unbelievable things. For what did God ever promise to those who believed that they would eat flesh here? Did not all those who truly believed understand that salvation lay in this, if they relied on the mercy of God, of whom we have an undoubted sign and pledge, the only begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ? What do you think now, that this subtle poem (yes, behind itself!), which is spoken with words alone (for no mind can understand it, nor does faith indicate it, as has been heard), has any power with the faithful? Nothing with God.

(53) Then it followed that all who were truly godly either did not believe such things here, or, when they were urged to believe, they fled with their minds, even though they were lapsed with their mouths; indeed, they believed that it was so, as the ungodly prescribe; for who (whom one thus introduces into unbelievable things) has not given flight thus: I will not search it 1) (expendam), but [will] the fathers.

1) Instead of the words: "I do not want to explore it" in the old edition, "I do not want to weigh the thing."

and so often the nudges 2) of truth spoke thus: This is ever a miracle! How is it always that you are forced to believe that you see well, [that it] may not be so; that even Christ himself taught, [that the words] should be understood spiritually, since the Jews also could not understand it?

54 But now the theologians pretend that it happens bodily and sensitively, which I neither feel nor realize. Has not every one thus spoken to himself? It is not proper for you to look anxiously at things? But the theologians did thus learn [i.e. teach] to flee, that the truth might the less 3) come forth and be understood. But those who have been godless have not left themselves to Christ; much less have they given thanks to him for the salvation he has given us. What else have the theologians done but to cast us out with their iniquity, so that it is impossible for them to have believed it themselves, even though they say it a thousand times? For faith is a gift of God. If God has never given such a gift, he has not caused it to be believed. But that he did not prescribe such things is evident, for the flesh is not useful at all.

(55) This is also the very brightest and firmest thing, that we have all admonished our minds in regard to this bodily-spiritual (that is, I must speak, whether I want to or not) food, mostly for the reason that truth conquers all; and the cold, fearful mind would not resist, because it saw another commanded by the pope. Where then did this call or exhortation come from, since no other thing can so exhilarate our minds as the chewing of the divine word? As David also testifies in the 118th [Vulgate, or 119th according to the Hebrew] Psalm: "O Lord, how sweet are your words to my throat? they are honey to my mouth. And again: The word or commandment of God is bright and enlightens the eyes. And: O Lord, thy word is a candle unto my feet, and a light unto my footsteps.

(56) If the curtain, which diminishes the splendor of the face of Moses, has been accepted, what was the reason why we all fled in contemplation of this meal? For if it has reason in the power of the divine word, it should also have the common way with other words of God,

2) "The nudges of truth" will probably mean: those who shut up the truth.

3) Here we have erased the words "the truth" because they are too much.

that the more it was acted upon, the more it became clear and pleasant. Thus it is found that, since faith is a perfectly sweet and joyful thing of the soul, and this bodily sensible food either weighs down the mind, or makes it sad, it is brought forth neither from the opinion of unrighteous men, nor from the word of God. However, so that we do not do anyone too short, some might want to feign ignorance of their guilt, for the sake of Christ's words, which we call consecrationis, that is, of consecration, because they publicly speak thus, pointing to the bread: This is my body 2c. Of which we will now speak.

Now we have (as we hope to God) conversely the unflavored opinions of the bodily flesh. In this alone we want to have conquered that the opinion [which] is given that one eats in this remembrance or thanksgiving the bodily and sensitive or touchable flesh of Christ is not only ungodly, but also foolish and cruel. Unless you dwell with the anthropophagi, that is, with man-eaters. Let each one be free to choose the way in which he understands spiritual food; but that this may not be in our favor, but in Christ's, until such time as one shall consider the opinion which we shall bring forth. Then it will be proper for each one of us to know what the Lord will give him, for we neither like nor want to prescribe the law to anyone.

58) So I testify to the one Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who knows all hearts, that the things we will soon bring forth will be done solely for the sake of truth experience, 1) We well know the insatiable thirst for honor of the old Adam. 2) Which days of suffering (if we ever had them) 3) we could have satisfied long ago with the favor of the greatest princes of Christendom; which we nevertheless want to conceal so stiffly that we do not proclaim (as some do) with silent rejection. We also know how difficult it is to stand up against an opinion that is outdated in all people. For we are Christians for the most part, that we want to be seen how we have done such a great thing, when we have not accepted the outward things.

1) The translator has lost the construction. He wants to say: The following things we want to bring forward only for the sake of the investigation of the truth.

2) Marginal gloss: Ueppige Ehre thut den Gelehrten viel zu Leid.

3) So put by us instead of: "if we ever loved him". Zwingli wants to say: If I had ever had this disease of ambition, I would have been able to satisfy it through the favor of the greatest princes.

We have protected the things we call sacraments, although we never, or even seldom, seek our life in them, and strengthen what is dilapidated in them; 4) although we should take care of them above all things, so that we come closest to the model Christ, whose name we have. Therefore it is a dangerous thing to enter into such a controversy, since you must have so many enemies, and they are quite cruel and ungracious.

59) For he who is able to rage here in the most imprudent way wants to be considered the most godly. But what is to be done for him? The law says that if you find an erring ox that is your enemy's, you must send it home to him. And if any man see that the whole world erreth, shall he not warn? And if one sees that in our time so many Hercules come forth fearlessly, and bring out everything that has been taught harmfully so far? The heavenly king has recommended many pounds to many, so that some of them may diligently advertise, but some of them may fill up. 5) So he has also given us a penny, whose care burns us all the way, warning us for and for that we should not let him be put off. 6) And as others sail fearlessly through the great sea of the holy scriptures, because all their harness is strong and firm, the sail boom, the sail pole, the rope, the nail, the oar, the fore and aft shoals, 7) the sides also; so they bring forth great goods everywhere.

But our boat, 8) so badly fastened as it is, forces us to navigate carefully by the land and safely guide the small, undecorated ones. Therefore, we will also take care that everything we produce in this is so strong and firm that it cannot easily be torn or broken. We also hereby ask all who dispute under Christ not to judge before they have 9) heard the whole transaction. Accordingly, we want to bear amicably, God grant! whatever judgment they make 10); for if they keep with us, there is no doubt that we will be honorable; but if they in turn spank us, condemn us, curse us, they will do it (if they are in their right mind) by the power of the Scriptures.

4) In the old edition: vestnen.

5) Who - are lazy.

6) Instead of "put off", perhaps "rust" would like to be read.

7) In the old edition: "in front and behind horror". From the context one recognizes that front and rear part of the ship must be meant.

8) Weidling - weak vehicle. - Who? is probably as much as barge.

9) So put by us instead of: "and".

10) In the old edition: joch.

Therefore, we owe them no small thanks, namely, if they will lead us from the wrong to the right path.

(61) For we are of a mind to be exceedingly willing to loosen 1) and obey him who warns us rightly with heavenly teaching. But those who try the matter with cries will do it no less in vain, because Hercules Hylam 2) prepares. For we are hardened by the cries: This is heretical, erroneous, injurious to the ears of Christians. For the cries have so often blown up our ears that they have made a drive. Therefore let no one speak here: Who would suffer this? the whole world is of a different opinion 2c. But let each one consider for himself: It hath often happened, that a whole nation hath erred, even to a few; as it was in the days of Noah. Elijah also thought he was of one mind; but Micah stood of one mind against all the company of the wicked prophets.

(62) The most truthful things have always been known least of all; so perhaps even those who do not keep the remembrance or thanksgiving in the common way do not do so unjustly. Therefore, as Moses counsels, I will see what this fire will do.

(63) But I faithfully forget 3) before my God and Lord Jesus Christ, and before all creatures, 4) that I am more inclined to the meaning of Christ's words, which we will bring forth, than to the other one, which we have held until now. Although I freely speak nothing, but I wonder if [someone] would bring forth something clearer and more conformable to the faith, that I will embrace it with great thanks. '

(64) So we have said that the ignorance of Christ's words, "This is my body," led us astray, because we thought we were eating the flesh in the flesh and in the flesh. And if we had considered the meaning of the words more from the holy Scriptures, neither from the most ambitious of men's decrees or judgments, we would never have fallen into so many clumsy questions. Nor should these words, that is my body, have been so handled with unwashed hands, that we had not beforehand searched all the nooks and crannies of the scriptures, and seen what sense they

which they would not bear; as we have seen in other things.

(65) For example, if at this time some admit to works, but that is by the grace of God alone, they do not do so without Scripture. For there are no fewer places in Scripture that ascribe to works, but that which is of God's grace alone, than those who ascribe it all to God's grace. But which sense or opinion shall overcome here? The one that faith states. Thus faith says: We are a work of God; we breathe or live from Him, we are moved in Him, and are in Him; we walk or walk according to Him; so also all things are His, and we are useless servants who are not sufficient for any thing; but all our sufficiency is from God. Now those who hold this meaning or opinion, easily dissolve themselves where they fall into the span 6) or trade of works in Scripture; for they see that it is of God's grace and kindness that He imputes to us works which yet He forfeits, yea, that the work is His, not ours; and therefore safely proceeds through all Scripture.

66) So also in this place it should have been done. Now after 7) Christ has said to the Jews, "The flesh is not useful at all" (for the Greek "ō-- oūs^" is able to do this much), no mouth should be allowed 8) to speak any more about the flesh. [to] speak of the flesh, especially when it is seen clearly that the Jews also offended against the flesh, and Christ met their offense with the words: the flesh is of no use at all; so that no one may now pretend to be unequal in this matter. For nothing else offended the Jews, but that they thought that one must eat the bodily and delicate flesh. So Christ comes to the rescue of their error and says: the flesh is of no use at all, the spirit makes the mind alive; he has spoken salutary words, namely, that whoever relies on him or on him, that is, that we speak, believes that he 9) will give his body and blood for us, and he will have eternal life. The words are short, but from them breathe the heavenly spirit and life.

Why then have we so unawares fallen into such a hard mind and opinion, when we would have such a strong blessing or power, that all sorcery of human gall 10) might be seen? Is not the word of Christ

1) i.e. listen.

2) Hylas, a companion of Hercules on the Argonauts' voyage, was robbed by the nymphs in Mysia, where he wanted to draw water, therefore Hercules' calling and searching for him was in vain.

3) "to forget" - to confess, to pray.

4) i.e. creature.

5) "Abweg" set by us instead of: "Allweg".

6) Chip - Dispute.

7) "now" put by us instead of: and.

8) gedüren - to dare, to submit.

9) So set by us instead: The but.

10) Galstrung - spoilage; galstrig - rancid.

such a barrier, 1) that a believing mind neither should nor may jump over? Is it not a cord by which one levels everything that is rough and uneven, where one is of righteous faith in God? For he who has grasped the head and sum of the matter, namely, that all those who have trusted in Christ have been given power to become sons of God; yes, they now recognize themselves to be sons of God and heirs through the same unifying Spirit; yes, those of them who are thus accomplished in faith 2) will shun, just as the Jews do, when he hears the words: This is my body, when he hears Christ speak so publicly next to it: The flesh is of no use at all?

68. Thus, O just and merciful God, you let us fall into darkness after we have ceased to trust in you, so that we are blind in the midst of light, and grope like the blind! For if our faith had been right, it would have dispelled the darknesses in the same way as the visible sun dispels the night. O how inexperienced are thy judgments? For as it hath befitted thy righteousness to smite us unbelievers with such blindness; so also it hath befitted thy gentleness to open our eyes again, and to lift them up unto the light, as it is said of eagles, [that] they do unto their young. That after we feel that we may suffer the light, we also recognize the good deed, that we could not have opened our eyes against the light out of our strength; unless you, who also call things that are not yet, had called us into your wonderful light.

69. therefore the said words of Christ, the flesh is of no use at all, compel all understanding into the obedience of God; so that henceforth thou shalt not understand the words, that is my body, any way, neither mayest thou understand them from the flesh or sensitive body; as it is opened. For this reason it is now necessary to see what or what meaning they must have. For (so that we do not leave this behind) this clumsy counterstatement: Why do we not force as more these words: the flesh is not useful at all, according to the prescription of those: this is my corpse? So, that we recognize those before being understood according to these, neither force these according to that force. Yes, the counter-accusation is not valid. First, because the words that Christ speaks there: the flesh is not useful.

is not useful at all, are exceedingly clear, that no one may conquer that there is another or significant sense in them. Secondly, that faith admits that this is the true meaning which the words bear. For who would believe that Christ would have thrust us into darkness, in which he did not let the Jews remain? Christ is the light, the gospel is a light. Who then can think that we are forced into those things from which Christ led the Jews away, so that they would not be afraid? Lastly, that the sensibilities 3) here be not so much repugnant and unwilling, as that the false faith may boast that it believes that bodily flesh is eaten. For the sensibilities may not be persuaded to rejoice, they feel that they feel no way; for they poorly yield to faith, believing the things which they do not feel and experience; though nothing is expected of them that is above their law and nature. But if this fictitious faith, which thus judges the sensitive flesh, forcibly strikes the sensibilities, so that they are forced against their nature, they feel what they do not feel, they never become obedient. And if you force them with violence and rage, so that they are forced against their will [to] rejoice, which they do not feel, then they also cry out eternally against it.

Now we come back to the track. We must see what is the right natural sense of these words of Christ, because they may not have the gross and physical sense.

In this time of ours, there have come forth those who have said that the symbolic, that is, other-meaningful sense of this little word "that" must be explored. 4) Whose faith I boast, if it is not fictitious. (For God knows the hearts; we poor people must now judge from what we see. Yes, I praise their faith highly; not because they may act these words unwise enough, but because they have seen that it may not exist that we understand a bodily flesh here. But which charybden fear forced them to approach the Scyllam, I will not say here, because it does not belong here.

Seventy-two: Now when they read in three evangelists and in Paul, Jesus took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, saying: Take, eat, this is my body!" they argue.

1) In the old edition: "such a cabinet that the" 2c.
2) performed - reported; also in the opposite sense: brought out of the right direction, reversed. Here it will probably be taken in the former sense.

3) Marginal gloss: Sensations are seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, tasting.

4) Here Zwingli comes to Carlstadt's interpretation. Compare the next following marginal gloss.

They, the meaning or pointing is changed here so that this pronoun or pointing word does not show 1) the bread, which he took, broke, and offered; but the body of Christ, which he himself received. And no doubt their meaning or opinion (for we have not read anything of their writings, except a very small booklet) is that Christ wanted to show the disciples that his body was the true one, 2) of which the prophets said much before how it should be used. Their opinion may well help that Christ John thus said on the sixth: The bread that I will give you is my body, which is given for the life of the world. For they would like to present here: "Behold, the body, which I told you long ago must be killed, is now accepted for slaughter; but let all fear and delay be removed; here I am; I myself present myself. And lest you fall into error, and think that because I am the Son of God, I will not thus put this body to death, but will quickly blow out and present another, as has often been seen to be done by the angels; yea, lest ye think (for human invention is sacrilegious) that I will present another body for him: I tell you publicly and clearly that I will give the body, which you see before you, for the redemption of the world.

I want to say with kind leave that I think of the words that we will also see very clearly to be the right thing. If we want to forcefully bend this little word "this" to Christ, then all the action, which is so fearfully described by all, will grow cold and perish; that it must be against God, who meant that it was so diligently expressed in vain: Jesus took the bread, passed it on, gave thanks, broke it and gave it to the disciples, and said: Take and eat, that my body may be given for you. For what need was there of so great a proclamation, which the evangelists have so actually presented, that even to this day, as often as we hear the words, we think we see Christ Himself acting and speaking all things? Yes, why did Christ need so much armament, if he did not want to speak anything else, neither that his body now stands between the guest 4) and the enemy? Does he make them eat according to the custom of hospitable people (now had

5) as if he wanted to say: Be happy and eat? To what does it belong: He has spoken good things over, he has given thanks, he has broken, he has given? Did they not eat, Christ put before them or offered? 6) Therefore we are forced here to leave all action and speech (which is ungodly and ungodly), or else to understand badly that what Christ gave with such diligence and splendor was a sign of his corpse.

74) Nor does it prevent that *panis*, that is, bread, is **masculini generis to the** Latins and Greeks, and corpus, that is, corpse, *neutrius*; for such speech you will find without number very near in all tongues; with which speeches one reaches from art 7) to matter. Example: Take the cup, for this is the best gold, which is among all the king's crockery. See how here cup, man's craft, 8) signifies the art, and the gold the matter; for the cup is made of art, but the gold is of which the cup is made. So one goes from the art or handicraft to the matter, so that one recognizes by the things deliciousness. Therefore one would give to the old opinion with this argument before weapons, neither would break from the hands. Yes, if we fell into the disease of word-fighting; then 9) the meat-eaters would say: Behold, in this speech one goes from bread to matter, from art to body; and the meaning is: The bread is to matter half the same body of Christ.

(75) Although here, too, there would be deceit (which we must say, however, so that no one takes it in hand), for it happens in common speech that one goes from the art to the matter, which the laborers have seized, 10) to work in it. Therefore, one should go from the bread to the flour 11) and speak: Bread is flour. 11) But we have not said these things, which are more subtle, nor firm, because we put one power into them; but learn that such speeches are found in all tongues. From this, then, it follows that that argument, which was taken from change of gender (*generis*), is stupid.

The third. If Christ adds: Do this in remembrance of me! Dear, what are the disciples told to do in remembrance of him? If you say, "Eat," we will answer in the affirmative: Where will

5) The brackets are set by us.

6) "bote" probably as much as: nōthigte.

7) Art here is in the meaning: that which is made by art.

8) i.e. cup, which is of masculine gender.

9) After "then" we have deleted "it".

10) Here we have deleted the word "has".

11) In the old edition: "meal".

1) Marginal gloss: Insxts odtsnāitur variatio æmonatrutionis.

2) Maybe: would be?

3) In the old edition: den.

4) "Gäche" perhaps: a steep slope.

Do we then throw down the words "this is my body", which stand between them? Does it not seem to you to be wonderfully sacrilegious, since all the actions and speeches that precede and follow these words make it clear that what is served to be eaten here is the body of Christ, even though it is a sign, and what is said to be done in remembrance, expresses the whole cause of the meal? Does it not seem sacrilegious to you [that] the words which are between them are pressed elsewhere? It seems to me that one should not do such violence to words, even though faith does not doubt the other meaning.

So the whole burden does not lie on this little pointer "that", but on another, which is nothing greater after the letter number, namely on the little word "is", which is taken in the holy scripture not in few places for "means". Here I hear (so that I say this for the first time) that the Wiclef before times, and the Waldenses still today hold the opinion that this word "is" is taken here for "means" 2); whose reason of the scripture I have not seen, however. For it may well be that they are right in the opinion, but that they mean or understand right, they do not prove right. Which may have been a cause that their opinion was rejected as erroneous. For we too have experienced, by the grace of God, in many struggles that we have had with some of the meaning of the holy Scriptures, that some have allowed themselves to be forced into some things, and have given way to others to answer for, solely because they could not rightly understand nor prove [the] righteous opinion 3).

78 Therefore, I have ignored these cries: He is Viking, Waldensian, heretical, want to draw out the places from the Scriptures, 4) where no one may deny, this word "is" badly be put for "means". Accordingly, we want to prove brightly that also in this place "is" must be taken for "means".

In the first book of Moses, in the 41st chapter, Joseph, the interpreter of Pharaoh's dream, says: "The seven beautiful cows, and the seven full ears of corn, are seven fruitful years, and have a power of dream. Dear! how? are seven fat cows seven years? No. But the cows he saw "mean" seven fruitful years. What power of words denied before no one

He may become, he is not right-minded. So it is without contradiction that "are" is taken here for "mean". Soon after the words followed Also the seven dry and lean cows, which went up after those, and the seven thin ears of corn, which were spoiled by burning 5) are the seven years of the future famine 2c. See again "are" taken for "mean".

80 Now let us come to the New Testament. When Christ, in Luke 8, by the likeness of the seed falling into the earth, signified the manifold difference of those who received the word, and the disciples did not understand it, but asked what he meant by the likeness, he spoke to the last: The seed (of which they had heard much), yes, the seed is the word of God. Now no seed is the word of God; but by this word he signified the word of God: but here "is" is put for "signifies." Soon after: But he that fell into the thorns are the 2c. That is, but whom I have spoken falling into the thorns, signifies the 2c. Soon after: But he that fell into the good ground is the 2c., that is, the seed which I said would fall into the good ground is the 2c. So Matth. 13. is put in the same simile "is" for "means", although the speech is a little stranger.

In the same place, when he opens the likeness of the wheel sown 6) between them, he says: The field is the world. Now the field is not the world, but means in this likeness the world. There: the good seed are the sons of the kingdom, that is, the good seed means the children of the kingdom. There: the weeds are the children of the evil one; that is, they mean the children of the evil one. There: but the enemy who sowed them is the devil; that is, he signifies the evil enemy. There: the harvest is the end of the world, but the reapers are the angels; in which both places "is" and "are" are taken for "means" and "signify".

82) I mean, it is enough brought forth, so that we prove, "is" and its kind for "means" to be put. But some of them break out in such an ineffable way 7): If we want to force every word to mean every thing in such a way, nothing will remain whole in the holy scriptures; for it is forfeited that the wicked will press or force some sense into any words; so it is necessary that mau

1) "zeichlich" - to a character.

2) Marginal gloss: Behold, how great things are often attached to small things!

3) In the old edition: preserve.

4) So put by us instead of: "will".

5) So put by us instead of: "Brenner" after Gen. 41, 23: .wersenget".

6) Rade - weed.

7) inhospitable - inhospitable.

answer them a little sweeter, neither throw them. Who is ignorant that no word is not, it is sometimes 1) (like a plant) taken out of its own soil and put in a foreign one, since it is much more delicious, neither if you left it in its own soil, that is, in its proper custom? Which custom 2) is common to the Hebrews above all others, as being publicly invented by all the speech of Christ, even though it is described in a foreign (namely Greek) tongue.

83 Take a most rejected word, which is beloved to you: dung. Now Christ, Luc. 13, introduces the arborist, who prefigures the idle barren tree, and promises to put dung around it: how could he more sweetly signify a mild minister of the word? Which ministry is undoubtedly to nourish some idiots with all artistry and to commend them to the Lord with fervent prayer that he will not judge them according to their merit.

Take another word: stone. Is this word not in a more honest place, if it means the stone of Christ, or if it means a useless stone standing upright in a field or in a wall?

So also the effects are drawn into another sense. Did not Paul use this effect "to walk" wisely when he says to the Galatians: "You walked well" for: you lived or walked well and with good conscience? Also when Christ our Savior says, "I am the door," was he a door? Now he must be a door according to the impatience of those who do not want to tolerate the words and effects of other borrowings. So tell what kind of door he is, a wooden, stone, ivory or horned door, as one reads in Plinio and Homero? I am the way. I am a vine. I am a light 2c. The words conquer, it pleases us or not, that we are forced to give them another meaning. For is he a vine? No; but he holds himself like a vine.

Therefore, one should not cry out so clumsily: Behold, dear brethren, the thing befalls you, they want to deprive you of your language. If only we could not conduct our daily speeches in an orderly manner 4) without needing to borrow words from somewhere else and borrowing them from somewhere else. But faith must teach us to see in what meaning we should take any speech or word. But

We would be unfair to Christ and to ourselves if we understood him to be a lamb or a ram (John 1 and 21) and a fatted calf (Luke 15). Now when he says, "I am a vine," he says nothing else but: I bear or hold myself against mine own as a vine. Who now will stir up this understanding? Who can complain that they are doing what is not right?

So also in this place one should interrogate the faith. If he states in this speech, that is my body, that one should let this word "is" remain in its natural meaning, then one should badly follow the faith, and fear nothing at all those who [as] we see, out of ungodliness may subject [themselves] to all things; for they may not snatch the truth out of the hands of the godly, God grant as they wish. But may the. But if faith cannot bear the meaning that is found in some of the ways above, and is especially firmly opened with the single word: the flesh is not useful at all, then in this place the little word "is" (short of it) must have another meaning, God grant what the unlearned and unbelievers cry out.

Therefore, according to our understanding, this word "is" is here taken to mean, although the understanding is not ours, but of the eternal God. For we cannot boast of any thing that Christ has not wrought in us, Romans 15. For we cannot boast of any thing that Christ has not wrought in us, Romans 15, as has been sufficiently proved above; that since faith is from the invisible God and reaches to the invisible God, it is a thing that must be prior to all of the five sensibilities, therefore everything that is a body, and that is sensible or touchable, has no way of belonging to faith: Now it follows that if we say that according to our understanding the word must be taken in that place, we do it only for the sake of some idiots; and not that this understanding may be truly reversed with some scriptures. For either the word "the flesh is not useful" must be rejected, which is spoken ungodly; for it is possible that heaven and earth perish not one letter from the word of God; or else this must be the single and simple sense.

89) Therefore let us see before all things how all things will turn out, if we take "is" for "means. And all things will turn out well, if we are also proved in the midst of 6) that also in this place "is" must be taken for "means"; which we had taken upon us to prove for the other. So it stands

5) In the old edition: in.

6) "mittenzu" - meanwhile.

1) i.e. sometimes.

2) Marginal gloss: To carry elsewhere, to take elsewhere from where or for each other.

3) So put by us instead of: run.

4) commensurate.

in Lucas, that 1) we will be satisfied from the evangelists: And when he had taken the bread, he gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it unto them, saying, This is my body given for you: do this in remembrance of me. Stand here, O faithful believing soul, which [thou] art caught with unskilful opinion; would well 2) all things be fitting, as one here takes nothing freely from them, nor does to them, and yet all things remain well fitting; that thou art astonished that thou hast not seen this meaning all along; yea, much more thou art astonished that the 2) beautiful whole body of this speech is so freely torn asunder by some: He took the bread, gave thanks, broke it and gave it to them, saying 2c.

90. See how [this passage] here gives nothing [but]: This (indeed, that I give you to eat) is a sign or emblem of my body, which is given for you; and this you shall do for the memorial of me. Does not this saying, "Do this in remembrance of me," publicly indicate that this bread is to be eaten in remembrance of him? Therefore the supper of Christ, as Paul calls it, is a remembrance of the death of Christ, not a remission of sins; for that alone is of the death of Christ. For he says: That I now command you to eat and drink shall be unto you an eminent sign, which ye shall all use, as ye eat and drink together, keeping my remembrance. Which remembrance Paul 1 Cor. 11 (so that nothing would break the proper sense and understanding, after he has put to both wine and bread: Do this in remembrance of me!) thus declares: "Therefore, as often as you eat the bread (which is a meaning, for none of them calls it meat) and drink the drink, proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes.

91 But what is proclaiming the death of the Lord? Nothing else, neither to proclaim, to proclaim, to give thanks for, to praise; as also Peter 1 [Epist.] Cap. 2: That ye may declare the virtue of him that called you out of darkness into his marvelous light. And therefore Paul teaches us that until the end of the world, when Christ shall come again and deal justly with the human race, we are to accomplish the remembrance of the death of Christ by proclaiming his death, that is, by proclaiming the virtue of Christ.

The Greeks also called the remembrance a thanksgiving.

Now we want to come to the words of the drink, in which this sense is found even brighter. But we want to indicate before that here [the] drinking vessel is taken for the drink; that which is kept, for that which is kept. So the words are: This drinking vessel the new testament, in my blood, which is poured out for you 2c.

Here we want to request each one in particular. 5) Drinking utensil (is said before that it is taken for drink). The New Testament (that is, privates 6) or covenant). We know well that the article x in the place as much [the-]may, as "is". Same as also in Hebrews Hif and Hu. For Paul in 1 Cor. 11. put them both, the article and the word "is": x SeaS^ xxxxx that is, the drink is the new testament; that nothing may break us. I have yet to speak "this" (without the little word "is"), lest any man should accuse me of iniquity; how is he now? Is the drink or the dishes the new testament? Yes, it is; the truth speaks thus. But the new testament has no power neither in the death nor in the blood of Christ. Yes, actually the death and blood of Christ are the testament or covenant itself. But if the drink also is the testament, then it follows that this drink is the true and sensitive blood of Christ; for the same, poured out for us, has sanctified the covenant, made it firm and solid.

(94) Here we have to step down from good people, even though we do not have a different mind from them, but the thing itself is different; think what would be the point, even though we are far from them, and the thing itself is different?

95 Therefore in this place the word testament or covenant is used elsewhere for the sign or emblem of the testament. Just as the letters are also called messages, although they neither breathe nor speak, but find them signs of the speeches and deeds of those who lived and spoke sth.

Another and clearer example. Letters are often taken for wills or legacies, as is often seen in Cicero. The will is opened and read 2c. Now the letters were not the will, but the goods that were made to one.

5) "request" - to inquire, to investigate.

6) "Made" - Legacy.

7) "nierinnen" - in nothing, nowhere in.

1) So put by us instead of: that.

2) In the old edition "they".

3) So put by us instead of: "the pretty whole body ... be torn".

4) So set by us instead: Word mark.

[For what good would it have been to have made a letter? But in the letters was understood, 1) what was made [bequeathed] to each one and had to be given.

97) So also in this place the testament is the death and blood of Christ; but the testamentary letter, in which the order and sum of the testament is comprehended, 1) is this sacrament, for in it we commemorate the death of Christ and the shedding of his blood, which good things they have brought us. And when we partake of the same good, we give thanks to God for the will or testament that He has made for us by grace. Then the testament (that is, the testamentary letter) is opened and read when the death of Christ is recognized, proclaimed, praised and thanked. But then the testament is divided and torn up, when every man trusts in the death of Christ; for so he misses the inheritance that is made to him.

98. But that this potion, or vessel, is thus taken for a sign of the true testament, is indicated by the words themselves, when he says, The potion a new testament (that is, the sign of the testament and the letter of privation) is in my blood. He does not say: The potion which is the new testament is my blood; but: The drink a new testament is in my blood. Now where one thing is in another, there is a difference between them, as between two things; which the sophists call realiter, that is, as distinct things. But those things that are divided from one another as distinct things can never come together to be one thing. For the thing that is in another is not the thing in which it is.

99) Now what was the cause, that after the other evangelists, Matthew and Marcus, had spoken? This is my blood of the new testament, that therefore Lucas and Paul speak: The drink of a new testament is in my blood? There would seem to be a great difference, for those call it a blood of the testament, but these a testament of the blood, that is, a letter of privy and a sign of the testament, which has power in the blood of Christ. All things were done with diligence; for Lucas and Paul, who wrote after those two, have impressed something light upon their words. For when they saw the words: The drink is my blood, enough to be dry or arid to some understanding, although they were understood clearly enough by the ancients (as one may notice in Tertulliano, which will come after). But when they (Lucas and Paul) judged that

1) In the old edition: out of print.

in the future not everyone would understand this speech thus: The potion is a sign of my blood, which blood is a blood of the new testament (for so much can the article xx), they have formed the speech differently: This drink is the new testament, that is, this is the new testament's drink, which new testament has power in my blood. For Matthew and Marcus said: of the new testament; but which Lucas and Paul called: the new testament. Then it may be seen that they spoke "the new testament" for "it is a sign of the new testament".

100) Just as the letter is called a testament, in which the things bequeathed 2) are understood, and the emperor is called the images of the emperor; from this it follows that it is a sign of the new testament. This sense becomes brighter, if we will actually consider the articles in all four 3) 2c.

101) So then the words of the drink stand thus: The drink is a new testament in my blood; since "in my blood" can have no other sense than: which testament has power in my blood: so it is evident that the words of the bread are also to be taken and understood in the same way. This (which I tell you to eat) is a sign, or means my body, which is given up for you. But here we desire that no man be vexed in the fearful inquiries of the words; for we put our ground not therein, but in the one word, The flesh is not at all profitable; which word alone is strong enough to compel that "is" be put in the place of signifying, or signifying, or "is a sign," although otherwise the speech would not have the sense to be understood at all.

One should also visit Paul in other places; 4) so that we may understand more clearly which way the faithful used this sacrament in the times of the apostles. In the first Corinthians, on the 10th, he writes: "The drink of grace (that is, of the free gift and honor of God), which we bless (that is, which we must also give thanks to Him), 5) is it not the common of the blood of Christ? This is so much said: If we drink with one another of the drink that Christ has given us as a sign of His free

2) In the old edition: "made" and immediately after "out of print".

3) Marginal gloss: Here is something in Latin original that can not be well translated; meets the language.

4) d. i. examine.

5) Marginal gloss: *dsueäiotio*, a free gift, *vsnoäwsrs*, give thanks, is the right kind in the writing of words.

Is he not whom we alone drink, who have the blood of the testament in common? He therefore that drinketh here openeth himself to all the brethren, that he is of their number that trust in the blood of Christ: and that this is the certain natural sense of these words, some certain signs do prove, which follow soon after.

103. The bread that we break (understand, among one another), is it not the sharing of the body of Christ? That is, if we break bread among ourselves, is it not that we all, who are the body of Christ, open ourselves to one another and open ourselves up, that we may be of the number who let themselves be joined to Christ? Now follows a sign, by which it is understood that this is the right meaning, and that this word "body" is here taken differently 1) neither for the sign of the body of Christ, namely for the church, when he says: "For we are one loaf, one body, the whole multitude; for we all share with one another of one loaf.

We see here in the 11th chapter that the custom of this sacrament in Paul's time was like this. The disciples of Christ came together and initially ate the whole supper with each other. Then some of them had them carried to the table, splendidly and deliciously, after which shame was born for those who did not have such things. Some ate in time, some delayed it, from which it happened that some of them were already full and waiting for the festive bread or the bread of thanksgiving, but some had not yet eaten when the bread and drink of remembrance were carried around. For the sake of abuse, Paul taught them to eat at home and not to despise the church of God, that is, the congregation, and not to eat the bread of remembrance at home, but the daily supper.

But when they were gathered together to give thanks and praise to the Lord, they were admonished that they should not eat without a show, for then he says, "Man proves himself. 2c. For whoever eats of the sign shows himself to be a member of the church of Christ; therefore it is not fitting for him to eat of the sacrifices of the idols, nor to sit at the table, who has sat in the great supper of Christ (for Paul reaches here in this place, 1 Cor. 10). For those who eat here become One Body and One Bread; that is, all those who come together here (for the reason of proclaiming the death of the Lord, that is, to give thanks and praise) and eat this Meaningful or Significant Bread,

to present themselves as the body of Christ, that is, members of his church and community; which church, having one faith and eating one substantial bread, is one body and one bread.

From this it is evident that Christ has fed and watered us for the reason that, as each of these priceless berries and sticks of flour come together in one body, we are also joined together in one faith and one body. Therefore also the Greeks called this feast and supper 3), that is, the joining together, because with this sign or supper they were joined together into one body, just as they were otherwise joined together bodily.

The places in the stories of the messengers, which are about the breaking of the bread, serve almost well to this sense and understanding, if one is to understand them, as many think of them, from the common of the important bread. And truly, no one can contradict, it must be understood Acts 2 the first opinion of the breaking of bread of this significant bread, because it says: And they all firmly adhered to the teaching of the apostles, and the common, and the breaking of bread and praying. For soon after this he speaks of the bread, that is, of the bodily food, as they needed it in every house.

From this it appears publicly that the apostles used this bread of remembrance, as is now shown, as you may well judge from the things that go before and after. Then also, as bright as the sun shines, it is evident that circumcision and the paschal lamb, both of which could not be used without blood, were turned into the two things acceptable to man by Christ, who with his blood represents all blood; by which we see that the roughness of the law was turned into the goodness of grace. To the law, which was sanctified with the blood of cattle, was committed the blood of circumcision. To the Lord Christ, who sanctified the eternal testament with his own blood, we are committed or attached with the superfusion of water; by this we learn that the sacrificial fire is extinguished with the blood of Christ.

The paschal feast was a great wedding and memorial, in which they thanked God for having redeemed them from the Egyptian power. But so that no footprint of the bloody law remained, he (Christ) wanted his feast or remembrance to be celebrated with the emblem of wine and bread, which are two things for all people.

3) In the old edition: genämet.

1) Marginal gloss: The body is taken differently and differently.
2) i. furthermore.

are friendly and useful to people. And according to such an understanding, baptism is our circumcision, and thanksgiving our Easter, that is, the feast, wedding and remembrance of our redemption.

(110) From this it follows that this was a false faith, which taught that the use of this important bread cancels sin, because the one Christ cancels sin when he dies. Now he died only once, as is learned by the whole epistle to the Hebrews and Romans on the sixth. From this it follows that he, having died once, is able to go on into eternity and is strong enough to put away all the sin of the world. It has also been a false faith or doctrine that has pretended that this bread is a work or sacrifice that, offered daily, pays for our sin, as we have proven in other places with much labor. But in no place shorter neither against Hieronymum Emser Steinbocken; in which booklet¹⁾ we have closed the whole sum in two bad short accounts, which we also want to put here. But we want to speak here before, which we have also spoken there before.

From the book Antibulon, that is, Widerwehr, which Zwingli wrote in Latin Wider den Emser.

1. the new testament is eternal, as Isaiah 9. and Jeremiah 31. is learned: so also the blood, in which the new testament is founded and sprinkled, must be eternal; for the blood is the blood of the eternal Son of God, 1 Peter 1. Hebr. 9.

Now follow the two accounts. 1) The one blood of Christ takes away our sins; for he alone takes away the sin of the world, and hath reconciled all things with his blood, Col. 1. For if our sins had been put away any other way, Christ died in vain; and they that did eat him were yet hungry, and they that drank him were none the less thirsty; but which be far from all believers, that they should remember such things! For when he (Christ) was lifted up from the earth, he drew all things to him. Nor is sin accepted without blood, Heb. 9. 2) Now the blood of Christ is not offered up more than once²⁾, for it is the eternal blood of the eternal Son of God, Heb. 9. He is offered up once with His own blood.

entered into the holy places. 3) It follows that the blood of Christ, once offered, endures forever to pay for all the sins of all men.

3) On the other hand, notice: 1) Christ is sacrificed only when he suffers, sheds his blood, dies, for all things are equally valid; which I prove: Paul speaks to Hebrews 9. thus: Not that he sacrificed himself thickly³⁾, for if that were the case, then he must have suffered often from the beginning of the world. From this it is clear that sacrificing Christ is nothing else than suffering and dying for Christ. For Paul, when he says that there must be only one sacrifice, proves it for the reason that Christ died only once. From all of which it follows that Christ alone is sacrificed when he dies. For sacrifice follows death and occurs after death, for the sacrifice is not accomplished until that which is sacrificed is killed. 2) Christ may henceforth die no more, suffer no more, shed no more blood, Rom. 6, 9. f. Christ, who has risen from the dead, dies no more; death has no more power over him. For when he died once, he died for sin, and that only once; but when he lives, he lives. 3) Thus it follows that Christ may henceforth no longer be sacrificed, for he may no longer die.

(4) Hereby it is revealed how the Roman bishop, and all his followers, have so flagrantly deceived the Christian race. For what good have they not done by keeping the mass⁴⁾? They were given whole kingdoms or territories to eat the Lord's supper for us, even though they did not eat it, but they pretended to sacrifice Christ for our sins; which way, if it had come from the apostles or most distinguished brothers of Christ, would have given it a form and a prestige. But since there is no reason at all for this custom of measuring 5) either from the institution of Christ or the apostles, why do we suffer in the temple, that is, in the congregation of God, such an impertinent crudity, 6) which so obviously breaks out to the dishonor of Christ? Why then do we not call all ministers of the Mass to desist from such a frightful dishonor of Christ? For if it is necessary that Christ be offered up daily, it must then be done and followed, that

¹⁾ What follows is from the cited book against Emser. The book Antibulon is therefore according to the time the earlier.

²⁾ In the old edition: einest.

³⁾ d. i. often.

⁴⁾ In the old edition: Mißhålten.

⁵⁾ Marginal gloss: vox ædiss siAnitwLtioni" ^i.e. this word has two meanings].

⁶⁾ d. i. Krämerei.

Christ, once sacrificed on the cross, is not enough for eternity. What greater thing can be called against such dishonor?

(5) Therefore all masses are to be laid down with care, and the Lord's Supper is to be used after the exposition of Christ; and yet no injustice is to be done to the sacristans, who were chosen for this office, but they are to be nourished with peace until they die. And therefore, in the place of the deceased, one should not take others, but use their goods for the use of the poor.

(6) But the things which are here opposed from the fathers, and from the councils, and from the papal laws, are so unfounded, that it is not necessary to refute them: for as no man before the birth of Christ could make us blessed by any sacrifice, so no man hath reconciled us to God, since Christ once suffered death on the cross. No assembly, no council, no fathers have been able to make him sacrificed again.

7 For as he hath blotted out all the sins of the world from everlasting¹⁾: so is he also unto the end of the world salvific unto all them that trust in him. For he is eternal God; through him we are created and redeemed. And if anything contrary to this should come out of the holy Scriptures, let it not move thee: but hasten quickly to the place of the Scriptures, whence it is plain; and then thou shalt quickly know that it is a theft, or a necessity of the Scriptures. Take the same: Many are they that have dealt variously of the priesthood of Christ; yea, that they have made themselves such priests; and for a remedy of such error have they brought in that which is written to the Hebrews in the fifth, Every priest taken from among men is set apart for men; and many other places out of this epistle. But if you look at the matter more closely, you will see that there is no other colbe to make you crush all these objections than this epistle to the Hebrews, which I almost advise you to read.

(8) Now when you come to the aforementioned place to the Hebrews, you will find publicly that Paul, by the parables of the old chief priest, wanted to give an understanding of the priesthood of Christ, which was not administered in such a way that one priest after another was appointed to it, or another was put in the place of the one who died. For how would Christ be a priest for eternity, according to prophecy?

1) i.e. from the beginning of the world.

of the prophet, if another were to take his place? Is Christ then dead? or is he deprived of his office, that another should be put in his place? But because he sitteth in eternity at the right hand 2) of the Father, and taketh away our sins for ever with the sacrifice once made on the cross, there is no need that any man should sit in his stead: for only he that dieth as the just for the unjust may take his place. But since no one can be such a one, and no one can do such a thing, except the Son of God, it is an ungodly thing to speak of the sacrificial priesthood.

(9) I am not speaking here of the ministers of the word and the church of God. For such are the keepers of the secrets of God, that is, the secrets of God; and are not the priesthood of Christ. For no one can be such a one, except Christ, who is sufficient for us in eternity with the Father. And if anyone would object that in the new translation of the New Testament in³⁾ the book of the stories of the messengers it is written Cap. 13, 8.: But when they sacrificed to the Lord 2c., you should know that among the Greeks it is called *liturguntōn* [xxxxxxx-

xxxxxxx]; which word is no less with them, that we speak: the serving, than: [the] sacrificing. And also with the Greeks in no place by the whole New Testament, if one deals with the table of God, is drawn in. Then it is evident that this little word *sacrificari* is not taken in this place for offering or slaughtering a sacrifice, but for serving. For it is a common thing in the epistles of Paul that this little word *leitourgos* *is taken* for servant. when to the Hebrews on the 1st day the little word

leitourgia [liturgia] is taken for the word service; the same also Phil. 2. But more cheerfully⁴⁾ he expresses it Rom. 15. since he calls the ministers of the word by an agreement 5) immediately as sacrificial apostles, *liturgus* [Λειτουργός] OR *hierurgus pūs*. For as the ancient priests slaughtered cattle for a sweet savor unto the LORD; so also the ministers of the Word are to convert the vicious people to a true sacrifice unto GOD. For thus saith he: I have written to you more boldly, brethren, in part as one who warns you by the grace given me of God, that I may be *liturgos*, that is, a minister of JEsu Christ among the Gentiles, handing the hierurgon, that is, the

2) In the old edition: Just.

3) "in" here and otherwise in the same case put by us instead of: an.

4) d. i. clearer.

5) i. e. transferred speech.

Gospel of God, that it may become a pleasing sacrifice to the Gentiles, and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. From these words of Paul it is clear what we are to understand by the little word *liturgian* also in the stories of the messengers Cap. 13. For the men who are called ministers of the word with great concern, with much sobriety, 1) for otherwise the ministering of the word is not thought of here, which is unusual in the custom of the apostles who preach the word unitedly.

(10) Therefore, the thanksgiving or communion or supper of the Lord is nothing else but a remembrance with which those who firmly believe that they have been reconciled to God the Father through the death of Christ proclaim the life-giving death, that is, praise, rejoice in, and proclaim it.

11) Now it follows that those who come together for such a ceremony or wedding, bringing the death of the Lord to remembrance, that is, proclaiming his death, testify to themselves by the act that they are members of one body, and one bread; for all those who trust in Christ are one body; which Paul testifies in many places, namely, in the above-mentioned place, 1 Corinthians 1:10. 10 Therefore whosoever eateth with the Christians when they proclaim the death of the Lord, whosoever eateth with them the meat of the flesh, the same shall live afterward without doubt according to the ordained rule of Christ: for he hath made others to understand that he trusteth in Christ. Therefore they that trust in him shall walk even as he walked, 1 John 2. Then cometh it to pass, that they which had agreed in this bread cast themselves out of this common place one from another; 2) If any man did any unruly whoring, or drinking, or profiteering, or worshipping idols, or speaking after them, or robbing them. What custom, if it had never departed from the congregation of Christ, would not the life and attendance of Christians have been better?

(12) Look, O godly heart, how vain we become when we pursue our sins! We have all wanted to attain our salvation through masses, even though the Lord's supper (performed according to Christ's custom) does not forgive sin (for this belongs to Christ alone), but it was an obligatory sign that testifies to us of God's community, as warmly devoted to Christ. What a testimony, if we did not keep it faithfully, that we had been excluded from the company of the

3) so that Christian innocence would be kept all the more skillfully. But what happened after we changed this rule of our life and the discipline of Christian morals into another custom? That is, we have all seen with our own eyes that we have become more impudent than Turks and Jews (as far as life is concerned); for with them there is not so much common adultery, not so much sneaking and sneaking, not so much dog-like stuffing, not so much unlawful robbery; not to mention the arrogance and grandeur of princes and the common people, eternal wars, so many impure blasphemies, shameless words, lies, deceit and falsehoods. Do we not want to exhaust this swamp of vices all together with measuring, listening, creating and reading?

13. This I believe, no one will deny, that we have all fled to the Mass as the last refuge; indeed, we have come to the folly of thinking, when we had seen the bread, that it would serve us for salvation; Nor have we been pleased with such things, but have worshipped those things which we have seen, forgetting also our own statutes and articles (as they are called), in which the New and the Old, who have written, speak alike in this matter, namely, that the righteous humanity of Christ should not be worshipped. God alone is to be worshipped, and no one has ever seen God: why then do we worship that which we see, since God alone is to be worshipped, whom we have never seen? Where do those go who teach that one should worship the *Eucharist*, that is, thanksgiving? Who has ever worshipped thanksgiving? What is thanksgiving? or where is it? or how is it? Is it not then alone, if one gives thanks? So what is the common? indeed nothing else, but a gathering, a wedding gathering. But who has ever worshipped such? It is the effect and a custom, which then has its essence, if it happens.

(14) The supper of the Lord is not to be regarded differently; then it is a supper and a thanksgiving, when one eats with the proclamation of the death of Christ. Does one also read that the apostle worshipped this supper, since Christ has set up his remembrance of it? 5) Woe to our souls, who are thus bound to error, that I fear, when we already see the truth placed before our eyes, that we will not be able to understand it.

1) i.e. fasting.

2) Marginal gloss: It is the right custom of thanksgiving of the congregation of God.

3) So put by us instead of: and.

4) i.e. shameful, shameless.

5) So put by us instead of: which.

accept! Where then does our faith reach out? or in what things does our faith hang? Is it not in God? Why do we refuse to turn our minds away from the outward show? Why do we put our hope in things that Christ has not shown us? Is not our salvation therein, who is a beatifier of all nations? Why then do we seek our salvation in the bread of remembrance? Although I am of the opinion that the bread and the drinking vessels of remembrance should not be handled without all discipline and shame in the congregation of God, in which congregation all things should be done with discipline and respectability, 1 Cor. 14. But in the discussion we will speak more about this.

(15) Now let us bring forth some of the ancients, who, as we shall clearly understand from their words, understood no flesh, indeed no flesh at all, in this sacrament or significant bread. For what is the use of calling the spiritual flesh, which is much the same as calling water fire and wood iron? But afterward they that have kept silence of the flesh, yet so that it may appear openly, [that] they also have been in the mind in which we are; but keep not silence of this, that they may say where[-to] 1) this supper is set up. Then it becomes known that with them there has been a different custom of the supper than the Roman bishops have indicated to us.

16 Tertullianus in the first book Wider Mareionem writes thus, namely: Christ has not rejected the bread, with which he wanted to signify his body. Luge, how cheerfully 2) he speaks that by the bread the body of Christ is signified! not that by the appearance of any bread the body of Christ is signified; but with the significant bread, which the faithful used in the proclamation of the death of the Lord. Then we call it a significant bread, which signifies and signifies. 3)

17 Augustine, although he speaks of this bread differently in another place, can be seen in two places what he wanted to understand through the body. The first place does much for the understanding of Tertullian, which is in the preface of the third Psalm, where he speaks of Christ and Judah thus: "And in the history of the New Testament of our Lord, such great and marvelous patience, that he called Judam one of his own.

Good 4) as long as his thoughts were not hidden from him, because he called him to the supper, in which he recommended and presented the figure of his body and blood to his disciples". How clear is this, as Augustine speaks here, namely, that Christ gave the figure of his body and blood to the disciples? but how the figure? No doubt the custom of this significant or figurative bread, in which bread is signified and indicated, with an outward sign and glory, the remembrance of the death of Christ the Lord; or as the man in the Old Testament indicates and signifies the future bread of souls, Christ, that this bread also brings to our remembrance the slain body of Christ for us and his shed blood.

18 Augustine also, writing in John in the 72nd treatise, clearly rejects the flesh of Christ. As to the first: "But he hath laid out the manner of his gift, as he gave his flesh to be eaten, saying, Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. The sign that someone has eaten and drunk him is this: If he dwells and abides in GOD, and GOD in him; if man cleaves to him, and is not forsaken by GOD. This he exhorted and taught us with hidden words, that we should be in his inheritance, and under the head he is in his members, [who there] eat 5) his flesh, and not forsake his unity. But many of them that were there understood not the Lord, and were vexed: for hearing these things, they thought nothing but meat, which they also were. But the apostle says: "Verily, to understand after the flesh is death. The Lord gives us his flesh to eat, and to understand after the flesh is death, if he says of his flesh, for there is eternal life.

19 "Therefore we should not understand the flesh according to the flesh, as in these words: Therefore many, when they heard, not of his enemies, but of his disciples, said: This is hard speech, who may hear it? If the disciples thought this speech hard, what did the enemies do? And so it must have been that Christ spoke that which was not understood by all; the secrecy of God should have made them cautious, not contumacious" 2c.

With these words of Augustine we see clearly that he has also been of understanding, namely,

4) as a good one," that is, as if he were good.

5) In the old edition: "eating" and "leaving".

1) „wozu" put by us instead of: wo.

2) serene -clear. Compare § 9 middle and § 32 end.

3) In the old edition: listed.

that one should not pay attention to the flesh of Christ. Soon after, in the same treatise, he explained more clearly, saying:

21. Has Christ been of much use to us through his flesh? How, then, is not the flesh profitable? But the Spirit has dealt through the flesh for our salvation's sake. The flesh hath been the crockery; therefore lye what it hath held in it, and not what it hath been in itself."

22' Notice that he says again that one should not pay attention to the flesh, whatever it is. Why then do we look at the flesh alone here, since it is of no use?

Now we want to step to those, 1) who have laid out the custom of this food so that we can see completely how this sacrament was held by the ancients (not only the thing itself, but also the custom). Then we can easily see how Augustine, a man before others of a sharp and prudent mind, was not allowed to speak the truth in his time, which at that time was to a large extent lost. The godly man saw completely what this sacrament was and in which custom it was used.

24 But the opinion of the flesh was too far torn. For the first we carry out Origen to this saying in two places, which also of the custom and the thing half at it itself with us hellet. 2) The first place is in the homily on the 23rd chapter of Matthew, at these words: You tithe mint, dill and caraway 2c., saying thus:

25. "But if in these words of the gospel a moral mind is also to be taken in hand, it is to be known that, just as mint, dill, and caraway give flavor to food, and are not in themselves a principal food: That there are also in our walk some things of this kind which are more excellent and necessary for the justification of souls, than these are the principal things of the law, namely, judgment, mercy, and faith; but the other things are like unto those things which 3) give savor to our works, and make them more acceptable and sweet, as, breaking off of laughter, fasting, kneeling, perseverance in the assemblies, going often to the sacrament, and other things of this kind, which are not righteousnesses in themselves.

are, but are respected as a serving taste of the same righteousnesses."

26 Lye, how Origen disguises the common works that we call going to the sacrament (which was done more often by the ancients than in our times) as the lesser and external works of the tongue! 4) Which he would not have done if he had understood the matter of the flesh, as we do, and had made himself famous.

The other place is also about this evangelist in the 35th homily, about these words: This is my body 2c., in which place he soon speaks this way:

28. "This bread, which God the Word professes to be His body, is a nourishing or feeding word of souls; yea, the word that proceedeth from the word which is God; and the bread from the heavenly bread, which bread is laid upon the table. Of which table it is written: Thou hast prepared in my presence a table against them that trouble me. And the drink, which the Word, GOD, calls His blood, and passeth away, is the Word that watereth, and filleth abundantly the hearts of them that drink. Which drink is in the vessel, of which it is written, And thy watering drink, how glorious is it? And this drink is a sprout of the true vine, which saith, I am the true vine. And is the blood of this vine, which cast into the troughs 5) of suffering, [which] hath brought forth for us this drink.

29) "So the bread is the word of Christ, made from the wheat, which, falling into the good ground, brought forth much fruit. But why did he not speak thus? This is the bread of the new testament; when then he said: This is the blood of the new testament? For the bread is the word of righteousness, with which bread souls, if they eat it, are fed and led. But the drink is the word of the knowledge of Christ according to the secrecy of his birth and passion. Forasmuch then as the covenant or testament of God is set forth and given unto us in the blood of Christ, that we, believing the Son of God to be born and to die according to the flesh, should be saved; not in righteousness, wherein, without the faith of the passion of Christ, there can be no salvation. For this reason alone is here from the

1) Marginal gloss: Come forth, you theologians, and scold your Augustinum a heretic!

2) d. i. agrees.

3) "the" put by us instead of: is.

4) "Tongues" perhaps as much as: appendage. - "verschupsen" --- to disregard, to reject. Instead of "verschnupt" in the old edition must be read "verschupft". Cf. § 2 in No. 15 of this volume in Oecolampad's answer to the Syngamma. Likewise § 81 in No. 16 of this volume.

5) "Trotten" (from Treten) - winepress.

Drinking vessel spoken of: This is the cup of the New Testament."

30 It is too long to put all the trade here. In these words of Origen, we recognize that he also believed that the true principal of this sacrament is faith, in which we believe that Christ offered himself to the Father for us, for this is the food of souls.

(31) But the custom of this sacrament he interprets, saying immediately afterward in the same place, "And Jesus, therefore, with them that keep the marriage feast with him, taketh bread of the Father, and giveth thanks, and breaketh it, and giveth it to the disciples, according as every man is able. He gives it, saying, "Take and eat." Notice how he calls the wedding feast, that is, a glorious gathering of the congregation, or running together. But that he says: Christ gave, after each one is able, it is clear that he speaks here of the faith of thanksgiving (which God does not give in equal measure to all).

32 Thus Origen here cannot be understood of the flesh, for such flesh is like one with all those who perceived it, as they speak according to their opinion. But what follows here in Origen is for the first time seen by a stupid reader as if he were speaking of the flesh; yet it is no less 1) found in him, as is well known to one who sees him closely. Yes, also the things, which he puts afterwards, show cheerfully, what thanksgiving or Eucharistia is with him, and what his custom is, since he speaks thus:

33) "After teaching the disciples, who had celebrated the wedding feast with their master (lug, the wedding feast), and had taken the bread of dedication, and eaten the body of the word (see if he meant a sensitive body here), and had drunk from the drinking vessel of dedication" 2c.

34. perceive the thanksgiving, 2) the common of glory, or proclamation of the death of the Lord.

35 Hilarius, in the 9th Canon, speaking of the fasting of the disciples of John and Christ, says thus: "But that Christ answered the disciples not to fast in the presence of the Bridegroom; he teaches and gives to understand the joy of his presence, and his presence in the presence of the Bridegroom, and his presence in the presence of the Bridegroom, and his presence in the presence of the Bridegroom."

3) No one needs food in his presence, that is, because Christ is preserved in the image of our minds. But when he cometh from us, saith he, they shall fast: for all they that believe not that Christ is risen shall not have the meat of life. For in the faith of the primitive 4) shall receive the sacrament of heavenly bread; and he that is without Christ shall be left in fasting of the food of life."

Here Hilarius understands the secrecy of Christ to be the food of souls, which food, if it is present, is not fasting for anyone. But if the food is taken from them, fasting will also come. But those to whom Christ is risen, that is, those who admit that Christ is risen from the dead, they alone eat the sacramental bread, which is the meaning of the heavenly bread. On the other hand, those who are outside of Christ are left at the fasting of the food of life. Therefore he thinks that the Lord's supper is a sign of those who trust in Christ, in whose hearts he is risen; that is, those who firmly believe that he is risen; for those who believe him risen must believe him to be a true God. Now those who believe him to be a true God may not be, but they must trust in him. Therefore the brave man says: In the faith of the risen ones the sacrament of the heavenly bread is taken.

But in the 30th canon, of Judah, he speaks thus: He would not drink well with God, who would not drink with him in the kingdom 2c. Which speech also (as I am concerned) has something, then it is learned that Hilarius did not understand that in the bread of the Lord the body of Christ is eaten, who hung on the cross, or wept in the manger, as they speak. For he says: to drink with God, and not: to drink the blood. But to think this of Hilario, 5) also that he speaks nothing of the Lord's supper, but these few words.

38 Hieronymum about the prophet Sophoniam 6) in the 3rd chapter I bring in for the reason, not that he serves much in this matter, but that he has much different opinion about thanksgiving than the pope. Therefore he says: "Also the priests, who serve thanksgiving and

3) "which" put by us instead of: which".

4) "Urstände" - resurrection. Compare the following paragraph.

5) "wehrt" put by us instead of: mehrt.

6) i.e. Zephaniah.

1) "minders" - in the least.

2) Marginal gloss: The paschal lamb is reversed into a thanksgiving.

distribute the blood of the Lord to their people, act ungodly in the law of Christ, thinking that thanksgiving is in the words of the sacrificer and not in life, and that only the glorious commandment 1) and not the merit of the priests is necessary" 2c.

39 He says to the first, "And they share the blood of the Lord with their people. In which words it is not obscured that even in the times of Jerome the priests not only ate, but also served the whole congregation, not only with bread, but also with drinking vessels.

40 Accordingly, he says: "Thinking that the words of the sacrificial priests make thanksgiving, 2) and not life. With these words she 3) cheerfully opposes the teaching of the popes, [who] do not deny any boy to make thanksgiving, but Jerome means the opposite, although neither Jerome (lest I anger those who think much of him) nor the pope speak rightly of thanksgiving.

(41) Lastly, if by the merits of the priests he understands the works of the law, he also errs with the pope; although the pope does not ascribe anything to the merits of the priests, but to the glorious commandment. But if by the merits he [understands] the Christian life, which is fashioned according to a righteous faith, that the same make thanksgiving; he meant it rightly. For thanksgiving is when the new people, gathered together by faith and life in Christ, give thanks to their original 4) body.

42. Augustine on Johannem, Tract. 84, on these words: No one has greater love than this, that he lay down his life for his friends, he speaks soon after thus: "Without doubt it is that which is read in the Proverbs of Solomon, Cap. 23: When thou sittest at supper at the table of the mighty, consider and understand what is set before thee; and so knowingly put thine hand to it, for such things thou must prepare. For what is the table of the mighty but this alone? From thence is taken his body and blood, who hath set his soul for us. And what is sitting at the table, but going there with humility? And what is to take heed, and to understand the things that are set forth, but to have sufficient grace?

1) "Commandment" placed by us instead of "prayer" according to § 41.

2) "make" put by us instead of: mache. How this sentence is to be understood follows from § 38.

3) "they," namely, Jerome's opinion of thanksgiving.

4) "Urhab" here will probably mean "originator" or "creator". Walch explains it by "intention". Otherwise it also stands in the meaning: beginning, beginning.

think? And what is to put the hand so that you know you must prepare such things, other than what I have now said: That as Christ laid down his life for us, so shall we lay down our lives for the brethren?

43 "Thus also saith the apostle Peter, Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow in his footsteps." Notice to what custom Augustine tells us to eat the body and blood of Christ; namely, in the custom that we give life for the brethren no other way than as Christ did for us.

But lest anyone think that Augustine understands these bodily things through the body and blood, let us also bring in what he said above in the 26th treatise in this way: "He now goes on to explain how the things he says are done, and what it is to eat the body and drink the blood. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. Therefore to eat this food and drink this drink is to abide in Christ, and to have him abide in him. Of him that abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, neither eateth he his flesh spiritually, neither drinketh he his blood, though he carnally and visibly presseth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ with his teeth; but rather eateth and drinketh the sacrament of such a high thing unto him for a judgment."

What could be spoken more clearly than these words? What could be said that is more pure and gentle? For while he has spoken, though he presses it carnally and visibly with his teeth, yet soon after, lest anyone should think that it should be understood of the flesh of Christ, he puts the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, supposing that this is called eating carnally, when it is eaten sacramentally. But sacramentally eating may be nothing else, [but] eating the sign or meaning. Again, so that no one disparages what he has said, eat sacramentally, as if such eating weakened the words of Paul 1 Cor. 11: Whosoever eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself 2c., for one might say: If I eat it sacramentally alone, how can I be guilty of the body and blood of Christ? Therefore Augustine drives such an outrageous reproach, which has grown up from there, behind him, when he says: "But rather he eats and drinks the sacrament of such a high thing for his judgment. Luge, as he does not say: of such a high thing; but: that which is high.

5) Here we have omitted "that" because it is too much.

Sacrament of such a thing. But what thing? That we are in Christ through faith, and he is in us. Therefore (when he then speaks more carefully) he speaks and indicates that everyone who eats the sacrament of faith in Christ alone eats and drinks the meal, thinking that this sacrament should not be eaten by anyone but those who trust in Christ.

46 This Augustine also, in the third book of the unanimity of the evangelists, in the first chapter, when he showed the reason why John was silent about the body and blood, when he described the supper and the washing of the feet, says: "But John said nothing here in this place about the body and blood of the Lord, but testified that in another place the Lord had spoken of it much more superfluously. Therefore Augustine thinks that the meal is necessary (as much as belongs to the matter), which is dealt with in the 6th chapter of St. John. But that same eating is to give faith to the words of the Gospel. Therefore, according to him, we do not eat Christ other than by faith, if we trust in him as the undoubted pledge of our salvation.

These things we have brought forth from the bravest of the fathers, not that we wanted to support the cause, in itself clear and confirmed with the word of God, with human prestige, but that it be opened to the weakest, 1) that We are not the first to bring forth this opinion without doubt not to the weakest. For I testify with God that I made this deal in silence with many scholars some years ago for the sake of His honor alone, for the custom that I would not unwisely scatter something unprovoked among the common people, which might at some point cause a great commotion; and as I have discussed the matter with many, 2) so I have found many more who have indulged me in this opinion of mine.

(48) Therefore, I have asked God for the 3rd time to show us a way by which commerce, which is almost difficult according to the judgment of the simple, may come to the knowledge of many people. Which trade, on the one hand, is not so difficult as we all would have thought; and, on the other hand, nothing more convenient and nothing more useful to the community of God would be. For what has given further occasion to all vices, but that we, if we have sinned brazenly, have not withdrawn ourselves from this fellowship? Or

What could have provoked us more to love and favor, than if Christ, who died voluntarily for us poor and enemies, had been brought before our ears without interruption? Or in what way might the danger of shame have compelled us from adultery, usury, lavishness, grandeur, arrogance, avarice, and other vices, but that we were often and thickly at such a supper, from which some would be driven away with great shame, since daily punishments were inflicted on the vices?

Therefore, because I saw that the natural right custom of this sacrament would be so useful, I (when I spoke) earnestly asked God to show us a way by which we could take such a dangerous matter in hand prudently 4) and with good consideration. So God heard me, since I prayed earnestly; 5) therefore we consulted at last that this custom might come forth if the Mass were overthrown; which, if it were overthrown, we hoped that thanksgiving also might be restored,

50) But here I saw nothing more vehemently opposed than the sixth chapter of John, where this immovable and stiff adamant, the flesh is not useful, is so set in its colors and all hard metal that it stands indestructible, whatever you stick in it, and also it wants 6) all things to be broken in it, unless you do a little damage to it.

51) After this place, this seemed to me the most skillful: God has never seen anyone, John 1. There he forbade to worship anything that is seen and felt. Lastly, it was necessary to explain the natural and right custom (of this thanksgiving I mean), which, after it is understood, the forgiven hopes and abominable opinions will fall away from themselves.

I have spoken this advice to many. But before the matter has come to light, some little books come forth, I do not know what urgent words they utter, nor are they strong and loud enough; 7) they do not attack the matter in the place where victory may be achieved. So the divine power holds itself in human dealings, against which we are forced with unwillingness 8) to bring forth this opinion of ours; and also many brethren everywhere require such from us as much as with unwillingness.

4) i.e. mindful.

5) "since I prayed earnestly" put by us instead of: earnestly praying.

6) Maybe..rather" ?

7) louder - clear.

8) In the old edition: vanquished.

1) In the old edition: become.

2) spoken about - discussed.

3) d. i. more often.

(53) We have also written an epistle to the preacher of the gospel at Reutlingen, 1) as to one who is unknown to us face to face, which we have presented with such high admonition that no one would let it go forth, 2) which I have not seen go forth from the graces of God, although many devout brethren in the Lord have seen it. But since we started these commentaries afterwards, how could we have expressed our opinion differently than we did in the above-mentioned epistle? Since it was necessary to write commentaries, for we had promised such to not a few pious and learned men from France.

54. Therefore, we ask God, before whom we stand today and lift up our hands without stain of diligence to riot or honor, that this be the will of His establishment, which we have declared (as there is no doubt in our minds), that through the favor by which He has had mercy on all the human race, He may open the eyes of all men, so that they may all recognize the abomination that has placed itself in God's stead, and cease to worship. For this must be a great abomination, so that which is a creature is taken for God.

How can the worship of bread not be the highest ungodliness, since God alone is to be worshipped, and no creature at all, that even the theologians think that the righteous humanity of Christ may not be worshipped without the danger of idolatry? But what is that they say: They worship not the bread, but the body of Christ? Do they not now also worship a creature? Where then are their decrees, in which they forbade to worship mankind? But again they say: We worship, and eat also the spiritual body of Christ. Oh God! What is the spiritual body of Christ? Has anyone in Scripture found any other spiritual body of Christ than the church? as Eph. 4, Col. 1 is written. Or our faith, by which we believe, have paid our debt to him on the cross, and are assured of salvation through him? Why do we trouble the godly ears with the voices, 3) which no mind [has] been able to grasp? The spiritual body is understood by man in the same way as if you said: a bodily mind or carnal reason. Or do we not then eat the body of Christ, especially spiritually, when we believe it to be slain for us, and

Is not the spirit and the life in us now? What do we tie together words that do not rhyme, just because we bicker without ceasing? Let us speak more brightly! We eat spiritually, if we come to Christ through the favor of God. What else can "eating the body of Christ spiritually" be but trusting in Christ? What do we devise new foes that cannot stand up to any reason?

(56) I am the light of the world, says Christ. Since he is the light, who would believe that he would have thrust us into such darkness, by which faith is much more likely to be weakened than strengthened? True and experienced things we speak. For if the human heart is now assured in faith toward God through Christ, has it not grasped the summa of its salvation? Without a doubt, yes.

57 What do you think grows in him when he is driven to such unruliness, which horrifies all understanding? Truly nothing but a wavering. But you would say: Faith is able to do all things; which if thou hast not, thou canst not be saved. Let us answer: In this way everyone has been deceived, for those who receive this crude opinion strictly demand faith, to which they otherwise do not admit much.

(58) Thus those who, out of the temptation of the flesh, as Paul says in Ephesians 4 and Colossians 2, do what they will, present it as stiff. Because you urge them to such an extent that they have to surrender, or are rushed, they flee 4) to faith; which if they had had faith, they would never have been able to produce such things as stiffnecked. For those who trust in Christ have no hunger nor thirst for anything else, for now they have the food with which the souls are refreshed. Therefore they put into faith that which it does not have, nor does it allow to be put into it, 5) as has been sufficiently proved above.

(59) Therefore they put not a bad dishonor upon him, that the flesh of Christ might endure through him, and that twofold:

First of all, that they may beautify this flesh with faith, for faith opposes it; then it will be necessary to have such a thing of itself, and not by faith; for faith extends itself into the things that are, before 6) you trust them. Therefore our faith may not make this flesh, which indeed I had not said,

1) The letter to Matthäus Alber, preacher at Reutlingen, dated November 16, 1524; found Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1880.

2) "let" put by us instead of: let.

3) i.e. words, expressions.

4) they flee - this is how they escape.

5) "lasset" put by us instead of: lasset.

6) "before then" put by us instead of: before and.

if it were not for some who bring forth such a lukewarm expedient of faith that they may speak: The flesh exists through faith. What could be said that is more clumsy? Can faith bring it about that bread is flesh? One should have stiffly proved this with the word of God, through which faith takes place, and not thus imposed on faith by force. 1)

60] To the other: Do they so dishonor the faith, that they say: Faith makes blessed; which is true in itself. But in this place it is as far from the truth as light is from darkness. For they pretend 2) that faith makes blessed him who believes in the bread, or that the same bread is bodily flesh.

(61) But these things are spoken without all valor of the word, because nowhere is it read: Verily, verily, I say unto you, that whosoever believeth that he eateth my flesh in this bread shall be saved. Yes, much another error will follow, namely, that two ways to salvation are useful. One, if we trust in Christ; the other, if we believe that this bread is flesh. For thus they say, Except thou believe it to be so, thou mayest not be saved.

62. Lug, how human reason, willing and knowing, found darkness in the midst of light, in which darkness it groped, and thus in the grasping and requesting of its subtlety found glory with the simple.

What is the sharp diligence of Scoti and Thomae, in the investigation of the transformation of bread and wine into the body and blood, other than a quest for the fame of subtlety? They have become like physicians who are not well versed in the art, who, in order that they may be regarded as experienced, bring about with their medicines that at the same time that they come to you, you become aware of a new disease; which new disease, if they take away the 3) disease, is considered good. See if the thing of which we are here speaking is not like them?

64) These have spoken first: Christ's bodily flesh shall be eaten, as he wept in the manger, as he hung bloody on the cross; they speak no more, 4) for as he passed through closed doors to the disciples, so shall he be eaten.

They were happy to go after the rulers. And so that they would not be held as unjust masters, they devised marvelous intrigues, so that they would present the matter in such a way, and their foolish minds, which truly never believed, or yet rejected, what was true, would see it, and led them as in an erroneous course, now showing this, then that, so long that they no longer had any regard for the outcome. Which, when they had conquered most of it, they used a tyranny against those who wanted to look at the matter more closely; they called those who wanted to bring forth the truth heretics. What can there be much talk about?

(65) When they were about to sell this bread to the common people as a merchandise, they must have made something of it, which greatly astonished all men, that they might increase the reward. Therefore they started to make the bread into meat, [have] put the word: The meat is not useful.

(66) Therefore, all those who read this opinion of ours, we pray by faith, through which we are all saved, not to hastily reject or condemn what they hear, even if it seems to them to be completely unheard, but to ask God to give them the light of a true understanding, by which light they may look at what is true, right and firm.

Truth is cheerful to look at, has no arrogance, and cannot be won with flattery. Then it comes about that those who know something bad about them must not look at such truth stiffly and without fear at first sight; but if they have tried it now and often, they will not let it go any longer.5)

68. May the Almighty God grant us in the end that we may recognize this [as] the right glory of God, by which the mind alone adheres to the one God, alone follows, alone desires to please and to live His will!

69. Again, may He grant us to realize that the outward things of this world do not make us better, but if we give them much, they will take us away from the true adornment of God. This happens in such a way that we turn the things that we have so far offered to the adornment of God Maozim (whom we have honored according to the saying of Dan. 11. as being in the holy place, even though we did not know what he was, with gold, silver, precious stones and other precious things) to the poor, and so our minds (which have so far been wandering with false hopes) are attached to the one God through the eternal pledge, his Son. Amen.

5) i.e. refresh.

1) So put by us instead of: "aufgetrochen" - imposed.

2) "arch before" - ^"turn before.

3) "the" put by us instead of: "it". The meaning of this sentence: If they eliminate this new disease, they will be considered good doctors.

4) "speak" put by us instead of: speak.

12. John Bugenhagen's "Letter against the New Error in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. *)

About September 1525.

Johann Bugenhagen Pomeranus wishes the grace of God through Christ to the highly learned Doctori Johanni Hesso, pastor of the congregation of Christ in Breslau.

Esteemed Doctor! I now know nothing special that I would like to write to you at this time, except that we would like and always desire that the gospel of the glory of God may increase among you through Christ with all modesty and meekness, which we also owe to our enemies, as far as we are allowed, if only the gospel remains pure and righteous: For what should I write much, since Doctor Majobanus, 1) who is to be our mouth and our epistle to you, is again traveling to the ruch; but the same Doctor asked me to indicate to you only in one or two words what I should think of answering to the new errors which are now rising against the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is not possible to answer them with more certainty than with the bad text and words in the Scriptures, which the masters and perpetrators of such error tear and tear up pitifully. And although I know that you do not need this, yet, because I am asked, I will gladly serve you and others with this little.

1. so the words in the evangelists, Matth. 26. Marc. 14. Luc. 22. read: "this is my body, this is my blood."

2) It is against the common usage to speak in all languages that the little word "that", with which one is accustomed to indicate something, should indicate and mean something else than the very thing that is presented. And this Carlstadtian error, with the two little words *hoc* and *hic*, that and this, 2) does not please Zwinglio either.

3 But Zwinglius, seeing that it has not gone out well, nor' wants to go, so takes

1) Ambrosius Moiban, pastor in Breslau. - "Mobian", Köstlin, "Martin Luther" (3rd edition), p. 84, is a misprint.-

2) In the old edition: that.

he has before him the little word "is", and argues about it, it should mean so much here, as: This is my body, this is, this means my body, and: This is my blood, this is, this means my blood, and brings up sayings where it is thus taken and understood. But Christ does not here interpret any dream or likeness; and though three evangelists, and Paul, have written of this thing, yet none of them, not even with one word, has signified that the little word "is" here should be so much as: This is my body, that is, it means my body; yes, they say publicly differently, as I will soon indicate.

4. But Zwinglius sees that it will not follow immediately when I say: the little word "is" means in another place as much as "means", therefore it must stand here also in this way, otherwise it would be taken and understood everywhere in this way, as if I spoke: Peter is a man, that is, he signifies a man; and now sees that there is still available to prove that it should also mean so much here in this place: so he has nothing else that he would like to bring up (which he nevertheless makes him dream strongly enough) but this saying in John: The flesh is not useful, John. 6 Here we must laugh at the great theologian with his Carlstadt: so now lie down these two little words 3) that and is.

5 Who does not see that Christ there in John condemns and punishes the carnal mind of his disciples, in that he holds the flesh and the Spirit against each other, and now speaks not of his flesh and his blood, as before, but of the flesh and the Spirit; as the Scriptures in all places condemn and reject the flesh, but praise and accept the Spirit? places condemns and rejects the flesh, but praises and accepts the Spirit. At times the Scripture calls the flesh the letter. And Isaiah says: All flesh is hay, Isa. 40. And St. Paul to Romans on the 8th: "To be carnally minded is death, and to be spiritually minded is life and peace. For to be carnally minded is enmity against the flesh.

3) Marginal gloss: Äö 6t es" sueeudusrunt.

*) This missive appeared about September 1525 (for on October 23 Zwingli replied to it) both "Latin and German. The title of the Latin writing is: Contra novum Errorum hæreticorum in sacramento eorum sit anZuinis Domini nostri Iosn Oüristi pistola .Io. LuMnuaNi Domsrani acI D. Hsssum, Vratislav. pa "torsm. German under the title we placed over it. We give the text according to the old edition of Walch.

God, since it is not subject to the law of God, because it is not able to. But those who are carnal may not please God."

But again Peter said to the Lord, John 6: "Lord, where shall we go? Thou hast words of eternal life, and we have believed and known that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." For Christ does not say there, John 6, My flesh is not useful; otherwise he made himself a liar. For he had said before to the Jews, "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Now wilt thou say that this is not a useful thing, from which the life of the world comes? Or, is the life of the world nothing, which before was dead and condemned? But Christ says badly here: "The flesh is not useful; as he also says to Petro in another place, Matth. 16: "Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven," that is, the Spirit of God.

7. no flesh is useful, but this flesh is useful, in which God is; then John says: "the word became flesh", Joh. 1. just as no water is useful, so is 1) the baptismal water useful, in which the word of God is. Likewise, no bread is useful, but this bread is useful, in which is the body of Christ, because of Christ's word, which cannot lie.

8 Therefore this saying of Christ, It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth not, John 6, condemneth and overthroweth all human wisdom, and all human righteousness, and all things that are in man, and that pertain unto men: but he would have us to be taught of God. Therefore it is ungodly and unchristian to interpret this saying to this flesh, in which God is, through which flesh we have been sanctified. So you see how Zwinglius can muster nothing at all, and how he is not at all a theologian here in this place.

(9) But that he calls us Christ-eaters and flesh-eaters is blasphemy; for we neither rend nor eat the flesh of Christ, but we eat the bread, and in the bread the true body of Christ, which is not seen nor torn, but is believed to be present and eaten, because of the words of Christ.

Now take the text and grammar before you from St. Paul's epistle, 1 Cor. 10: "The cup of consecration, which we consecrate (which is commonly called consecrating), is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" Communion, that is, in which the blood of Christ is in-

common is distributed, and becomes common to you, to me, and to all who drink it; so that this treasure in the sacrament, by reason of the word of Christ, may be distributed as Christ commanded.

11. Further, "The bread which we break, is it not the fellowship of the body of Christ?" Communion, that is, in which the body of Christ is shared and made common to us. Therefore here truly is the body and blood of Christ, for he thus saith, "The bread which we break, and the cup which we bless." But in that he says, "For we many are One Bread and One Body," he certainly indicates a spiritual union, but soon after he says, "Because we are all partakers of One Bread." We among us, he says, are one thing, but for the sake of the one bread which we eat, and of which we are partakers among ourselves; how can the bread be one which you eat in Breslau, and which we eat here in Wittenberg, if in the bread is not the one body of Christ? But that he speaks of the bodily bread, there is no doubt about it.

12 And in the following chapter, 1 Cor. 11, St. Paul further says: "The Lord Jesus, in the night when he was betrayed, took bread, gave thanks, and broke it, saying, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you (that is, for your use)", that is, distributed to each one. Just as the word "break" is used in this way in the prophet Isaiah: "Break the hungry man's bread," that is, divide it and give it to him. He must be blind who does not see that in the bread is the body of Christ, and that the body of Christ is taken from all, and that only the bread is broken; for so he says beforehand: "He took the bread, gave thanks, and broke it": just as Paul also said above: "The bread we break", and soon after says here: "Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you", so there is the body of Christ. But how it is there, what is that to me? for he that hath appointed it so looketh on it, whereunto I alone believe, and do that which he hath commanded me.

013 And of the cup he saith thus, This cup is a new testament in my blood. Review and repeat the whole Scripture, and you will not find anywhere that the New Testament is called anything else than the forgiveness of sins through Christ or through the blood of Christ. As the prophet Jeremiah Cap. 31. writes of the new testament, where God says: "The time will come when I will give another testament than has been given until now; for I will be merciful to their iniquity, and their sin and their unrighteousness I will remember no more".

1) "yet" put by us instead of "also".

also the epistle to the Hebrews stands these words in the prophet Jeremiah, Heb. 8, and St. Paul repeats the same to the Romans on the 11th [v. 27.], thus saying, "This is my testament unto them, when I shall take away their sin."

If then this cup or drink is a new testament, verily it is forgiveness of sins, which ungodly and unchristianly is ascribed to bad wine; therefore so is the blood of Christ in the wine, which then is clear from the following words, as he speaks quickly upon it, "In my blood"; and in the evangelists it is written, "Which is shed for you for the remission of sins."

14) Paul continues: "Whosoever therefore shall eat of this bread unworthily, or drink of the cup of the Lord, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord"; 1) does not say: he is guilty of the bread and of the wine.

015 Further, "Whosoever eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, lest he should discern the body of the Lord." Verily, they do not discern the body of the Lord, who say that it is bad bread; neither do they discern it, who believe that the body of Christ is there, and yet do not go to it as Christ commanded, that they may eat it in remembrance of Him.

16 Now tell me, what does Zwinglius want to do here, in these two places, since there is nothing in them, that he may say that the little word is so much as signifies; for St. Paul speaks thus, "He is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and does not distinguish the body of the Lord"; and does not say, "He is guilty of the body signified, and does not distinguish the body of the Lord. Paul thus says, "He is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and does not distinguish the body of the Lord." He does not say, "He is guilty of the signified body and blood of the Lord, but of the true body and blood, which is truly here in the bread and wine. For of the man he saith here, he that eateth, and he that drinketh; neither saith he, that he distinguisheth not the signified body of the Lord, but the body of the Lord 2c.

(17) Likewise, what will the others do in these two oertens if they do not find a koo?

18 I have led wood, Doctor, you may build. And herewith be blessed in Christ! Ask God the Father for us.

But I may freely confess, first of all, that I did not write this; then, that we do not keep this order of the mass in Wittenberg in Latin, which some, who act in the play as boys, not as Christians, presume to have interpreted into German. If the same fellows like their thing so much, they defend it with the holy scripture and do not lie under our name. But I am especially perverted and displeased by the fact that they make things necessary that are not necessary. But that we preach the Gospel of Christ daily in German here in Wittenberg, they do not consider that a German mass. However, I will not say that they have no regard for the weak brethren, 2) in that, even though the gospel has not yet been preached sufficiently, they make themselves think that they have all the power to do so, even to the annoyance of their brethren; but of that another time.

(20) Likewise, in the same booklet, they indicate a manner of trusting the married persons, as if we also used the same, and were prescribed by us; without which they clumsily cobble together many things from Scripture. Thus they pretend that when we marry, we say that God cursed and maledicted the marital state after the fall of Adam. But that is what some devil has said, not me. So unlearned are they, these new theologians of ours, that they understand and interpret as a malediction that which we sometimes say about the cross, which God has placed on us in the conjugal state.

(21) But to that which is also written there in the booklet of both or one form of the Sacrament, I confess and do not deny that I have written it at this time in Latin to a good friend, but which I would much rather be read in my words, wherein it is written.

(22) I would have said this long ago if I had not thought that it was to be despised. But now, because many of them fall and deviate in a new way to the doctrines of men, I should not despise it.

23 Dear one, tell me, what is the use of some who, in matters concerning the salvation of the soul, condemn the doctrine of men, as is right and just? because they cannot indicate and give a reason for the things to which they are subject, except to say that some write such things and hold them so.

2) "that they have no respect" put by us instead of: "that I have no respect".

Johannes Bugenhagen Pomeranus.

(19) Now and then a booklet is sold in which is written the order of the mass, as if it were so ordained and kept by us.

1) Marginal gloss: In these two places there is no äoc, also no

13 Mch Zwingli's answer to Johann Bugenhagen's letter. *)

23. oil. 1525.

Translated from Latin by M. Aug. Tittel.

Johanni Bugenhagen, the Pomeranian, Huldreich Zwingel withdrew his greeting!

Grace and peace from God! If I had ever wanted to make a name for myself and to quarrel, I would have had a very nice opportunity through your letter from the holy supper, through which I could have gained the approval of the common man, as if I had atoned for both desires. But since this, namely to write out of quarrels or vain honor, is supposed to be as far removed from a Christian mind as it is, unfortunately, common at the present time, I have resolved to answer all your things freely and heartily, but also modestly and kindly; you, however, will listen and pay attention, because I do not want to make any further lengthy preface.

The title of your letter is: "Against the new error. On account of this title, you cannot unwind that you did not put it forward, either out of ignorance or by force. For if you do not know that the ancients were of this opinion of ours concerning the supper, your ignorance will be overlooked; provided, however, that you do not at another time so quickly come out with "new error," namely, to call that what Christ, the apostles, and the earliest Christians held. Read the book of Oecolampadii, 1) and if it is not contemptible to you, our "contribution". 2) But if you are not ignorant in the old opinion about it, it is something violent and wanton that you nevertheless took this title to it.

1) "Oecolampadii book" is the book that Oekolampad sent to the Swabian preachers: ^oauuis Occolumpackii às Senninn vcrftorum Domini, Doc 68t Corpus lneuin, juxtn V6tu8ti88imo8 nutores 6Xpositions over. It is reprinted in ^etn ct scripts pudlicn ecclssine hosts mdcRScac; sã. DtnL DudinMC 1719, p. 41- p. 150.

2) This refers to the book that Zwingli wrote in August 1525 to strengthen his onunentsrius às vern st kaisa rcliZionc. It appeared under the title: Lubsiaïurn às sucknristin.

3) In the letter itself, you think, I have found this loophole, that is so much should apply as, it means; because I saw that it does not go well with Carlstadt's interpretation. Dear! Why do you do this, since you see that our letter went straight to one from Reutlingen (since Carlstadt's books only came out) 3) and was copied afterwards, and soon came to more than 500 brothers before it was publicly printed, although no one knew yet how Carlstadt's books would be received. What you attribute to me here, you have rather, in my opinion, attributed to Carlstadten. For when he saw that you had long decided that the i st here should not apply as much as it means; likewise, that one should worship the Lord's Supper, he considered the argument too hard if he attacked the matter on this side; for he chose another, which any other judge would have attributed to fairness and gentleness rather than bitterness. For he has seen that it would be a foolish thing to say that a memory is to be worshipped. Since he could not tolerate such ungodliness, and since he was worried about quarrels, he attacked it in order to help himself out of such distress. But how can you accuse us of a finding, since I attacked the matter where you had long thought it was impossible to grasp?

4) But that you say: No dream or parable is interpreted here, is inconsiderate. For, as will become clear, here is the figurative speech that is in the words: The seed is the word of God. Now that we have proved that it is just such a figurative speech, what is the difference whether it is put differently in the interpretation of a dream or parable, or in a complete and definite speech? since the interpretation of a dream or parable must also be a complete and correct speech? But that you may have enough, see here complete (or bad) speeches: this is the Pesah [Passover]; He is the Elijah; these are the

3) These brackets are set by us.

*) This writing appeared in October 1525 in Zurich in Latin under the title: Rcsponsio aã DuMnũnSii spistolnĩn; in the same year there also in German under the title: "Eine Antwort Huldrichs Zwinglii auf die Epistel Joh. Bugenhagen aus Pommern, das Nachtmal Christi betreffend". We give this writing after the old edition of Walch.

two testaments. And since you say: Neither an evangelist nor Paul has indicated with only a few words that this is to be taken meaningfully here, this is a futile evasion; just as if the scribes, when they needed disguised words, always added a book of interpretation to interpret such disguise (or blurring). One must know how to find the disguises with the light of faith; for otherwise we have many passages in Scripture with such undoubted markings that nevertheless one will not be able to force a quarrelsome or unbelieving person to admit a disguise there; e.g.: I am a right vine, and: my flesh is truly food. Behold, truer (right) and also true! And yet, one must allow a blunt speech there, or commit blasphemy. How much more must we admit a blunder where no mark stands in the way, and the truth of faith requires it? And that I open my opinion to you in this, because I see that you do not consider the flowery things so very carefully: so hear, with permission to speak, what is also clearly felt in Psalms. I have seen that in these words there is a blurring long before Carlstadt comes forth with his "this" (or "that"); but by what word I should explain the blurring I have not seen. For it is not enough to say: this is a *tropus* (or efflorescence), if one does not give the efflorescence at the same time with other words. For example, when Christ says, I must be baptized with a baptism; likewise: I have food to eat; the hearer is not helped if I merely say, It is a vague speech; but I must also give the vague with other clear words; namely, to be baptized with a baptism, by this: to bear the cross, or to die, or to suffer; likewise also the other speech (scil. of food). But who will be so foolish as to say that because I here explain "to be baptized" by "to suffer," then everywhere where baptism is written, suffering must also be implied? This is perhaps none of your business, but is only incidentally taken along for some ill-minded people who spread themselves with such conclusions among the simple-minded. For, they say, if it means so much as it means; so when the heavenly Father says of the Son, This is my Son, we shall have to interpret it thus: This means my son; just as if we had given a law that is must be taken nowhere else but for means. Whose impudence any blind man may see. So we have, since the care for the simple ones makes us

I learned [taught] how to take the word "is" for "means," but I did not see that the words "this is my body" were spoken in a figurative way. I saw that the words, "This is my body," were spoken in a faded manner; but in which word the faded manner actually was, I did not see. Then it happened, by the grace of God, that two pious and learned men, whose names I will not mention, came to our Leo [Jude] and me to discuss this matter, and when they heard our opinion in the matter, they thanked God for it. For they concealed theirs, because at that time it was not safe for everyone to reveal what he believed in this matter, and they only took out of their bundle the letter of a learned and pious Dutchman, 1) which is now printed without a name, and showed it to us. There I found the beautiful pearl that is to be explained by means here. And since we had to necessarily explain this word in our interpretation (Commentario), it seemed best to open the word, in which the flowering stood, with this its key, than merely to say: It is something flowered, we have thus taught that the is is put here instead of this: It is a sign or figure; it means. And I am not at all sorry for this interpretation. For if one says a thousand times, It is a flowering, and does not explain it, one gives the child a hard (unopened) nut. As if I had not said it yet, so that the author (or authorizer) of the sweetbread would not be exposed to some unintended danger by our way of writing, if the letter, as I said, had not already been printed.

5 Soon after, you say, "We imagined that the word of Christ, which is flesh, is of no use, would have special power to prove that the "is" here means as much as it means. It is true that we imagine such things, or, as you say, dream them. For those who do not see this certainly sleep very deeply, and are all the more unhappy than we are, because even in sleep they do not see a single image of truth. But let us see which of us dreams best: you, since you say, even with testimonies of Scripture, which are somewhat distorted, that Christ in these words, the flesh is no

1) A jurist, Cornelius van Hon or Honius, had written a letter to Luther in the summer of 1522, in which he presented the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which Zwingli later appropriated. This letter is probably meant, which Zwingli published (without a name) under the following title: Npistvla oliristiann ndmodum, ab annis guatuor ad ^uendarn, npud guerv vmne judioiuu saorne scripitrne tult, ex Latavis missa, "ed kpreta; lonM allier traotans ooeuana dominioam, taetenus traotata est.

not speaking of his flesh and blood, of which he only spoke before, but condemning the carnal mind of the disciples, and falling from his purpose to a common [doctrine], or 1) we, who hold that he speaks of his very flesh and blood, about which the disciples murmured with the Jews, and before which they bore an abhorrence, as they [flesh and blood] were bodily? 2) Especially since one sees that Cyril, Augustine, Chrysostom, although the latter is somewhat darker, among the ancients; among the moderns who are still alive, Erasmus and almost all scholars in the heap are of the opinion that Christ here takes the flesh as those took it to whom he answered; but who took it in such a way that they believed that he spoke of his bodily flesh. If one, I say, sees this, why will you say that we are only dreaming? Does he who diligently reads the old authors dream? It seems to me that those are rather dreaming who rather bring their things thoughtlessly to the table than read the old ones. For 3) it is over with the saying of Comici: Nothing is said that was not said before? Since we now bring the opinion of the ancients to light again, as we have sufficiently indicated in our "**commentario**," why are we blamed for concocting a new error?

(6) But there is something that may be offensive to the simple reader in the reading of the above authors, which may also have caused you to stumble. For since they also use the words of the spiritual and carnal mind, and you have just the same in your mouth, your mind is not directed to what they mean by it. For when they here reject carnal mind, they mean by it that which the rude disciples and Jews had, when they thought that Christ spoke of his flesh, but they do not mean a common doctrine of the carnal mind; which may be seen from a certain discourse of Augustine, Tract. 27: "The flesh was the vessel; mark what it had, not what it was." And soon after, "The flesh helps nothing." As they understand the flesh, so I do not give my flesh to eat. But they do not call the spiritual mind here in general, but actually that, by which was believed what Christ taught under the parable of eating and drinking, namely, that those who believed that they were redeemed by his death, and by his blood

would be reconciled to eternal life, as Peter understood it when he said: "We believe and have known that you are the Christ, the Son of the living God"; since we clearly see that the spiritual mind of Peter was nothing else than trusting in the death of Christ. But you take the carnal and spiritual mind in general for the carnal and spiritual mind, and believe that Christ falls from the former speech of the flesh and blood, given for us, to the common mind of the flesh and spirit, as a common doctrine, in which you are quite mistaken. Which is clear for this single reason: Dear one, tell me whether Christ, from the place where he thus began to speak, "Does this offend you? How, then, when ye shall see the Son of man depart thither," 2c., do you better their error and rebuke them, or not? Where you deny it, many things will hinder you, which follow, e.g., "There are some among you who do not believe." Which is a word belonging to the former matter, since he had said, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." And this, "Therefore I said unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it be given him of my Father," which is also taken again from former matter; likewise all the rest that follow, from which every one sees that Christ fall not from the intended doctrine to something common. If then you admit that he meets their error, you must also further admit that he understands flesh as they understood it; but they believed that bodily flesh was presented to them; therefore Christ also said that bodily flesh was of no use. For if these words of Christ do not set us free from the understanding of the flesh, we shall still today have to understand the words: My flesh is truly meat, according to the will of the Roman pope, from the flesh. But who has ever doubted that what is written in John 6 must be opened with the axe "the flesh is of no use" and shown that he is not speaking of the flesh? Do you not yourselves also make it evident with this single key that the eating of the flesh is not taught here? But how is it that we deprive ourselves of our best defense? For if this word be taken away, we have none further by which the antitype may be so valiantly repulsed.

(7) But if Christ here proceeds from a special doctrine to a common one, I ask, whether he intended to cause error by the common doctrine of the Jews and disciples, or not? If he did, then the common teaching has become a special teaching.

1) So put by us instead of: the.

2) "would have been" put by us instead of: were.

3) "for" put by us instead of: the.

has been. He then meant nothing more than this: As the carnal mind is harmful, so this also hinders you in the understanding of the gospel, that you think I speak of the flesh; one must put the carnal mind entirely away, so that you think of nothing carnal at all, and so may also know that I speak of no flesh. But if in these words he has not wished to remedy their error, he has allowed them to err freely. And how can we also know whether they have erred or not, since such an obvious sign, which you demand of us, is with them, which also the Roman Catholics have now used for so long a time, namely: "My flesh is truly meat" ? What shall be a sure sign, if it is none? Go then, and leave off this: "The flesh is of no use"; on what grounds then do you want to enforce that this word: "My flesh is truly meat" is not to be understood of the flesh? Finally, if the words, "The flesh is of no use," do not refer to the foregoing, tell me whether you think that the flesh of Christ, eaten (or devoured) in the flesh, is of any use? If you say yes, you will not be able to prove it by any other word than this: "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life." Two ways of attaining salvation are thus presented to us: one is by trusting in Christ; the other is by eating his flesh in the flesh. By such an answer, however, we fall into a double error; the first, namely, that we falsify the said words, "He that eateth my flesh," 2c.; the other, that we promise life to those who eat bodily. But if the eaten flesh of Christ avails nothing, why do we dispute so much? why do we dwell so on such words?

8 Let us not, my dear friend, seek such hiding places and evasions, which not only obscure the truth but also betray it to the enemies.

Now I come back to your letter. Isn't this a strong conclusion: If the flesh is not useful, then there must be an obfuscation in the words "this is my blood", or "this is" means as much as "means"? But you, since you cannot outline this fortress, reverse the order of the conclusion for me. For I do not thus proceed: Is is put for means. I prove it, because the flesh is no good, as you put it. But in this way: The flesh is of no use, therefore the words of Christ: This is my body, are spoken in a vague way. Which order you may not break by any art or violence. Then

we do not explain the dumb speech according to our wit or delusion, but with the help of the Scriptures. You also mock me, as a great theologian, who never arrogated to myself the name of a divine scholar, but often read with annoyance the titles Doctor or Professor Theologian in the writings of such people, who are perhaps theologians. For how should the Roman pope deny me the title of Doctor, which Zurich offered me, 1) but which some hardly attain when they travel to Rome with all danger and great expense? You do not know that I recognize more than too well that everything about me is poor and insignificant, otherwise you would have omitted this insult. But what you mockingly laugh at will one day make you weep. For woe to you who laugh, for you will weep. I should be pitied rather than mocked and laughed at if I were in this error.

(10) You call Carlstadt mine; why, or for what purpose, you will know. For I think to myself: If Carlstadt is an evil man, why does he make him mine? The disgrace must necessarily fall on you if he makes you a companion of someone of whom he does not think much good, even if you do not know him. But if he is a good man, as in truth many think, why do you belittle him so? And so I may turn where I will, but I cannot absolve you of insolence, which I have long since forgiven you.

(11) Ye have also added this very untimely: Shall you say that this is not profitable, whereof the world hath life? For in order that we might bear clear and glorious witness to the fact that Christ's flesh is not only useful but also life, we have used the same words at the end: Christ's flesh is very useful, **coesa, non ambesa**, as it is bruised (or sacrificed), not as it is chewed or eaten. But you, since you do not hear these so bright things, I must almost believe that you are dreaming.

(12) The testimonies which you bring from the Scriptures are certainly taken from them, in the places where the common doctrine of the carnal mind (or understanding) is practiced by godly men. But what use is this in the way you conclude here? You should have brought testimonies, since the place: The flesh...

1) Marginal gloss: One has Hadriani of the Pabst's letter to Zwingli, so still to be found with me. (On January 23, 1523, Pope Hadrian had issued a flattering letter to Zwingli, so that he would use his influence to keep the powerful Canton on the papal side in political matters).

is of no use, would be drawn to your mind. But since this is not possible for you, you do as much as you can, and cite some that come closest to him, and in words are quite related and have the same meaning, but in substance they differ by leaps and bounds. Therefore, for their sake, I leave nothing of our opinion, for they are not at all suitable here, but are spurious. But your opinion or statement, which goes like this: "But that you call us eaters and carnivores is blasphemous," I am very glad to hear, although I recognize only a little blasphemy in it, that I call the carnivores who do not eat meat even where they think it. Since you notice this about yourselves, you have called me 1) a blasphemer, [therefore] that I attribute something to you, which you neither eat nor feel. But before I hear anything from you of the art of teaching language, we pray, dear Master, remember the words which you finely presuppose in due season: "We do not rend (or bite) the body of Christ, but eat the bread, and in the bread the true body of Christ." For here you must teach us the art of language in a masterly way, in order to bring out that the words of Christ, "This is my body," have been changed into the following: in this bread my body is eaten. You must undoubtedly be a true teacher of the art of language if you deny that the bread is the body or the flesh, and yet believe that you eat flesh in the bread; for Christ by no means said, Eat this bread, for in it you will eat my body; but, This, which he gave, is my body. Dear Master, show us more such passages in holy scripture. But lest I jest at an inopportune time in a serious matter, I appeal to you, Mr. Pommer, to make the pronouncement which explanation of Christ's words is more compulsory: whether yours, since you say: bread is bread, but in the bread the body of Christ is eaten; or ours, since we say these words are blurred, "this is my body," and explain the blurring thus: "this is," that is, it is a sign, figure, or antitype of my body, which 2) is given for you.

Now let us look at your artificial things from the linguistic doctrine, namely the other part of your letter. Pommer (says): The blessed drink, which we bless (that is, according to the common way of speaking, consecrate), is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? that is, the communion, since the blood of Christ is communicated and distributed to you, to me, to others, so that such treasure is distributed and made common to us 2c.

1) "me" put by us instead of: the.

2) "the" put by us instead of: that.

(14) First of all, my dear Pomeranian, see how you have not yet done anything about this, if this is already the meaning of Paul's words that you have given. For you would see that the drink and the bread are called the body and the blood, because they are signs of these things; just as in Genesis 17 circumcision is called a testament and a covenant, which was only a sign of the covenant; as you can see in our "Subsidio".

15 But now let us look at your grammatical things, so that it is obvious how you do not understand things from the art of language, as they are necessary here. 1) Since you explain this "which we bless" thus: which we generally consecrate. Dear, let us look at your: **vulgo**

quem consecramus³⁾ a little bit right. Who is the **vulgus** (or rabble)? This is not how Ambrose, or Athanasius, or some of the ancients interpret it. Erasmus gives it thus: Does not the holy cup, which we take and consecrate (sanctify) with thanksgiving in remembrance of the death of Christ, indicate the communion, that we are at the same time redeemed by the blood of Christ? You see here that Erasmus, in the first part of this interpretation, takes "bless" for "give thanks," as his Theophylactus and all the ancients do, but not for consecreren or einsegnen, where he does not take it for [it] is so much as to grow together into one; although he has added the word "consecreren," but so carelessly and after the fact that one can well see that he was not concerned about it. Which rabble or common people then explains the place in this way? For you can easily see which interpretation is according to Erasmi. Namely, the rabble, which we had already left in Egypt with the onions and garlic, we seek out again, I say, and turn, as the proverb says, again to the acorns. Remember also the other piece of Erasmi's interpretation, where he speaks: [It] indicates a fellowship, that we are all redeemed by the blood of Christ.

Now we want to show clearly where you get stuck in these words. Community is not taken *passively* in these words (because we also want to speak from a master tone once, since we see that you not only need their [the grammar's] words out of your own power, but also defy them), as you explain it, namely for the healing of the body and for the healing of the soul.

3) These words of Bugenhagen are completely twisted by Zwingli. Compare § 10 of the previous scripture. Bugenhagen says: "The cup, which we bless (commonly one says: which we consecrate)," Zwingli makes out of it: "which we consecrate in common (vulgo - to the rabble)."

blood of Christ himself, which is the sole cause of your error, but for us who are Christ's body, namely his church, people, assembly, congregation, or, as Erasmus gives it, community. Therefore perhaps xxxxxxxx dear community Communication (Mittheilung) may have given rise to the error that Paul was thought to have understood Christ's bestowal by it. Therefore the words: xx xxxxxxxx (the cup of blessing we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ) would be better translated thus: the cup of thanksgiving, that we may give thanks, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? that the understanding would be this: the cup of thanksgiving, that we may give thanks, what is it but ourselves? For we, what are we but the fellowship and the company, people, congregation, and society of the blood of Christ? that is, the people washed away by Christ's blood' and he calls those the blood of Christ who trust in his blood. As elsewhere he calls those the circumcision who serve God in the Spirit, Phil. 3, so also here are those the fellowship of the blood of Christ who rejoice and are glad in the very glorious church, that they are set at liberty by the blood of Christ. That this is the right mind of Paul, we will prove, both from his words and from the ancient mind. If we look at the matter Paul is dealing with, we will have to admit that this is Paul's opinion. For he admonishes against idolatry. Which is done much more emphatically when he says: "You are a different and more glorious people than to mix with the idolatrous crowd," than when he says: "You have fellowship with the flesh and blood of Christ, therefore you should not have fellowship with the idols in their idolatry. For all that Paul says is not only very emphatic, but also well-timed and quite proper. But who does not see that this is much stronger and more excellent when he says, If ye desire remembrance or thanksgiving, 1) are ye not the fellowship of the blood of Christ? Christ's people and church? than if he only said: When you eat the blessed bread like this, do you not share out Christ's body? The last mind would not keep so much from idolatry. For there are still men who think they have power to limp on both sides; but the former, as a torrent, sweeps away all falsehood, when he says, Ye are the communion of the blood of Christ. So much of the opinion and content.

(17) But the words themselves are so strong and well put that we have no reason to suspect some obscurity in them. For since, after the words, "Is not this the communion of the blood of Christ?" he immediately adds, "Because we many are One Bread and One Body, in that we are all partakers of One Bread," he gives the reason that those who repeat such thanksgiving are the communion of the blood of Christ; indeed, he declares it, saying, as it were, "No one is surprised that those who celebrate this assembly have been called by me the communion of the blood of Christ; for we are all One Bread and One Body. Behold! One loaf, One Body, not Christ's flesh, but His Church. Now he explains how it comes about that we are all One Body, One Church, and One Bread; namely, because we (he says) all enjoy One Bread. But if Paul, the incomparable speaker of Christ, had thought that by eating the fleshly body of Christ we became One Body, he would not have said, in concluding the speech and explaining the cause, For we all partake of One Bread, but: Of One Body. But since he says: We would therefore be One Body, Bread and Church, because we would be partakers of One Bread, does he not clearly show that it is a spiritual Bread? But when some of the mob make a noise and cry out: If Christ had not wanted his flesh to be eaten here, he would not have used a fancy speech in such important matters, but would have spoken in a bad way: nothing is clear from this but a restless and deceitful head; as if Christ had not also spoken in a fancy way in the main work of Christianity, when he says: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Item: "I will make you fishers of men." Item: "You shall carry neither bags nor bundles." Item: "My flesh is truly meat." For are not such doctrines of the highest importance? and yet he has spoken in them in a vague way. And the jurists say that it is a title of handing over the keys; but if a person in authority, that is, of worldly rank, held the same in low esteem, and, handing them over to the emperor, said, This handing over of the keys signifies our handing over, and the handing over of all things; would he not thereby become a laughing-stock? Thus there are innumerable things, both in things and actions, and even in speeches, which neither happen nor are said without a sign and a blurred understanding.

18) As far as the authors are concerned, it is well known to you that the ancients wanted to indicate by the single word "synaxin" that in this assembly the whole body of Christ, that is, its

1) Perhaps: "commits". Cf. § 17.

Church, not by the presence of the body, for how could its remembrance take place where it itself was present? but by the presentation of the symbolic (meaningful) bread, that is, by the fellowship. For the ancients considered that they sacrificed and served God when they ate together. Otherwise, enough has been said about the name

Eucharistia. Augustine is also of this opinion, **Tract. 26.**

in John, when he says: "Believers know the body of Christ when they do not fail to be Christ's body." And soon after: "By this food and drink he wants to understand the fellowship of the body and its members, which is the holy church" 2c. Read the whole of this tract and the following, and you will find that what we defend is not a new error, but a common doctrine with the ancients. I also ask that

you read in the papal decrees de **Consecr. dist. 2.** the chapter: **Quia passus est**, and another soon after,

Prima, of which Battus Effinger, a councilor with us, of whom much is to be hoped, recently reminded us, who was very surprised that many made such a clamor, since precisely what is taught publicly is also in the papal decrees. So much of the place 1 Cor. 10.

19 You will, however, consider what Oecolampadius wrote about the old opinion. For since you say that it cannot otherwise be possible that One Bread is eaten at Breslau and Wittenberg, this is as much as nothing; for it is also not One Bread that you eat with your wife. But in the mind of faith we eat One Bread, that is, of the same sign, because the same is one; though the bread is distinct, yet that is one, for whose sake all believers eat it.

(20) What you say about the testament, namely, that it is the forgiveness of sins given by grace; that 1) is rightly said. But you soon lose your way again, because you make the cup a testament, since even the blood of Christ is not the testament, or the blood by which the testament was confirmed. Therefore, it is a vague speech when the blood of Christ, or the cup of thanksgiving, is called a testament. More about this in our "contribution".

21 You say: Paul says: "Let him be guilty of the body and blood" 2c., but not of the bread and wine. Answer: But you are somewhat foolish, which you will forgive me for understanding, to speak in a dumb way. For you may take the body and the blood for the bodily things, or you may take the bread and the wine for the bodily things.

for the church; so Paul means nothing else than that he desecrates and betrays Christ's institution who does not go to it with a proper mind or willingness. For why should Paul say this of the carnal body, since his way of reasoning is entirely to keep from the company of idolaters those who are Christ's body? But Christ's institution or foundation is the thanksgiving and union of His body. For those who are in such thanksgiving testify that they are members of the one body of Christ. All this is betrayed (or destroyed) by those who either have only the appearance of giving thanks, since their faith in Christ is not correct, or who despise Christ's church, and are members of the harlot, that is, (the church) of idolaters. Ambrose agrees with us when he speaks of these words in 1 Cor. 11: "But what is to be punished but for the death of Christ? For there he is killed for those who yet make his death void." Read also Athanasii interpretation about this place, you will see if he believed that here the flesh is eaten. Here Myconius also reminded me at the appropriate time of your own things. Read therefore what you yourselves wrote about the 110th Psalm: Those do not distinguish the body of the Lord, who make no distinction between the church of Christ and a harlot devoted to idolatry; or who do not sit at table here other than in an idolatrous sacrifice. You ask: What will Zwinglius do here, since no 68t (is) present here? Answer: Exactly what I did before. I say that almost everything that Hebrews, Christ, Paul, the apostles speak is obscure. And if some of them do not notice this enough, they obscure everything by seeking great mysteries from it, yes, by writing poetry, because with them there is just

as much lovely food (**deliciae**) of a manifold learning as with the most distinguished Greek scholars. That you think you have given Joh. Hesso, our common friend,

matter (**silvam**) to hand, I understand from your words; but what kind of construction he will lead from it, he sees. Unless by "give wood" you understand as much as to dare something, or to challenge it to the battlefield, where your words draw it, but not I myself. For they make you Achilles, but me Hector, since perhaps both our persons would hardly be suitable for such a game; at least we hardly consider ourselves a common soldier. Let us, my dear John, not listen to such voices of parties and gangs. For this opinion of ours is provided with such firm grounds,

1) In the old edition: "is that". - Soon after, we put "It is" instead of "Is it".

2) "the" put by us instead of: "the".

Not only a few Achilles, which you do not make, but also not a thousand Hercules will throw them over the heap.

Here you have my opinion on all your things that you have gathered in this letter above. If someone wants to indulge in quarreling, we do not have this way. So far we have kept these measures, that although we have seen that many do not teach too correctly about purgatory, about the intercession of the saints, about secret

confession, about keys, about the images (**statuis**) in churches, and about the Lord's Supper, we have not touched anyone's error by name.

(23) If, however, you or anyone else wishes to quarrel with me, I diligently refuse to do so, as much as is possible; but where it is not possible or desirable, I will quarrel under the umbrella of truth, before the eyes of Christ and by his help, so that it may hopefully be seen that I am not blown to smithereens. But I exhort you as well as the others to refrain from the shameful custom of reviling and scolding, that they may not be taken for brawlers rather than investigators of the truth.

We have to settle the matter with Scripture and reasons based on faith and Scripture. We must settle the matter with Scripture and with reasons based on faith and Scripture; not with great bluster and market clamor. There will be no lack of enemies and shouters who will mock us, even if we remain moderate and silent. Will Rome be silent? likewise the princes, who have long since grown weary of the gospel they have received? Let us then act the truth in a pure and undefiled way, so that when the prince of this world, the devil, comes, he will find nothing in us. The Antichrist cannot be completely defeated unless this error is also destroyed and he completely falls down. Let us first of all look the truth right in the face, but not at the reputation of men and their high persons. For when the truth appears, everything must give way before it.

24 Be well, and interpret everything for the best. For we, too, are happy to forgive you, since you have called us masters of error in the words of Hieronymi, along with other abusive words. From Zurich, October 23, 1525.

b. How Oecolampadius joined the Zwinglian leadership and got into a dispute with the Swabian preachers, as well as with Luther himself.

The *Syngamma Suevicum*; Or of the preachers assembled at Schwäbisch-Hall Scripture against Oecolampadius,

with D. Mart. Luther's preface. *)

October 21, 1525.

To the Christian reader I wish, Martinus Luther, grace and peace in Christo.

However, no one can resist the devil, because God alone does not always bring misfortune.

and do harm, because he, a desperate evil spirit, never rests, but, as St. Peter says, prowls around us as a fierce lion, seeking whom he may tempt.

*) This writing, which is dated October 21, 1525 (according to this our time determination), was still published in 1525 in Latin in a single edition in Schwäbisch-Hall under the title: elarissimoruna, (jui Halas

Luevoruua onvenerunt, virorum super Verdis eoeuae Domini, et piuru et eruckitum, ack 4oannsin Oecolarnpackium; then at Wittenberg 1526 and at Frankfurt 1561. It is included in the *^eta et serixta pudliea eeelesiae irtemder^ieae* etc., edited by Christoph Matthäus Pfaff, Tübingen, 1719, p. 153. The *Syngamma* was translated into German in 1526. There are two different translations from this year; one of them has the title: "Genöthigter und fremd eingetragener Schrift auch nützlichen Deutens der Worte des Abendmahls Christi *Syngamma*" 2c. Wittenberg 1526 by Joseph Klug; the other has the title: "Gegründter und gewisser Beschluß etlicher Prediger zu Schwaben über die Worte des Abendmahls Christi JEsu (das ist mein Leib) an Johannem Ecolampadion geschrieben, von neuem durch Johannem Agricolam verdeutscht. Actual report of D. Martin Luther concerning the Jrthuini of the Sacrament. Hagenau, by Johann Secerium. Anno 1526." Luther wrote prefaces to these two editions of the German translation. One (which is found in the editions only in Walch and in the Erlanger, vol. 65, p. 185) is prefixed here to the "*Syngamma*"; the other forms the following number (15) of this volume. We have retranslated the "*Syngamma*" according to the latter Latin edition.

we are still guilty, as much as we like, to be God's co-workers, and to resist him by the word. He has indeed devoured many through the new seducers and sacrament abusers, and does not yet stop devouring; he would also like to have me in; look at and want to adorn himself with our poor sack, and indeed the booklet I have written against D. Carlstadt should give me enough testimony to what I believe. Which he has also so far left unbitten and uneaten, and my reasons there still stand firm and unmoved. But they are far superior to us in one respect, that is that they are idle and embroider full of words, hurry the world with books and shower it. Now then, I hold, the proverb shall strike them too: Haste broke the neck, *cito fit, cito perit*. But we miserable worms also crawl out against the great talkers, and confess our

Faith against their error; let it help what and where God wills. Accordingly, I have the fine little book Syngamma, made by my dear lords and friends in Swabia, to spread among many, now for the second time helped to promote into German, and is the longer, the dearer to me, because I see how they commit crimes against it, and do nothing, but that they betray their spirit and bring it to light. It has remained before them and will remain before them, because it is the truth and puts lies to shame. Therefore I command every Christian to arm himself with it in conscience, and to beware of the devil, until God gives the truth the victory. It must and will be argued: he who lies there lies, let the word help him up again, and preserve those who are still standing; if I can do it, I will also do it, as much as God gives me. May God's grace be with us all, and soon wipe out these mobs. Amen.

Godly and learned treatise (*syngamma*) of the very famous men who met in Schwäbisch-Hall in 1525 1) about the words in the Lord's Supper.

To Johann Oekolampad, preacher in Basel.

Johann Lachmann of Heilbronn, Erhard Schnepf of Wimpfen, Bernhard Griebler of Gemmingen, Johann Geiling of Ulsfeld, Martin German of Fürfeld, Johann Gallus of Sulzfeld, Ulrich Schwiger of Weifsach, Johann Valtensis, Wolfgang Taurus of Orendelsal, Johann Herold, Johann Rudolphi of Oeringen, Johann Jsenmann, Michael Gretter, Johann Brenz and other preachers assembled at Schwäbisch-Hall [wish] to Johann Oekolampad preaching Christ at Basel: 1. Grace, mercy and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, Amen. In Christ, beloved Oecolampadius, love 2) (by which you have sacredly sworn to us, who preach Christ in a large part of Swabia, that we should rid ourselves of the most harmful poison, the quarrel in the church,

The first thing we have to do is to respond in writing to your outgoing booklet on the interpretation of the words "this is my body. We are also urged by faith to speak what we believe. For since this booklet of yours on the Lord's Supper was read to us, what should we do? Should we remain silent? Not at all. Faith in Christ desires to burst forth even in the midst of temptation and to make itself known to the whole world; so far is it from it that it should be deterred from public confession either by embellished speech or human prestige. For us also, as the prophet says, the speech of the Lord has become a consuming fire, and having shut it up in our bones, we have passed away [Ps. 102:4] and could not endure it. Should we not rather have sent out a booklet into the world and testified that our faith is different from your opinion, which is based on reason and (as you will no doubt hear) quite miserable

(**qualibus-what kind**)? But love hindered us, lest we, without having first admonished thee, should bring thee into the mouths of men. We, as many as are ours, have hitherto acknowledged thee as a father to be worshipped in Christ; why hast thou not treated us as thy sons? For behold, how fine it rhymes that thou didst first, without admonishing us, in our churches, which we did not by our own merit,

1) In our Latin original erroneously: 1526.

2) In our Latin copy the subject of the sentence is missing. According to the letter of Oekolampad to the preachers in Swabia, "Karitas is to be added. Therefore, xer is to be read immediately following.

but by God's grace (**munere**), you stir up discord over Holy Communion, but then you counsel us with many reasons that we should not violate love (**servemus**). If

you expect so much (**tantopere**) love from others, why did you first sow the seeds of discord? You, the father, lay dice and forbid the children to play. Hardly had we escaped Carlstadt's pernicious gruel, behold! you stir up the same mischief 1) again (albeit in a much more learned manner). But thanks be to God, who according to His mercy, which we have received in Christ Jesus, His Son and our Lord, has instructed us that we do not consider that which is foreign to the word of Christ to be better and truer for its own sake, because it is spoken in a better and more learned way. For even an unpalatable food is not palatable to us because it is presented to us in a silver vessel. We value the taste, not the vessel, and John prescribes that spirits should be tested to see if they are of God. Are we not prevented by this very fact from looking at the appearance of the speech, but rather [urged to look] at the truth of the word?

2 Therefore, dear Oecolampadius, we are fully convinced that, according to your own modesty, indeed, according to Christian integrity, you will easily tolerate that we differ from your opinion about the bread and the wine in Holy Communion until the Lord has granted both you and us to be of the same mind. But we wish this to happen shortly, for if we disagree longer, how great evil will we have to expect for our churches, which have hardly been snatched from the jaws of the Antichrist? If a private man errs, that brings little danger, if a neighbor quarrels with another, little harm, but if a prophet errs, if a bishop quarrels with another, what joy is that for Satan, what rejoicing! We sacredly affirm that in this matter we seek nothing else (though we are not justified in it) but the glory of the Word and the benefit of the churches. Now may Satan go and still greatly boast that strife is in the church, for he will boast to his detriment (malò); for we dare to promise ourselves a very great benefit from this friendly disagreement, by God's grace. Paul disagreed with Peter about the custom (onsrs) of the law, but in such a way that from this disagreement our

1) Carnerina is a large stinking swamp in Sicily.

harmony has come into being. Why should we not hope for the same thing in this matter, which is basically not so dissimilar to that one? But now let's move on to the matter itself.

First of all, the spirit, which is at odds with itself from the beginning, makes us very suspicious of your matter of the Sacrament of the Supper. For Carlstadt, the champion (xo/M^aio^A) in this struggle, refers the pronoun "that" in this speech "that is my body" to the body, not to the bread; this is sufficiently attested by his outgoing books. But he has left the battlefield and someone else has the litter. Zwingli, however, refers "that" to the bread, but agonizes over the word "i st" in a marvelous way, until he makes "is" into "means" by a transformation, or, if he prefers, by a kind of transmigration of souls (^sT-s^wa-sr). You come as the third one and give us also in a third way of speaking a sample of what you are able to do, and make "body" a sign of the body. There are three words, namely just the apple of discord, 2) about which we argue: "that", "is", "my body", and they have already produced three sects for us! It is not surprising that Isaiah says [Isa. 8, 14] that the Lord is "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense", since this word [that is my body] is a very small one according to the letter, but a very large one according to the matter, and it annoys so many and so great people. If one had to infer the father from the offspring, that is, from the sects, then we would certainly judge that the father was deformed. But we have learned to treat the word of the Lord with the greatest reverence,

although it gives many a cause for ruin (**ruinae**), certainly not through his fault, but through the ignorance of those who read or hear it. And indeed you and Zwingli, you agree, but where is Carlstadt's "that"? For either he teaches evil by referring "that" to the body, not to the

bread, or you err from the right aim (**scopo**) by referring "that" not to the body, but to the bread. See to it, dear Oecolampadius, lest a somewhat nosey man sing to you this saying: lies do not stand with themselves. But you say: Far be the quarrel about words, we want a fight about the matter. However much we may differ in words, we agree on the matter itself, namely, that the bread is not the body of Christ, and that the wine is not the blood. - Surely you will not consider your cause justified for that reason, because you agree on the main point?

2) Latin: ipsissiina seilleet Helena.

Is it not the case that the miser also makes a bargain in the gathering of goods, but in different ways? For the one increases his fortune by theft, the other by fraud, the latter by filthy frugality, the latter by shameful services. Are they not united in that they gather goods together? but they seek to accomplish this in different ways and in various ways. The truth, however, is not based on reasons that do not agree with each other, but on those that do agree with each other.

4 But this we leave aside, although it brygt your spirit quite strongly to the day. We must set about treating the reasons (*rationes*) of your booklet. For we cannot see our way to believing that you write seriously what you write right at the beginning: that we have drawn the error of the body of Christ from Peter Lombard and other writers of sentences. For the fact that we teach that the bread of Holy Communion, sanctified by the word of Christ, is the body of Christ given for us, we have not drawn from Peter Lombardus, for we do not do such great honor to a man, but from Christ's own words and from his holy mouth. Neither the famous Lombardus, nor even Damascenus, is so highly regarded by us that we should confess that we got our faith from them. We do not despise their work, for that would be spiteful and dishonest. But the fruit of the work in this matter (whatever they may have written in other matters, for we do not now intend either to excuse or to accuse them) we attach to GÖtte. At least you should see with what intention you call us disciples of Lombardus, because perhaps you want to use this name to make our cause suspicious, if not yet reprehensible, among the godly. For the same reason, if we are not mistaken, in the further course of the booklet you conflate our doctrine with the condemnable mass of the papists. Is this because we approve of the impiety of the masses by claiming that the bread of the Lord's Supper is the body of Christ? Not at all, for we are sure that you do not even suspect such a thing of us, and even this is our greatest concern, that we, with the word of the Lord, drive away this so abominable and detestable idol from our churches, at least work towards it with all zeal; but the Lord gives prosperity to this undertaking. It remains, therefore, that you accuse us solely for this reason, that we are on the side of the

papist impiety, so that 1) we should lose faith in our doctrine, yes, not in ours, but in Christ's doctrine of Holy Communion, among the godly, to whom everything in the papist church is suspect, but not so much the word as the sacraments. However, venerable Oecolampadius, far be it from us that we should suspect this of your disposition (*somnienius*); your sincerity is too well proven to us that we should suspect anything of the sort from you. But, thou sayest, the greatest cause of superstition and hypocrisy is given, if we are to believe that the bread is the body of Christ. - Well then! no godly man can approve of the idolatry (we would more properly say superstition) with which the bread of the Lord's Supper has hitherto been treated. For Christ says [Matt. 20:28], "I am not come that we should serve, but that I should serve." Thus by the word he brings his body in bread (*pani tradit*), and has given it to us, not that he might be ministered to, but that he might minister to us, that we might eat and drink it, to fortify our conscience. For how the bread of the Lord's Supper fortifies the conscience will follow hereafter. Now however much the hypocrites abuse the bread of the Lord's Supper, should it not therefore be the body of Christ? Or, because it would give rise to superstition, should we deny that it is the body? On the same ground, surely Christ would not be Christ, nor the Son of God. For because he had made himself the Son of God [John 19:7], they cried out, Crucify, crucify. The abuse of a thing takes nothing away from the truth of it. Even the word of the Lord is abused by the wicked; shall we therefore deny that it is the word of the Lord? Everybody knows how ungodly the Jews treated Christ, with the strokes of the cheek, the scourging, and the death of the cross. Should Christ therefore not be Christ, because he gave rise to these ungodly acts by preaching that he was Christ or the Son of God, or should we declare that he acted unjustly? For if he had lived as a private man, without holding a public office, according to the ways of the world, he would have given no cause to rage against him. But since he preached and became famous for his miraculous works, do we now want to cast the Jews' anger on Christ? Let that be far from us. In the same way one can speak of the bread of the Lord's Supper. For

1) Instead of st, we have assumed ut.

We would be unjust judges if we were to cast the cause of superstition, ungodliness, hypocrisy, idolatry out of the bread, which is the body of Christ. As if the bread were not the body for its own sake, because the flesh is superstitious, which sometimes even makes an idol out of God, seeking from God not what is God's, but what is its own. Will it therefore be evil that GOt is GOt? Do not many hypocrites make an idol out of St. Valentine or any other saint? But for the sake of foreign hypocrisy, Valentine, if any of the saints is called by this name, is not expelled from the number of saints. Therefore, as far as this reason is concerned, it still remains firm that the bread of the Lord's Supper is the body of Christ, according to the word of Christ. For what you bring from Augustine concerning the [various] kinds of miracles, we take as if you had adduced it in passing, not that we should think that you had presented it with the intention of refuting our doctrine. For although Augustine calls the bread a form (speoiow) which will pass away after the completion of the sacred action (*peracto Ministerio transituram*), he does not deny that the bread is what it is, namely the body of Christ, which is evident from the foregoing. For since he calls the serpent raised in the wilderness a figure which will remain only for a short time, he naturally lets the serpent remain what it is. Furthermore, what the bread of the Lord's Supper is, should become quite clear to us from the comparison with the brazen serpent.

For so it is written in the fourth book of Moses, Cap. 21:8: "The Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a serpent of brass, and set it up for a sign: whosoever is bitten, and beholdeth it, he shall live. So what is the serpent? Is it only a snake or only a sign? Not at all, but it is a healing serpent, or a healing sign. Where does it get this from? Because it is a snake, or because it is brazen? No, but because it has this word: "Whoever is bitten and looks at it shall live." This is how the Spirit interprets it in the 107th Psalm [v. 19. f.], "They cried," he says, "unto the LORD in their trouble, and he helped them out of their distresses; he sent his word, and made them whole." He does not say: he sent the serpent, but "the word." What kind of word? Certainly this: "He that is bitten, and beholdeth it, the same shall live." Therefore, by adding this word to the serpent, it becomes a serpent of such a nature as the word

It is a serpent, but it is also a sign, but it is also healing (sanativus). This is how one must speak of the bread in Holy Communion. For this bread, even though it is baked in the oven, even though it nourishes the body, is nevertheless of such a nature as the word which is added to the bread that we say so. But the word is, "u." Now as the word of the serpent brought the gift of *sanation* to the serpent, why should not the word of the Lord's Supper bring the body to the bread, since, as the word of the serpent possessed in itself the power of sanation, so also the word of the Lord's Supper has the body of Christ with it as its possession (secum possideat)? For that it is not a figurative speech (tropum), neither in the expression "is" nor in the word "body", we will show convincingly hereafter.

But you see, excellent man, that we present our opinion in a very rough way (pinguissima Minerva). Therefore, you will gladly put up with it if we have not been gentle in our words at times. So, since Augustine calls bread a form that will pass away, he does not deny that the bread is the body, just as he does not deny that the serpent has healing power (not insofar as it is a serpent, but insofar as it has the word), although he calls it [the bread] a form that will remain only for a short time. Furthermore, we are of the opinion that from this it is now quite clear how it is with the sacrament or the bread of the Lord's Supper. For many find fault with the fact that in such bread we seek fortification of faith, consolation of conscience, forgiveness of sins. For they say that outward signs cannot be a strengthening of conscience and a fortification of faith, but only proofs (*protestationes*) of faith, since carnal things are not efficacious in spiritual matters: "Trust! the cautious people, who thirst most for our salvation, fear that we would build our hope and confidence on the sand. But we have the right doctrine (*recte sentimus*), but those do not understand our opinion correctly. For who denies that the Sacrament is a sign (*symbolum*) and a public manifestation (*testatioutzln*) of communion? We agree with the Fathers, who called it both a communion and a gathering, as well as a love feast, so that in this very supper Christ speaks more of love, more of

of the fellowship of the brethren than anywhere else. But because Holy Communion has not only bread as a sign of communion, but also the Word, we do not wrongly seek consolation of conscience, forgiveness of sins, and strengthening of faith in the Lord's Supper. For all these things are found in the Word, if one seeks them only in true faith, for the Word comforts the afflicted, raises up the downhearted, strengthens the faith, in short, it brings us all the goods of God- Now since the bread of the Lord's Supper has this word: "This is my body, which is given for you," by which the conscience is fortified and sins are forgiven (for it is the word of the Son of God), what should prevent our not seeking these things in the bread? Since the bread of the Lord's Supper is not bread alone, but has the word: "This is my body" 2c. And we also seek the strengthening of faith in bread, not insofar as it is bread, but insofar as it has the word. Just as every civil meal is a sign of civil friendship; but it is also a strengthening of the same, not in so far as it is a meal, but in so far as it has friendly promises, or, if nothing else, friendly conversation.

(7) Moreover, there is a great difference between the sacraments given to Gideon and Hezekiah and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For the old word is confirmed by miracles, just as Christ's word was confirmed by miracles. The bread of the Lord's Supper, however, does not confirm the word, but is confirmed by the word. In addition, other miracles, which are miracles of action, not of the word, confirm faith for the sake of action, not for the sake of the word. But the sign of the Lord's Supper confirms faith, not for the sake of a deed, but for the sake of the word. As every word of God is a miracle, so is the word of the Lord's Supper, for no one can deny that the word of the Lord's Supper is the gospel.

8. listen, then, to what Paul says in Romans 1:16: "The gospel is the power of God, which saves everyone who believes in it. Will we hear your new interpretation also in this passage: the gospel (which also has letters and syllables and bodily [oaruallss] ways of speaking) is not the power of God, but signifies it? Would not all the glory (laus) of the Gospel be destroyed by such interpretations? And that you may fully understand what miracles we see in the bread and cup of the Lord's Supper.

we want to indicate this more clearly and coarsely. You believe without a doubt that Christ is not only true, but also the truth itself. For he says, "I am the way, the life, and the truth," and has also strongly declared that he is the truth, through signs and wonders and the resurrection and the sending of the Holy Spirit: for all these things are the confirmation (xxxxxxx) and seal of the truth of Christ. Since Christ spoke to the gout-broken man [Matth. 9, 2] or to the sinner [Luc. 7, 48]: "Your sins are forgiven you", is not the forgiveness of all sins included in this very short word and brought to the gout-ridden man and the sinner? Moreover, when he commanded the apostles 1) to wish peace to the house into which they were entering, saying [Luc. 10:5], "Peace be in this house," did he not include in this word, "Peace be in this house," and in a sense give peace captive to the word (for we speak roughly that we may be understood), which, included in the word, the apostles brought to the inhabitants of the house? What man of understanding would deny this? Further, since he says [John 11:25], "I am the resurrection and the life," is not life and resurrection brought by this very word to him who hears it, not an imaginary one, but a true one, yea, one 2) by which we shall rise and be resurrected if we accept the word? Thus, since he says [Ex. 20, 2.], "I am the LORD thy GOD," does not by this word "thy GOD" the LORD give himself to thee wholly, at the same time with all his goods? For he cannot be God without his goodness. Therefore, when he gives himself in word, he gives all that is his. In the same way, when Christ said: "my body is given for you" and "my blood is poured out for you", did he not conclude the body and the blood in this word? (Far be it from this word a spiteful declaration [invidia] even to such an extent that whoever takes hold of this word and believes and holds it in faith, he takes hold of, receives, has, and holds the true body and blood of Christ, namely, that which is shed for us, not a spiritual but the bodily (carnalem)? since it is not a spiritual blood that is shed for us but the bodily. Since the word alone has such a powerful effect that it brings the bodily body of Christ to us,

1) Instead of ^postolus is to be read ^postolos.

2) Instead of tali, read talis.

namely, that which is given for us, and the bodily blood which is shed for us: why should it not retain the same powerful effect when it is added to the bread and the cup? Or, does this word: the body is given for you, contain the body, and bring it itself to the hearer, but when to the bread is added "this is my body given for you," should it not retain the same as before? Should the bread take anything away from the word? Far be it from that, but it adds to the bread that which it contains. But it contains the true bodily body of Christ, therefore it also brings the body to the bread. [Here, then, is the miracle we confess to have taken place in the bread and cup of Holy Communion. For the whole miracle is a miracle of the word by which the body and blood are distributed by means of the bread and wine, not in so far as it is bread and wine, but in so far as it has this word: "this is [my] body, this is [my] blood." And it is no wonder that the apostles in the Lord's Supper did not wonder about it (however, who knows whether they wondered about it or not?), since Luc. 18, 32-34. *voy* is written to them, although Christ had said most clearly: "The Son of Man will be delivered to the Gentiles, and he will be mocked and reviled and spit upon, and they will scourge him and kill him, and on the third day he will rise again," - [yet] it is added: "But they heard none of these things, and the speech was hid from them, and they knew not what these things were spoken." For if at that time the speech was hidden from them, what wonder would it be if in the Lord's Supper also almost the same word had been hidden from them?

(9) Moreover, who can deny that Satan has undertaken many juggleries in regard (*oiroa*) to bread and wine? But he has done this with a far different intention than you suspect. For he did not intend with his absurd specters 1) that we should believe that the bread is the body, especially since the word of Christ says so, not the devil, but that he might drive us from truth and godliness into hypocrisy, ungodliness, and even idolatry. For Christ instituted the Lord's Supper that we might eat and drink, that we might seek in the Lord's Supper all that we seek in the Word. From *diösem* exceedingly

1) For example, that drops of blood are seen on the hosts and the like. Several such things are mentioned in Oecolampad's writing *De Zenuina vorkorum Domini eto*. "*x^ositiouo* mentioned. Cf. et *Koripts eoelisiae MirternderZioae*, eä. Dtatik p. 52. sq.

The devil would have liked to dissuade us from the wholesome use of the Lord's Supper, and he has dissuaded many, so that as partakers of the Lord's Supper, both by food and by reputation, they believed, deceived by vain seduction, that they were doing, giving, and offering something to Christ rather than receiving something.

(10) Now that it is not read that the church of the ancients bowed the knee to the bread and to the cup, should not the bread be the body for this reason? But perhaps they also did not bow the knee to the Word, for the sake of which the Word is not the Son of God? And even nowadays we do not pay bodily homage to this word, "the body of Christ is given for you," but as often as we hear it, we receive it with a reverent heart and faith, because that is the right homage; should it not bring the body to us or contain it in itself? When Christ washed Peter's feet, Peter did not bow the knee; is Christ not the Word or the Son of God? We have already mentioned this matter, that Christ did not give his body in the Lord's Supper to be ministered to, but to minister to us. For the same reason he gave us the whole Gospel, so that through it not only the body and blood of Christ would be present to us, but the whole power of God, the whole God, with all his goods. If a godly person does not uncover his head before the Gospel, does not take off the head covering (*capitium*), would he sin by doing so? Or does he declare by this sign that salvation is not brought to him by the word of the Gospel? Not at all, but what is brought by the word, he accepts with reverence (*adoratione*) of the heart, that is, with faith.

(11) But, you say, I have the fathers on my side, who agree with my opinion, and hold that the bread is a sign (*figuram*) of the body of Christ, or that it signifies the body of Christ, but is not the true body. We do not want you to urge us with human prestige, however sacred it may be, nor do the holy fathers themselves want this, that we should accept their sayings (*senſa*) with greater faith than those of Scripture, but neither are we so enamored (*ἡλαστοι*) of ourselves, nor such despisers, that we should reject the fathers. We receive them with the greatest respect and recognize in them very many excellent gifts of the Holy Spirit; their work and their care (*sollicitudo*) for the churches please us extra-

properly. But with all this, we do not prefer their interpretations to the very clear words of Christ. For although we admit that the Fathers, in a godly manner, called the bread and the cup signs (symbola) of the body and blood, likewise that the bread signifies the body, and the like, yet they will not be able to detract from the word of Christ (praejuckieadunt - they will not awaken any prejudice against it). For that otherwise they also call the holy supper a sacrifice, we interpret this to them for the best (oanckicke), not according to the sharpness of the word, but according to the word of Christ, who said, "Do these things," not for my sacrifice, but "in remembrance of me." Who will therefore prevent that we should not also interpret for the best, if they have sometimes called the bread and the cup signs, that the bread is not only a sign /and model, but a sign connected with the thing itself, since they call the bread sometimes the body, sometimes the sign of the body, 1) so that you must refer the sign from the bread, if it is bread, because in such a way the bread signified the body of Christ, before Christ was revealed to the world, as Tertullian quotes from Jeremiah [Jer. 11, 19. according to the Vulgate], "Come, let us devise a plot Against him: let us cast wood into his bread, that is, let us cast the cross upon his body." But a more correct reading is thus, "Come, let us cast poison into his food." For the citizens of Anathoth went about killing Jeremiah with poison. But this we will credit to Tertullian, since he has no ungodly opinion. Now as bread, inasmuch as it is, bread, is a sign of the body, so, inasmuch as it has the word "this is my body," it is not only a sign, but also the body itself. For it is much cheaper (justius) that we interpret the fathers by Christ's word, than Christ's word by the fathers. Let us listen to Chrysostom, who in the 83rd Homily on Matthew writes as follows: "Christ also drinks from the cup, lest they, hearing the words, should say: What, then, shall we drink blood and eat flesh? and be troubled. For even when he spake of these things before, many were troubled for the words only. So that this might not also happen at that time, he himself did it first, to cause them to participate in the hidden things (mysteriorum) with a calm mind." So far Chrysostom. Behold, he says, the apostles have eaten the flesh and have eaten the blood.

and Christ had done this first (for neither from what precedes, nor from what follows, will this be understood of a spiritual drinking [manducatione], but of the bodily); therefore, if he elsewhere calls the bread a sign, we shall meanwhile accept it in a godly and right way (candide), but in such a way that it does not contradict his former opinion, according to which he testifies that the apostles had drunk the blood.

12 You see the same thing in Augustine, who says: "He carried his body in his hands. Well, if he added afterwards: 'to some extent,' he does this only to soften and correct his expression (sermonis), not to say that the bread is not the body; if he calls it a sign, or a model, or an antitype (αντίτυπον), as Basil does, this will not detract from his earlier interpretation of the words of Christ. Thus, elsewhere, in reply to the inquiries (inquisitiones) of Januarius, book 1. cap. 6. he writes: "It is clearly evident that the disciples, when they first received the body and blood of the Lord, did not receive it soberly (jeunos);" he does not say that the disciples received the sign of the body, but the body itself. Furthermore, that Tertullian explains "body" by "sign of the body" in the fourth book against Marcion, this does not show that for Christ's sake he understood it that way. For even if we admit that Tertullian strengthened his argument against Marcion by this interpretation, we will not admit that he compelled by his reputation to understand the word of Christ in this way. There are other fathers, probably of greater faith, who write something quite different. For thus, according to your interpretation, dearest Oecolampad, we read in Theophylact about the 26th chapter of Matthew: "Furthermore, when he says: 'This is my body,' it is shown that the body of the Lord is itself the bread which is sanctified on the altar, and not a corresponding sign. For he did not say: this is a sign, but: 'this is my body'. For by ineffable effect the bread is changed, although this is not seen." Likewise about Marcus, Cap. 14: "When he had blessed, he gave thanks and broke the bread (fo do we also, adding prayers) [and said]: this is my body. This, I say, which ye take; for the bread is not merely a token and a type of the body of the HERm, but into the same is changed the body of Christ" (oonvsrtitur) 2c. Behold, how evil thy work succeedeth unto thee, so that it may be used against thee. But do you say.

1) Instead of appellat, read appellat (so. patres).

that Theophylact belongs to a later time than Tertullian? However, time does not take anything away from godliness. The dispute is not about stories or events, in which one must perhaps believe the older and earlier living more, but about the mind (*ingenio*) and spirit of the words of Christ. Now if it pleases you to compare Theophylact with Tertullian, Theophylact has left stronger traces of the true faith behind him, for the whole world knows what Tertullian taught of the double marriage (*digamia*) Against the Scriptures, and what he taught of the Comforter (*paracleto*) after the manner of Montanus. This is what we say about Tertullian, whom we venerate and hold in the highest esteem, not because we want to put something on him, nor do we perurtheize him for the sake of it, not to the fire or to hell, as the pope is wont to do, but to show that in this matter his reputation is not to be held in such high esteem that one should not deviate from it, although we do not deviate from him in this matter either, for we confess that the bread is a sign and image (*exemplar*) of the body of Christ. For as bread nourishes the body, so the body of Christ animates and nourishes the soul. But we affirm that the bread of Holy Communion is not only a sign, but also the true bodily body of Christ. On what ground? with what proof? Our reason is not taken from reason (*dialectica*), not a conjecture, but contains the proof in itself (*"αποδείχταός"*). It is the word of Christ who says: 'Mehmet hin und esset, das ist mein Leib' 2c.

(13) They say that it is an obscure speech (*tropum*), notice, either in the word "is" or in the expression "body," so that you must take either "is" for "means" or "body" for "sign of the body. It is to be wondered at that not also in the word bread, or broke, or take, or eat, a faded manner of speaking is devised, since with so great arbitrariness of mind a faded speech in "is" and "body" has become popular to them. Well then, let us consider your reasons, by which you assign the faded speech to the word "is": For also in other places of the Scriptures one finds "is" for "means", as in the 1st Book of Moses, Cap. 41, 26.: "The seven beautiful cows are seven fruitful years." Matth. 13, 38.: "The field is the world," and elsewhere: "The adversary is the devil"; "The seed is the Word." If you do not take "is" for "means" in these speeches, you no longer have an adequate speech. Truly! a beautiful conclusion art and a lovely proof: The raven is black,

therefore also the swan must be black; Absalom is beautiful, therefore also that Thersites 1) must be beautiful in Homer. Or is this not of the same kind: "Is" is taken for "means" in some places of the scriptures, so also in this speech "this is my body" must be taken for "means"? Far be it from us, when we hear such things, to learn to tear up the Scriptures in such a manner according to our liking; the anointing [of the Holy Spirit] teaches us far otherwise. For in the former discourses "is" may be taken for "signifies," which requires the interpretation of the dreams and the parable, and the peculiar nature (*proprietary*), for where either a dream or a parable is interpreted, only then will it be lawful to interpret "is" with "signifies," but not likewise in other discourses. For in the Lord's Supper Christ interprets neither a dream nor a similitude with the words "this is my body". But if we had any desire at all (which is far from us) to spin out the argument further, we should like to find the faded speech in these sayings: "the field is the world"; "the word is the seed", not in the word "is", but rather to transfer it to the words "field" and "seed", so that in the simile the expressions would be taken in their original meaning, but in the interpretation would be changed from the original to the faded (*tropicum*) way of speaking. And this is also according to the holy scripture, since in the first letter of Peter Cap. 1, 23, the word is called a seed, not a perishable one, but an immortal and imperishable one; if one were to take the word seed in its original meaning, one would not attain the right understanding of Peter's speech.

14 But, they say, even where there is no likeness and no dream, "is" can be found in Paul for "means," saying, "the rock was Christ." We acknowledge Paul's words; who better than Paul himself could interpret them? For that we might interpret "was" by "meant" in this passage, the foregoing does not admit of it under any condition, for he says thus [1 Cor. 10:4]: "all drank of one spiritual drink; but they drank of the spiritual Rock which followed with them." Which was the spiritual rock? (For nothing is said there about the bodily rock.) It follows: "That rock," namely, the one of which it was said, the spiritual one that accompanied the fathers, "was Christ."

1) About Thersites compare Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 1899, note 4.

Now, if in this saying "the spiritual rock was Christ," "is" becomes." Because neither a spiritual body nor the church were to be explained by "signifies," what inconsistency are given for us, therefore "body" remains in its original would that be? It is quite understandable to us that a meaning.

physical rock signifies Christ, just as we also confess that 16) Furthermore, what is brought forward from the 12th the bread here and there shadows him. For as a bodily chapter of the second book of Moses [v. 11]: "It is the rock is a strength to him that is founded thereon, so also Lord's Passover" rather confirms our doctrine than that it is Christ a strength to him that believeth; and as bread should overthrow it, because in this speech neither "is" feedeth the body, so also Christ feedeth the soul. But in may be interpreted by human presumption with means, the Lord's Supper it becomes another bread, which has nor "Passover" with sign of the Passover. For indeed the been sanctified by the word of the Lord. For if the bread in Spirit has reserved to Himself the interpretation of His the Lord's Supper is nothing but a sign of the body, what words, and does not give this honor to the flesh. And as need is there of sanctifying the bread, or of setting it apart Paul says [1 Cor. 2:11], "No man knoweth what is in man, from common use, since it was the same before except the spirit of man which is in him," so who should sanctification? And since Paul speaks of the rock among know better what is to be understood by the words of the the Corinthians, he understands this not of the bodily but Spirit than the Spirit himself? Therefore, most learned of the spiritual, which no one can deny who carefully Oecolampadius, allow us to obtain this from you, that we compares this passage with the preceding. It is true that may interpret "Passover" not according to a dream, but the fathers drank from the physical rock, but in this according to the opinion of the Spirit, who interprets it not passage Paul is speaking of the spiritual drinker, for he as a sign, but by "Passover sacrifice." For thus it is written says: "they drank from the spiritual rock that followed with in the same second book of Moses, Cap. 12, 26. f.: "And them". Here also belongs 2 Sam. 22, 2: "The Lord is my when your children shall say unto you, What manner of rock, the Lord is my fortress". And in Zechariah [Cap. 2, service have ye? ye shall say, It is the LORD'S Passover 5.], "I will be to them a fiery wall round about." Will you then sacrifice." You see that the Spirit, the best interpreter of take "is" for "means" in these passages also? No, for the His words, explains "Passover" not by "sign," but by nature of the speech demands that we look for the "Passover sacrifice," so that the sense is, "For it is the figurative (tropum) in the words "rock" and "wall." For in Lord's Passover," that is, it is the Lord's Passover these speeches the words "rock" and "wall" have passed sacrifice. For neither can sacrifice and sign be said to be from their original to a transferred meaning (translatitium), the same thing, unless thou wilt understand that Christ is but this cannot happen in such a way in this speech: "This is my body", because indeed "body" remains in its original a sign, when the Spirit says Christ is a sacrifice. For that Zwingli says that these words, "It is the Lord's Passover," are the reason for what immediately precedes, "and ye shall eat it as they hasten away"; does he not by such speech bring it about that he says nothing? Does the haste of eating have a reason, but the preceding has none? What then is it: "It shall be a lamb without blemish; in one house shall ye eat it; the posts shall ye put blood upon; about your loins shall ye be girded; ye shall have shoes upon your feet" 2c.? Shall there be no reason for this? But more correctly and beautifully Moses interprets himself, who refers "Passover" to the whole service (*religionem* - service, according to Ex. 12, 26.) of the lamb, not to a part.

15 Let us go through the Scriptures and investigate the meanings of "body". For soon the Holy Spirit uses it for the physical body, as Isa. 50, 6 [according to the Vulgate]: "I presented my body to those who struck it" 2c., and Luc. 24, 23: "They did not find the body of the Lord in the grave." But soon [it stands] for the figurative (metaphrigo), for the spiritual body, or for the church; 1 Cor. 15, 44.: "A natural body is sown, and a spiritual body is raised"; Eph. 4, 4.: "We are One Body"; Col. 1, 24.: "for His body, which is the church." But for "signs of the body" we find it nowhere. Now in this speech: "This is my body" the word "body" can be taken neither for the spiritual body, nor for the church, because soon follows: "who was given for you

1) In the original erroneous: 22.

2) Instead of *pairem* is to be read *pariern*. - It seems to us that right after that instead of: *arnakimus* - *orakirns* should be read.

consider with you whom we follow by deviating from your opinion. For you see most clearly that "was" in the statement: "The rock was Christ" and "Passover" cannot exist at all according to your way. Now, when the iron and brass reasons fall away, will you not fast the suspicion that the whole thing is a fraud?

Some seem to be able to strengthen their opinion somewhat from the first book of Moses, chapter 17, where it is thus written [v. 13]: "So shall my covenant be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." Circumcision, they say, is called a covenant or a covenant, although it is nothing but the sign of the covenant. For thus it is written [v. 10. f.], "Every male among you shall be circumcised. But ye shall circumcise the foreskin of your flesh. The same shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you." We thank thee, Holy Spirit, that thou hast freely made known what thou understandest by covenant, for since circumcision was before called a covenant, it is now called a sign of the covenant. Does he also give such a declaration (dis[s]ertat) of the body of Christ? For since Christ had said, "This is my body," is it added afterwards, that it is a sign of my body? But that would have been superfluous in such a great matter. But even Paul does not dare to make the body a sign of the body, for he says [1 Cor. 11:29], "that he might not distinguish the body of the Lord"; he does not say, "that he might not distinguish the image or the sign of the body". Furthermore, the whole manner (ratio) of circumcision makes our, indeed Christ's, opinion of the bread of the Lord's Supper most clear, for circumcision is both a covenant and a sign of the covenant, since it is not only a cutting off of the foreskin from the flesh, but also has a word added to it; which therefore is the word, such also is circumcision. Listen, God has spoken it. [Deut. 17, 1. f.], "I am [Almighty GOD], I will make my covenant with you." What is a covenant but a promise, an agreement (conventio), an alliance (foedus)? Now what promise happened to Abraham? It follows soon after [v. 4.]: "Thou shalt become a father of many nations"; [v. 6. f.]: "I will make thee almost very fruitful, and will make nations of thee, and kings also shall come of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee," 2c., "that I may be thy God, and of thy seed after thee. And I will give thee and thy seed

give after you" 2c. Behold, there thou hast the covenant; now is added, even the seal of the covenant [v. 10. f.], "All that is male among you shall be circumcised. But ye shall circumcise the foreskin of your flesh. The same shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you." 2c. Behold, there you have the sign of the covenant. Therefore circumcision is the seal of the real covenant, but it is also called the covenant itself, or the covenant; why? Because the word of the covenant is attached to it. For where circumcision is called a covenant, it is not to be interpreted that it is a sign of the covenant, but because the Holy Spirit has the word in mind, he rightly calls circumcision the covenant itself. For that it is a covenant, it has from the word; that it is a sign, it has from the outward sign of circumcision] (specie). Thus the bread of the Lord's Supper has the word, "This is my body, which is given for you." From this word it has that it is the body of Christ; but that it thereby also shadows Christ, this it has from its nature (*natura*). For as bread nourishes the body, filling the stomach, so Christ nourishes the soul's food; just as a rock, because it does not waver by nature and is firm, therefore most correctly represents Christ, who is a strength, a fortress, a stronghold (fortalitiu) to all those who trust in him.

18 Now let us also consider the other things that are quoted from Paul and Lucas about the cup. "This cup", he says [Luc. 22, 20. 1 Cor. 11, 25.], "is the new testament in my blood" or "through my blood" (for this is the same). But we must wonder how any one can presume to interpret, almost to say desecrate, in this passage "the new testament" by signs of the new testament. For it is added: "in my blood," as a declaration of the cup or wine. For whence is it called "the cup of the new testament"? because it is a sign of the new testament? Not at all; but because it contains the blood of the New Testament. Give glory to the Holy Spirit, and let Him interpret His own through Himself, which He does most carefully, both in Matthew and in Marcus. For what Paul calls "the new testament" is not called a sign in Matthew, but "the blood of the new testament". For so it is said [Matth. 26, 27. f.], "Drink ye all of it: it is my blood of the new testament." 2c. Do you want to have a clearer interpreter? We are still afraid to contradict the interpretation of the

Evangelists to make of the New Testament not the blood of the New Testament, but a sign? In addition, what is written in the second book of Moses Cap. 24, 8: "Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said: Behold, this is the blood of the covenant" 2c., he does not say: this is the sign of the covenant 2c. In like manner, when Christ sprinkled among his people by the word the blood, not of the old testament, but of the new, he took the cup, and said, "Drink ye all of it; for this is the blood of the new testament, which is shed for you." By this word, which was spoken at the cup, he sprinkled his blood, not the sign of it, into the cup of the new testament 2c. Unless someone wants the blood fei a sign of the testament, not the testament itself, no one will disagree. For the new testament is the forgiveness of sins, eternal blessedness, and, as Jeremiah says [Cap. 31, 33.], "I will put my law in their heart, and I will be their GOOD" 2c. The seal of this testament, yes, the attainment of it is the blood, but because the blood is the seal of the testament, shall it not be blood for its sake? Let this be far from it; for because the blood is the blood of Christ, therefore it seals and confirms the new testament. So also the wine in the cup of the Lord's Supper, because it is the blood of Christ, is the sealing and confirming of the new testament.

(19) But let us pass from the blood to the manner of baptism. For baptism is a burial with Christ and a bath of rebirth. How, then, are we to make of the bath and the being buried with Christ again a sign of the bath and of regeneration? We would rather that the Scriptures be treated according to their spirit, not according to our reason or invention, lest the ungodly, instructed by our sacrilege, subsequently become accustomed to trample the sanctuary underfoot. The words of God must be treated with fear and trembling, lest we be regarded as desecrators of them. Therefore, who can better interpret that baptism is the bath of regeneration than he who said this? For thus Paul writes to Titus [Cap. 3, 5.], "he made us blessed by the bath of regeneration." Why he calls baptism the bath of regeneration, he explains in Eph. 5,¹⁾ 25. f. Is it because it is supposed to be a sign? But in this way it does not wash the soul. Perhaps because it has water? but in this way it only cleanses the body. Wes-

So why is it called a bath? Listen to Pau; lum: "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it, and purify it by the bath of water in the word." Here you have quite clearly that baptism is called and is a bath of regeneration, not for the sake of the sign, but for the sake of the word. And what do we say differently of the bread of the Lord's Supper? For we do not say that the bread, inasmuch as it is a sign, is the body, but for the sake of the word, "This is my body." 2c. For that there is no obscure speech in the expression "body", we think, is already somewhat clear, after we have overturned your reasons of the rock, of the Passover, and of the New Testament. For it has been shown how forcible and completely contrary to the mind (ingenium) of the Holy Spirit your interpretations are.

20 Now let us move on to the other things. Matth. 11, 14. Christ says of Johanne: "He is Elijah." But how? Does he call John Elijah for his own sake, because he is similar to Elijah (refert) or because he is supposed to signify Elijah (signet)? Why is added: "he who is to be in the future"? Is the Elijah to be future who had to do with Ahab (^dabita) ? We have in mind in a much more certain way what the scripture intends (soopcm). For there are two people who are called Elijah. One is Elijah the Thisbite, contemporary of the king of Israel, Ahab. The other is the Elijah of whom the prophet Malachi proclaims in the third and fourth chapters that he will come. This Elijah is John, as also Christ's words testify, who says: "This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my angel." And afterwards [v. 14.], "If ye will receive it: He is the Elias that is to be future," not the Thisbite, but 8of whom Malachi says, "I say unto you, Elias is come already, and they have not known him." It is true that John went before Christ in the spirit and power of Elias, as Lucas testifies. But on this occasion one must not make "is" into "means" (rslsrt), because John does not mean that Elijah, the Thisbiter, but "he himself is Elijah, 8who is to be hereafter", that is, the one of whom Malachi proclaimed long before that he' would be before Christ.

21. furthermore, with what [good] judgment you have cited to confirm your opinion from the first book of Moses the tree of knowledge good and evil, furthermore from John: "Behold, your son" [Joh. 19, 26. according to the vulg.

1) In the original erroneously Eph. 6.

we do not recognize yet. For if you compare the word in the first book of Moses with the word of the Last Supper, they will be very far (xxx ὑὰ πασών) from each other, because it says: XXX XXXX XXXX from the tree of knowledge.

Good and evil, not: from the tree, which is the knowledge of good and evil. For you know better than we that n in the article is in the genitive. In the Lord's Supper you will hear nothing of the kind, for Christ does not say, "Take and eat, this is the bread of my body," but, "This is my body." And since John is called the Son of Mary, you cannot take "is" for means, nor "Son" for sign of the Son; for who ever heard such interpreters?

22 We demand firmer ground. And to confess the truth, your sect becomes much weaker and more despicable by these testimonies begged together, because you do according to the habit of the orators, who, where solid proofs are lacking, justify theirs by suppositions, and persuade themselves that they have carried out the speech excellently, if only they have not brought the speech to an end without [beautiful] paint (coloribus), the thing may be proven, however it may want. Almost right from the beginning of your booklet, you gather everything from everywhere that could give even a semblance to your cause. But we demand solid [proofs], against which even the devil can't be afraid, especially in divine matters. Human affairs are guided and supported by conjecture, which, though it may fail from time to time, fails with less harm. For it is not a tremendous harm if we lose our bodily goods. Divine things are based on solid evidence, so that our faith may be sure, so that we do not run in vain, so that we do not fall into temptations.

23 For suppose that we also believed that the bread of the Lord's Supper was only a sign of the body, convinced by this reason that in the first book of Moses the tree of knowledge is called good and evil, and because of the passage in John, "Behold thy Son." But what will we then answer the devil, if he should reproach us against it, that "son" is not taken for the sign of a son in this passage, and that also in the Lord's Supper it is not said, as in the first book of Moses, "This is the bread of my body"? Now, even if you could take "Son" for a sign of the Son (which the right nature of the speech by no means allows), who could make it certain that "body" must also be taken in this way? since you are not easily in the

You will find in Scripture that "body" is taken for "sign of the body".

If it were free to tear the Scriptures apart in this way, who could prevent another from doing the same in the statement found in Matth. 3, 17: "This is my beloved Son", so that the meaning would be: This is the sign of my beloved Son, since he would also have his reasons, which would be obvious to the flesh, and is still reproached by the Jews today, how a man could be the Son of God? And if our suspicions do not deceive us, then this spirit of the sacramentarians deals with it and works towards snatching away from us the outward Christ, the outward word. For he gives us a very beautiful sample of this matter by asking: What then is the outward word of God? Is it not the letter? does it not have syllables? Should letters and syllables make us blessed? It is obvious that he also wants to say: What is the outward Christ? Is he not a man? is he not flesh? But flesh is of no use, and cursed be he that trusteth in man.

(25) We are frightened as often as we think of this trick of Satan, for we know what he is up to, and it is certain that he is now preparing (coquere) such things in his house, but he does not yet come forth in open battle; but if one allows him to make signs of the body out of "body", what blasphemies should he not subject himself to? For the devil has the nature (naturam) to bring forth from his lair something far different than he initially pretended, for he knows how to easily transform himself into an angel of light. Have we not experienced this wickedness abundantly in our time in the peasants' revolt? In the beginning, he acted as if he wanted to assist the Gospel, relieve the poor of their heavy burdens and help them to freedom, but in the meantime he was intent on perjury, robbery, murder and all kinds of evil.

This spirit tears apart the word of God and pretends to teach the right use of the sacrament, as he is a cloak-holder (versipellis), but secretly he works for something else. It grieves him that the word of the Gospel has been revealed, he feels the decline of his kingdom and therefore pulls out all the stops so that he remains the prince of the world. For that would not be the smallest part of his victory, if he could impute the sign of the body for the "body". See, how great a gift he would have deprived us of!

For since God's Word makes the gifts of God present to us, which we will speak about later in the appropriate place, then through this word: "This is my body" the body of Christ becomes present to us and is presented to us.

(27) Now if the devil should be permitted so much as to make a sign of the body out of the body, will he not impute a ghost for the truth, an empty mirage for the cause? And he, when he has accomplished this, will not be satisfied with it and confine himself to it, but will proceed further and try to make also of peace a sign of peace, of the forgiveness of sins a sign of forgiveness. For since Christ commanded the apostles to wish peace to the house into which they entered, and sent them forth to forgive sins, a malicious man might say that the apostles were not able to offer peace and forgiveness of sins to their hearers, since Christ alone was the peace and forgiveness of sins, and no one ever saw Christ carried on the shoulders of the apostles from city to city and from house to house; but of these things afterward.

Now we return to what we have digressed from. You say: To Mary it is said in relation to John: "Behold, your son", of course he takes care of her 2c. There you could have answered yourself, because in this saying "son" is not taken in the original but in a figurative meaning, because there is a son by nature, a son after care, a son by adoption (adoptione), a son [begotten] by teaching. But since John is not a true and natural son of Mary, he will be her son by care [for her] and obedience [to her].

29. But that in this speech, "This is my body," such a figurative meaning is not, is indicated by the following words, where it is said, "Who is given for you." In this way, even if in this speech: "Behold, your son" were added: who is born of you, what is added: he is born of you, would undoubtedly force that "son" should be taken not for a son of concern, but for a natural son. Nothing like this can be said of the word of the Lord's Supper, which is fully protected by what follows against taking "body" figuratively (metaphorice) or figuratively (translatitie). Furthermore, since you are so astute in asserting figurative speech, you should have been careful not to make an

figurative speech, where this is by no means permissible. For you say that there is a trope in these sayings [Matth. 11, 11.]: "He who is least is greater than he," and [Matth. 13, 12.]: "He who does not have, from him will also be taken what he has." See thou do not, by asserting a figurative speech, not only deal unjustly against the Scriptures, but also sin against Christ. For if he only appeared smaller, but was not in fact smaller, then the eighth Psalm lies, which says [v. 6. according to the Vulg. cf. Heb. 2, 7. 9.], "Thou hast made him for a little while less than the angels"; so he himself lies [Matth. 27, 46.], "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" so Paul also lies, Eph. 4, 9.: "He is gone down into the lowest parts of the earth." What more is needed? If Christ was not in truth smaller, but only signified a lesser, it follows that he was also not in truth greater, nor did he ascend in truth, but only signified a greater, and that his ascension was not a true fact, but only a shadow, since he ascended only because he descended; was only exalted because he was in truth humbled to death on the cross, Phil. 2:8, and Eph. 4:10: "He that descended is the same that ascended above all heavens, that he might fill all things." This is what we said before, that the devil deals with making a ghost, a mirage and a sign out of Christ. Moreover, if you maintain that Christ is not speaking of the humiliation on the cross and of the abandonment of the Father, but of the opinion of men, according to which John was considered greater, but Christ smaller, you are speaking rightly in our opinion. For in the kingdom of heaven, that is, in the matter of the gospel, two people were held up by the people at that time, John and Christ. John was considered greater because of the severity of his life, but Christ was considered lesser because of the friendly intercourse [with sinners], so that he also ate with sinners. Therefore, if you look at the opinion of the people, he was indeed smaller, that is, in the hearts of the people; but if you compare him with John, he was the greatest.

30. you see again that no trope can be admitted here, and in Matthew [Cap. 13, 2.] ["He who has not"] is called a not having, not because he does not have the sign (figuram) [but because he does not have the thing] 1) namely, faith; for the sense is: because

1) The sense requires such an intercalation.

If he does not have faith, what he has (that is, the gifts of either nature or others) is taken from him; for to him who does not have faith, the gifts and presents of God never prosper. A bishopric is a gift and a gift. Whoever administers the bishopric without faith will be taken away from him, that is, it will not benefit him, it will not promote his salvation. For the gifts are of no use, but do more harm, if one possesses them without faith. Will someone, because he possesses the wisdom 1) of the flesh, without the spirit of faith, not really be wise according to the flesh? Certainly he is not wise according to the spirit, but in truth he is wise according to the flesh. Whoever possesses riches without faith, will he have only the appearance (*figuram*) of a possessor? Then it would be well with the thieves, who could protect themselves with this excuse against the death penalty, if they answered the judge according to your tropes, they had not taken the money from real owners, but only from those who seemed to possess. But who would not like to excuse his shameful deeds by these tropes also before the world and before God? For imagine that a citizen accuses another of the crime of a robber; if now the slanderer were brought before the court, could he not then easily excuse himself with the trope and interpret "robber" with signs (*figura*) of the robber? And we could object to being accused of being sinners before God's court by pleading the trope and saying, "Why do you condemn us? We are not sinners, but only have the *form* (*formam*) of sinners. Therefore, O Christ, why hast thou come down from heaven? Why did you not teach us, through some angel, the trope with which we could excuse ourselves? Certainly, the trope would have freed you from your suffering and death; we excuse ourselves from sins by your exceedingly bitter death, but surely it would have been more sweet (*dulcius*) for you to do so, that we might have saved ourselves from the judgment of God by the trope.

We are not playing a game, dear Oecolampadius, but we are only giving a small foretaste of future interpretations in Scripture, when we admit that "body" is made into the sign of the body. But you say: It is not uncommon that the signs of things are expressed by the words of things. Whether this is quite true, we cannot say in this place. At least what you teach about the fiery tongues and the dove and the blowing proves that

1) Instead of *sapisntia*, read *sapientiam*.

not your sentence, because also the Holy Spirit is neither called a fiery tongue in the flesh, nor a dove, unless a little word (*particula*), which denotes a likeness, is added, as in Jeremiah [Cap. 23, 29.] the word of the LORD is called as it were (*quasi*) a fire, and as it were a hammer that breaketh rocks, for so it is written: -ΩΩ ΠΟ Κ'ΩΠ :/? □ Φ' (ΙΤΒΜί nin, and Matt. 3:16: τό πνεύμα του -&εοῦ χαταβαῖνον ὡς εἰ περιστεράν, The.

Scripture says the Spirit of God descended like a dove, it does not say the Spirit of God is a dove, and John 1:32: 2) xxxxxxxxx xx

you see that it is said: "like a dove", but not that he is the dove.

32 Since this whole speech must be understood according to the way (*rationem*) of faith, there is a much different sense in the whole report (*sermone*) than is indicated by the words. Was not the Spirit in Christ before? Did Christ not have the Spirit before baptism? Far be it that we should say this of Christ, who is by nature the Son of God. What is it, then, that you say, "I saw the Spirit of God descend from heaven in the form of a dove, and remain upon him? Did the Spirit descend if he is bodily (*quod corporis est*)? Did the dove remain on Christ? Did he carry it around on his shoulders or on his head wherever he went? Therefore, when it is said that the Spirit of God descended, the Scripture expresses that the Spirit did not come upon Christ only recently, or that He fell upon Him from heaven, but that He made known His presence, with which He was always fully present with Christ (*praesentissimus*), through the outward form of the dove. Therefore to "dove" the circumstantial word *like* is added, which is not added to the word of the Lord's Supper. It is not said: This is as it were my body; it is also not said: My body is as it were bread, but simply: This bread is my body. We also read in Genesis 19:18 that God descended, but what is that but that the Lord, who is present everywhere, made His presence known through the trembling, the smoke and the fire? The same is written in the 1st book of Moses in the 11th cap. [V. 5: "Then the Lord came down to see the city and the tower. Was he not present before? Does he not accomplish all things? "Of him," says Paul [Rom.

2) In the original Latin: "äxe".

11, 36.], "and through him, and in him, 1) all things take place"; so what is: "he descended"? The Lord is everywhere present, but his presence is not everywhere manifest. Therefore, according to our way of speaking, he is said to descend from heaven when he makes himself known as present through some outward form. Now when he had confused the languages at Babylon, he made his presence known by the act itself, that is, by the confusion of the languages, but this does not mean that the confusion of the languages is the Lord. And in the Acts of the Apostles [Cap. 2, 3] there were seen by the apostles cloven tongues like fire, and the fire or the fiery tongue sat upon every one of them; yet it is not yet said that the fiery tongues are the Holy Spirit. Likewise, John 20:22, "he breathed on the apostles, and saith unto them: Take ye the Holy Ghost," but does not say, Take ye, this breath is the Holy Ghost, as it is said in the Lord's Supper, "Take ye (even the bread), which is my body."

(33) Now see how your disputation may stand, for since Christ says, "Do these things in remembrance of me," you presume to conclude that the body of Christ is not present for its sake, because Christ commanded that its remembrance should take place; but a remembrance takes place in absent things, not in present things. For this is your reasoning (ratiocinatio). But how is it that now, for the confirmation of your reason, you summon signs of things that are not absent to something present, as it were, as auxiliaries? Have you forgotten that, according to your doctrine, the signs are signs of things that are absent, not of things that are present? The dove, the breath, the fiery tongues are signs of the spirit, but also the spirit is present, not absent. Do you also want to affirm that the body of Christ is present in the Lord's Supper, even though according to you the bread is only a sign?

(34) We do not suppose that anyone has such an ungodly opinion that he should deny that faith drinks the blood of Christ and eats his flesh. For so it is said in John 6:55: "My flesh is meat, and my blood is drink." Whose? Of faith, for faith eats the flesh of Christ and drinks His blood by believing. If then faith eats the flesh and drinks the blood, it follows that the flesh and blood are present to faith, since, if they were not present, they would not have been eaten or drunk, or, if they were not present, they would not have been consumed.

1) üunt seems to be intentionally set instead of suut.

Since, of course, no one can eat God himself, that is, believe, except the one to whom God is present. For the wicked and unbelievers, He is absent, therefore they also do not eat GOD, that is, they do not believe in GOD. In short, as faith has God present when it believes in God, so when it eats the body 2) and drinks the blood, that is, when it believes, it must have the body and the blood present.

35) But who makes God present for faith (for we are not speaking of the presence according to which God fulfills everything, but according to which He is with the godly) but only the Word? For as He is revealed through the Word, so He is also given out as a present [^]GOtH through the Word. Joh. 1, 18.: "No one has ever seen God. The only begotten Son (who is the Word), he hath declared it unto us." And elsewhere [Joh. 14, 9.]: "He who sees me, sees also my Father", that is, he who has the word, receives, believes: he who has, receives, believes GOD. And so it is entirely ordered (comparatum) in such a way that faith cannot be directed to GOD in any other way than through the Word, which is the Son of GOD, and that also GOD does not meet faith in any other way than through the Word, because indeed GOD dwells in the cloud in the dark and, as that one [Paul 1 Tim. 6, 16], in a light where no one can come; and since no one goes in, no one goes out, except only the Son, who is the Word, who goes out and comes in, ascends and descends, and no one else. John 3:13: "No man goeth up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven." The godly also ascend, but in Christ and through Christ, in the Word and through the Word. Furthermore, since the Word offers God with all His goods to faith as a present one, why should the Word not do the same with the body and blood of Christ? since these are our gifts (dōna) and through them we are snatched out of the jaws of death, sin, hell, yes, even the devil. John says in the first epistle, Cap. 1, 7. "The blood of JEsu Christ makes us clean from all sin." So if the blood makes us clean, the blood must be present to us, since an absent thing does not make clean. But the blood of Christ may be trampled underfoot, or sucked out of the earth, and it is not possible for us to be clean.

2) Instead of crsāat here must be read sāat, and the comma after the following orsāat is to be deleted.

3) Instead of üās, üāsi will probably read sem.

lich that it should have lasted until us. Nevertheless, if we want to be cleansed in the meantime, we must be cleansed by [this] blood. But we do not see what could bring this blood to us, except the word. Faith, you say, offers us the blood. But whence does faith take the blood, if not from the word? For faith is not faith unless it is directed to the word. The Word is the object of faith, the Word offers to faith all that it receives or believes. And even wherever the gifts of God may be placed, be they either taken from us, or hidden and far from our eyes, they are brought back (restituuntur), revealed, and set before us by the Word. Let us look recently at some of the kinds of gifts which are brought to us through the Word, and it will soon be revealed how we receive through the bread, to which the Word is added, the body and blood of Christ, the excellent gifts which can never be praised highly enough. Food and clothing are gifts from God, but who brings us these gifts? who makes these gifts from God our own? You have the word Matth. 6, 30. 26.: "The Father clothes", "the Father feeds"; through this word God pours himself into our bowels, through this word food and clothing are brought to us. It seems as if the cooks filled us with food (farCire), and as if the tailors clothed us with garments, but the eye of faith, which turns its attention to this word, easily recognizes from where both food and clothing have been provided-. The wicked also have food and clothing, but not as a gift from God, because they have no word, or even if they have the word in abundance, they do not take it in faith. For the benefits of God are judged by the word, not by the appearance (specie), just as among men the benefits are judged by the attitude of the giver, not by the appearance of the gift. For even to Artaxerxes, the king of the Persians, a drink of water, which was given to him in both hands by a man of labor, 1) a common soldier, because he had no other vessel, was a delicious drink of rennet (nsotar), in that he measured the service of love according to the good will of the giver, not according to the usefulness of what was given.

due, but then also tremendously great, if they have the word and are received in faith. Therefore, the land of Canaan, the kingdom of Israel, was praised above all other countries and kingdoms, not because Canaan was more productive through the fertility of the soil, or because the kingdom of Israel, as far as outward appearances are concerned, surpassed other kingdoms in glory and power, for both the Babylonian and the Greek and the Roman empires were greater, but because it had the Word. Therefore, if you compare the land and the kingdom of Israel with others, it is by far the smallest of all, according to its prestige. What was the extent of the land of Canaan, what was the importance of the kingdom of David, when compared with Babylon and Rome? But if you compare it by word with others, it is by far the greatest of all. For the Word, from whose gift the Jews received the land and the kingdom, made known the benevolent and kindly disposition of God the Giver. But the value of the gift depends on the attitude, not on the prestige of the gift. What is the purpose of this? So that you may see that the gifts of God become true gifts for us when the Word is added to them. Now also the peace of God is a gift that is acquired for us through Christ, for since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ [Rom. 5:1]. But how is this gift set before us, how does it become present? Is it not through the word? Which one? "Peace to this house," or, "Peace be with you," or, "My peace I give unto you." When someone takes hold of this word in faith, he takes hold of peace. To this is added another gift, the forgiveness of sins, which is obtained from the Father through JEsuM Christ. But what is it that makes this gift present to us and holds it up to faith? Is it not the word of the apostles? It is also said in Matth. 16, 19: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." For this is not said to Peter alone, but to the whole company of the apostles, to whose confession Peter lent his mouth. But the meaning is: I will deliver (oommittam) the word of the gospel to you who confess me, Christ, the Son of God, which, confirmed by the Spirit, is the key of the kingdom of heaven, so that you may distribute (spargatis) forgiveness of sins throughout the whole world. He fulfills this promise later, Joh. 20, 22. f.: "Receive the Holy One.

Spirit; whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." As before he said, "I will give," now he says, "Receive;" as before he said, "the keys," now he says, "the Holy Ghost." For the Holy Ghost is the seal and pledge of the word; by which word sins are both remitted and retained, for what is called in this passage "remitting sins," is called in Lucas [Cap. 24:47.], "having repentance and remission of sins preached in Christ's name," and in Marcus [16:15.], "preaching the gospel to every creature."

Therefore (spargebant.) the apostles by their word brought forgiveness among the people and remitted the sins of the true believers. By what? By their power? Let that be far away, for Christ alone forgives sins, but by the word of Christ they spread among the people that which was Christ's, in the meantime keeping Christ seated at the right hand of the Father and neither depriving Him of anything nor taking anything away from Him. What then should hinder (vetarst) why the same should not be done with the body and blood of Christ, which [is done] with the forgiveness of sins? For as the forgiveness of sins is Christ's alone, who sits at the right hand of the Father, but is nevertheless committed (commendata) to the word, so that it might be distributed in the world through the apostles by means of the oral external voice, so the body and blood are Christ's alone, who sits at the right hand of the Father, but meanwhile is committed to the word: "This is my body; this is my blood," so that they might be distributed through bread and wine, external things. For if the forgiveness of sins is our gift, why should not the body and blood, by which forgiveness is effected (oonstinKit), be gifts also? Now if they are gifts, it follows that they are dispensed according to the manner of gifts; but they are to be dispensed by the word, which is evident from what has been said before. Therefore, if the word presents us with the body and blood, what is to prevent it from bringing to the bread what it contains? since the word "this is my body" is directed to the bread.

Perhaps you fear that there will be two bodies in one and the same place. Let go of this fear and get away from fleshly *imagination*; give the word the honor. For if it was not inconsistent for the body to be borne by the word (Zsstarl), how should it be inconsistent for it to be borne by the word in the bread? We do not hear Aristotle here, nor the speeches of reason (praedicaciones logicas); let Aristotle on his battlefield.

of two bodies; in the word of God we recognize another teacher. Does not Chrysostom also say, as you do, that in the Lord's Supper many things are inconsistent for our understanding, and which exceed our thinking? Well, you may be mindful of the fact that faith endures many inconsistencies not only in this sacrament but also in many other things. Why? Because faith is free to imagine anything as it pleases? Not at all, but because it has the word.

037 For give faith the word, and it shall take hold of far other things than the whole nature of things can bear. Does he not bear it that sins are not sins? that shame is not shame, death is not death? Why? Because he imagines it so? Far be it from him; but because he has the word [John 1:29]. "Behold, this is the Lamb of God, which bareth the sin of the world," likewise [Hos. 13:14], "Death, I will be death unto thee." Preach this to Aristotle; see if thou canst persuade him that death is not a death? For he will hold common sense (sensus) against thee, he will hold the nature of things against thee, he will hold reason against thee. What do you want to answer? Do you not believe because Aristotle does not believe?

(38) The same must be said of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For although reason cannot bear that the bread is the body, yet faith bears it for its sake, because it has the word, "This is my body," in which, as is evident from your collatis above, faith also cannot recognize a trope. Does not this word: "I am your GOtt" bring GOtt to us with all His goods? How, then, if reason could not grasp in what way in such a small speech, consisting of letters, syllables and expressions, such a great incomprehensible treasure is brought? And if anyone relies on this word, will he put up with a sophistical disputer and a sophist who says, "You trust in letters and syllables? We know and have learned from Paul [Rom. 1:16] that the gospel is the power of God that makes blessed all who believe in it. We reject the sophistic antics, namely: the gospel is a dead letter and consists of syllables, so how could it be a power of God?"

39 But what is this? If the bread is the body of Christ, then the body of Christ must be crucified again. Truly! a beautiful demonstration. As if Christ would rise again

because the word: "I am the resurrection" brings to us the resurrection of Christ, which is also ours, and this: "the Word became flesh" makes Christ's incarnation present to us. Wouldn't it be absurd to claim now that Christ had to become man again for the sake of this? Christ, by this word: "Peace be with you," "My peace I give unto you," has left peace behind Himself: will He, for the sake of it, again be obliged to eat with the disciples, and to converse, or to go through closed doors to those who are afraid (consternatos)? For because we confess that for the word's sake the bread is the body of Christ, nothing should have been imagined of any future (adventu), either in lowliness or in glory. For Christ came in lowliness in the flesh, but in glory he will come on that day which the Father knows; but by the word of God the distribution of Christ's gift in bread and wine takes place. Just as the forgiveness of sins, which is by far the best and greatest gift, is revealed and distributed to us through the Word, but no one, no matter how grossly minded, imagines a future in lowliness or glory, so when the body of Christ, through which the forgiveness of sins has taken place, is distributed in the bread through the Word, the distribution and administration of the gift takes place, but not a kind of new future of Christ, as it is said in 1 Cor. 10:16: "The bread which we break, is it not the fellowship of the body of Christ?"

40 Pay attention to the Hebrew way of speaking. What is "the fellowship of the body" but the body that is shared and given? So also Rom. 1, 4. according to the Vulgate] is "the spirit of sanctification," that is, the spirit that sanctifies, which we call the Holy Spirit. So the bread that we break is the body of Christ divided, administered, and made common (communicatum). This is what Augustine has in mind in the 9th book of the "Confessions", Cap. 13, where he writes of his mother and says: "She did not ask us this (that her body be embalmed in a precious way), but only desired that she be remembered at your altar, at which she had served every day without ceasing, so that she could know that the holy sacrifice would be administered (dispensari, by which the handwriting is erased, which was against us 2c). What is "that the holy sacrifice be administered" but that the body of Christ be distributed, which was given for us? But as peace and the forgiveness of sins, so the body and the blood are distributed through the word in the bread and in the offering.

Wine, since the word is added to bread and wine. The matter becomes clearer by an example. Any teacher who wants to communicate his will and his attitude to about a thousand students, does he not do it together in teaching by the word of doctrine and distribute it? For by including his will, so to speak, in the word, he distributes it among all of them, as many as there are who receive the word. In the meantime, he keeps his mind to himself, but still distributes it to others through the word. For here we shall not pretend, with Aristotle, that the words (vooss) are only the signs of the things that are in the soul; but to speak more correctly: the voice or the word offers us the things that are in the soul (res animae), brings them with it and presents them, while it [the soul] itself loses nothing in the process, but keeps its own for itself. Therefore, when according to the common custom the words of an author have been stated in a loud voice, we immediately add: This is the meaning of that author, this is the opinion of that writer. Who could tolerate that interpretation: This is the sign of that opinion?

(41) If a man is free to put his mind and opinion into the word, and to communicate it to the hearer, losing nothing of his opinion in the meantime, why should not Christ, who is God, be free to distribute and communicate his body and blood, enclosed in the word, through bread and wine? Furthermore, since the bread is the body of Christ, there is no need to fear that the same thing will happen to the body as to the bread; for the bread is baked, it is white, round or square, it goes into the stomach, is digested, and is thrown out by the natural process. For this reason should the body of Christ be baked, white, round or square, enter the belly, be digested, and the like? Let this be far off! For as the word of the Lord abideth for ever, being neither limited by place, nor by time, nor by accidental properties, nor can it ever be digested or destroyed (perdi), so the body is and remains put into the word (verbo commendatum). Now we maintain that the bread is the body, not insofar as it is bread, for otherwise what happens to the bread would also happen to the body, but insofar as it has the word. Therefore, the bread of the Lord's Supper, inasmuch as it is the body through the word, has nothing like fleshly accidental properties, for then 1) it is neither round nor square,

1) tiiQ6 i.e. if the bread is the body.

neither white nor black; but this it has and retains, provided it is bread.

We thank thee, Oecolampad, that thou, by thy own similitude, which thou adduceest of the key and of the royal scepter, assistest our opinion, and makest clear the meaning of the words of Christ. For whoever gives the key to a steward (oustoäi) and entrusts to him the power over the house, does he not make the key, the instrument of the house, the power over the house? Yes, [the power] not over the key, provided the key is only a tool, but add this word: I give you the power over the house, or: Behold, here you have the power over the house. Now the key no longer remains a mere tool, but also becomes the power over the house, not in so far as it is a key, but in so far as it has the word: I give you the power, or: Take away the power 2c. Why should we not be granted the same by you, that we hold such things of the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, that the bread, inasmuch as it has the word, is the body of the Lord?

But far be it, you say, that the spiritually minded, who were under the law and awaited the Messiah in faith, should have been poorer than we, to whom he [the Messiah] is revealed; to them the sacraments are only darker, to us they are brighter. We wonder, most learned Oecolampadius, why you constantly hold that conclusion against us: The fathers were saved by faith and did not have the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, therefore the bread of the Lord's Supper is not the body of Christ, nor the wine his blood; for this is the brief epitome of your proof, which is taken from the patriarchs and from their faith.

44 But if you continue to draw conclusions in this way, Christ will also become a non-Christ. For who can shut the mouth of an ungodly man, and prevent him, that he should not, after your manner of disputing, bring up his reasons, which deny that Christ had flesh? The fathers were saved by faith, and did not have the bodily presence of Christ, so Christ was not bodily present to Peter, John, or James; for what need is there of Christ's presence, if we are saved by faith, and the fathers were saved by it; or if he is present, he is idle. Who could suffer these ungodly things? And yet they would have an example (analogiam) in your way of proving. Well then, let us indicate, however crudely (crassa Minerva), a

How great a difference there is between the godly: of the Old Testament and the New Testament.

It is a very different way in the spiritual world than in this carnal world, and in a different way the eye of God sees than the eye of the flesh, because in the spiritual world nothing is past, nothing is future; there are not years, not hours, not time, but everything is One Perpetual, a completely present moment: "One day before the LORD is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as One day," because the eye of GOD sees everything as One moment. Therefore, in that the prophets use the past time for the future, as in Isaiah [Cap. 21, 9Z; "Babylon is fallen," they have not used the speech of man, but have spoken by the Spirit of God; but the eye of the flesh sees this as future, that as present, that as past.

46 Since everything, whether past or future, is seen by God in a completely present moment, it follows that the incarnation of Christ, His suffering, death and resurrection began, was completed and fully executed (consummata.) at the time when the Lord decided with Himself to declare and make known this to the world once, according to the manner of the time of this world. Therefore John says in the Revelation, Cap. 13, 8: "The Lamb is slain from the foundation of the world." How? The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world? Was Christ then, or had Christ then already become man? Certainly; for if Christ had not already assumed humanity, suffered and been glorified in the eyes of God at the time of Adam and Abraham, the patriarchs would never have been freed from sins nor attained to righteousness. In the eyes of God, we say, this was presently and quite truly accomplished and perfected; not in the eyes of the world, for in the eyes of the world the Incarnation of Christ [did not happen until under the emperor Augustus. But it did] 1) not happen at that time first, but in the eyes of God it is accomplished and fully executed beforehand, but it sang to be revealed and made known under the emperor Augustus, under the priest Simeon.

47. similarly, the Passion of Christ did not happen at that time first under Pontio Pilato, but...

1) The text seems to us to need an addition here, approximately in the way it was done in the bracketed words.

Under this governor, that which had previously been fully accomplished in the eyes of God was revealed and made known to the world. For the fact that Christ hung on the cross under the high priest Caiphas was not new in the eyes of God, as he had hung there from the beginning of the world, but now it was new in the eyes of the world, which see much coarser and more carnal than the eyes of God. Since neither the Incarnation, nor the Passion, nor the Death, nor the Resurrection of Christ had been revealed in the time of the former patriarchs, although they were already present to the divine vision, the Spirit did not want to reveal such a great mystery to the weak world, which was still under the disciplinarian, until the fullness of time came, for then God sent His Son, born of a woman and under the Law, to redeem those who were under the Law. Therefore, under the law and in the time of the patriarchs, the things that were to be revealed were hidden under the coverings of sacrifices and other shadows, lest, if by the outward word that which had not yet been revealed before the eyes of the world by the outward deed were revealed, the world should not be able to grasp it, or rather should be offended. Therefore, everything that is Christ was presented to the world through shadows, signs and images. All sacrifices are directed to Christ and have their aim on him, as it is said in the 40th Psalm [v. 7. ff.]: "Sacrifice and meal offering are not pleasing to thee, but thou hast opened mine ears. Then said I, Behold, I come, in the book is written of me; thy will, O my GOD, do I gladly." For Christ is not the Passover Lamb, but He is shadowed by the Passover Lamb, and the Lamb alone had His purpose in Christ. Nevertheless, the faith of the godly, as it is more sharp-sighted than a lynx, has had, received, and believed in the present Christ under the Lamb. Christ was, at the time of the Passover lamb, far from the ears and eyes of the flesh, but he was still completely present to faith, which flew on its wings (motis alis) from this world into the spiritual world and, according to the way of God's seeing, saw what Christ is. For thus God sees everything, even that which is to come, present before Him. In this way, faith makes what is very distant in the world's mind completely present to itself and sees it in this way. Was not the gospel also hidden from the fathers until it was revealed under Christ and the apostles? Nevertheless, the faith of the fathers had the gospel, even though it was still hidden.

very hidden and covered with strange shadows. But for us, who live according to Christ and are born again, the veil has been removed from our eyes and the gospel has been clearly presented, which was previously covered with veils.

(48) Now behold, what a good reason he would have who would say that this gospel, which is with us, has not been there in any other way than covered under a shadow. Therefore it is also not true, evident and clear with us. What could be more inconsistent than this conclusion? 1) And with your case it is just so, since you say that with the fathers the body of Christ was only shadowed and prefigured by signs, so also with us it is not signified in any other way than by signs; as if there were no difference between the shadows and the things that are shadowed, between signs and the true essence [*veritas*] of the signs. If then there is no difference between the fathers and us, why then does Christ say [Matth. 13, 16. f.], "Blessed are your eyes, that they see, and your ears, that they hear. Verily I say unto you, Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see that ye see, and have not seen it; and to hear that ye hear, and have not heard it"? No one will more easily explain how great an advantage we have over the fathers than this word of Christ. For he does not say: the prophets desired to believe and did not believe, but: they desired to see and hear what they did not hear and see.

(49) The fathers were not less than we in faith, for our faith and that of the fathers is the same, but they had much less than we in word and deed, that is, in revelation of Christ and manifestation of the word. By one example our opinion becomes clearer. Paul was called from his mother's womb to preach the gospel, as Gal. 1:15 says. But the calling was revealed from heaven long after he had become a man, Acts 9. 9 Did not Paul in the beginning, when the calling was still hidden, become less than he was before, but afterwards, when the calling was made known, he became greater than he was before (Se ips0)? Or do you, because he was set apart from his mother's womb, deny that he received greater things after the revelation of the setting apart had taken place?

50 To this is added the condition of the apostles. For the apostles also had the Holy Spirit before the death of Christ and His resurrection, for how else could they have been born but from the Holy Spirit?

1) i.e. a conclusion from the opposite.

The apostles can confess Christ through the Holy Spirit, Matth. 16, 16. f., where Christ also testifies that the Father revealed this; but the Father reveals and draws through the Holy Spirit. So the apostles must have had the Holy Spirit before the death of Christ, but in what way? Did they reveal it, or did they announce it? No, but still hidden and concealed. For it is written, Joh. 7,39.: "The Holy Spirit was not yet there, because Jesus was not yet glorified. But after Christ was glorified, he sent the Holy Spirit into their hearts to preach the gospel of the forgiveness of sins to the whole world. But what is this sending but to reveal and make known Him who was before hidden? Will you then say that the sending of the Spirit was in vain because they had it before? Let that be far off, for who could tolerate that? Were not the apostles more blessed by the revelation of the Spirit than before, when the Spirit was still hidden? They were more blessed, not through the Spirit, which they had received in the beginning through faith in Christ, but through His presence and revelation, since they had possessed Him before without noticing (*tacitissime*).

(51) Thus the fathers are not inferior to us in faith, but they are far behind in revelation. For what was present to them in faith, but nevertheless hidden in a dark 1) word and in deed and far from their eyes, is presented to us in deed and word. The fact, that is, the bodily offering (*traditio*) and the shedding of blood took place before the eyes of the world under Pontius Pilate. But because it had already lasted in the eyes of God from the beginning of the world, that we may say so, and had now been revealed to the world, therefore Christ, wishing to have this also present and made known before the world, put it into the word of the Lord's Supper, saying, "Receive and eat, this is my body; drink, this is my blood," 2c., which could not have happened before Christ, because Christ had not yet been revealed. But after the revelation happened, he gave the revelation and presence to the Word 2) for preservation, because thus the forgiveness of sins, which was obtained under Pontius Pilate (that is, revealed, because it was brought about in the eyes of God from the foundation of the world), is preserved by the Word. Why should the same not be said of the body

and blood of Christ, by which forgiveness of sins was obtained, and without which forgiveness is not? The fathers saw Christ under the Passover Lamb, under the manna, under the rock of the wilderness, but in very hidden faith, and which was known to the spirit alone, since nothing of these things was yet revealed to the world. But we receive the body of Christ in the bread and his blood in the cup by the word, not hidden, not absent, but distinct (for distinct is the word, "This is my body"), but present, since the revelation has taken place and is preserved by the word. Therefore all that is based on these grounds falls away: we are saved by faith, and the fathers, who are not less than we, did not have the bodily body of Christ, so neither do we, either present or idle. For on this ground also the gospel would be idle, idle also would Christ himself be, preaching in Jerusalem, and manifesting himself by miracles throughout all Judea, since the fathers had neither the outward gospel, nor such an outward Christ as our forefathers saw under Pilate the governor.

Because Abraham did not see Christ hanging on the cross with the eyes of his body (for in faith he saw the day of Christ), did neither Peter nor John see him? The evangelist John and Abraham were completely equal with regard to faith, but unequal with regard to Christ. For Abraham saw Christ by faith and spiritual knowledge (*Kpiritus tione*), but John not only by faith, but also by clear revelation and bodily sight. In this way the fathers also ate the body of Christ and drank his blood in the spirit, but we eat his body and drink his blood not only in the spirit but also in the flesh. For the bread we break is the fellowship of the body of Christ. And Christ says, "Eat, this is my body, which is broken for you," just as we hear the gospel not only in the spirit, which also the fathers did, but also according to the flesh, with bodily ears. Will we then say that the bodily (*carnal*) gospel is idle with us, or does not save, because the fathers did not have it bodily and were saved without it? There is no one who could deny that the body of Christ was present in the spirit to the fathers, because through the word 'of the promises the whole Christ became present to them, but with us it is quite different. For we are

1) Instead of *aesrto*, which does not seem to us to puff here, we have assumed *oxerto*.

2) Instead of *verdi* will read *verdo*.

not only in the spirit, but also by the letter, not by him who kills, but by the present delivery (sxtübiticms) of the word, the body and blood of Christ presented.

Let us explain the matter by means of an example. In the first book of Moses, Cap. 3, v. 15, there is the word: "The same shall bruise thy head." Gen. 23, 18: "By thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." 2 Sam. 7, 12. 14.: "I will raise up thy seed after thee. I will be his father" 2c. Jer. 23, 5: "I will raise up a righteous seed for David, and he shall be a king" 2c. The spirit of the word of these promises offered the present Christ to the godly fathers, but the letter of the word does not offer him presently, but is directed to the future (which is quite obvious, since it says: he shall tread down, it shall be blessed, I will raise up, not: he shall tread down, I will raise up), since the spirit, to whom everything future is present, comes to meet faith, but the letter is according to the capacity of the world. For since elsewhere, Isa. 9:6, he says, "A child is born to us," the letter assumes the manner of speaking common to the spirit, to whom future things are as certain as if they had passed away. Now that Christ is revealed, not only the Spirit of the Word, but also the letter (far be it from a spiteful interpretation of this word) offers Christ's body and blood to us as present, bringing them with it and showing them, saying, "This is my body, this is my blood." 2c. Further, if you would continue to ask what use is the eating of the bodily body, since the fathers did not have it and were none the less saved? we may also ask what use is the hearing of the revealed bodily gospel, which the fathers likewise did not have. Or, since the Gospel consists of letters and syllables, shall we not say for the sake of it that it is a power of God for salvation to all who believe it? And if we believe the gospel, will you then reproach us? You believe in a spelled or spoken God, as we have been harshly told by some others: Do you also believe in a spelled God?

(54) Therefore, since we affirm that we eat the body of Christ bodily (eus), meanwhile we will be able to obtain this from your kindness, that you do not receive this other than in an interpretation that is for our good (candida). For we eat the body and drink the blood bodily (oarus), not that we rend and break the body of Christ. As it is written in the recantation Beren

gars is called, but we treat the bread itself (ipsum) as bread, we break it, eat it and bite it with the teeth, but take the body, as we take the word: "this is my body", so that someone has said very beautifully: What we eat goes into the belly, what we believe goes into the mind (mentem). But, what is it that we are afraid to speak and teach (sentire) here according to the word of Christ? For he said, "Eat, this is my body, which is broken for you," that is, to be distributed. For this word be broken, *χλάεσθαι*, comes not to the body, but to the bread, Isa. 58:7, "Break thy bread to the hungry." For now Christ says his body is broken because the bread is broken. Who should take it amiss of us to say that the body of Christ is attacked with the hands and bitten with the teeth, not that this is to the body of Christ, but that it is to the bread, which is the body of Christ. For since the bread is the body of Christ through the Word, why should not that which is due to the body of Christ be due to the bread, inasmuch as it is the body of Christ? And since the body of Christ is added to the bread by the word, what prevents that which belongs to the bread from not belonging to the body? Hence it is that the body is broken, because the bread is broken, while at the same time the body remains in its entirety (integritate); and the bread is life-giving, because the flesh of Christ, now added to the bread by the word, is life-giving, giving life to the world, while meanwhile the bread remains in the same essence (substantia) which it had before.

(55) And there is no reason to fear, best Oecolampadius, that at the time of the Lord's Supper someone would occupy himself in a trivial way with contemplating the miracle, namely, in which way the body would be united with the bread, because even by us this could not be approved if it happened, but we will admit that this happens by those who are too superstitious. How now? Would we deny for the sake of it that the bread is the body? With this reason we could certainly force the eaters to have their teeth pulled out and their lips cut off and thrown away, lest, preoccupied with the taste of the bread, they forget to eat it. We could also deny that Christ is a man, since the sophists have spent long years in futile, not to say ungodly, disputations and even quarrels about the unity of the different natures in Christ. How

But would it be proper for us to deny the truth because of the vanity of others? Therefore, according to the teaching of the Spirit, who says: "the Word became flesh", we confess that the Son of God is man, and even here we do not stand still, but continue to ask what use the Incarnation is to us? how we are to use the man who is the Son of God? So also, after Christ's word, "This is my body," we confess that the bread is the body, and even here we do not stand still, but go on, asking and teaching what is the use of this bread, which is the body of Christ?

(56) Finally, let us also answer the scriptural passages held against us (*contrarias*). One of these is the passage quoted from John, Cap. 6, 63: "the flesh is of no use," to which you all run, as to a sacred anchor, as many of you deny that the bread is the body of Christ, and with which your opponents, as you urge them, should struggle. Because the interpretations of the godly of our time about this passage are not up to you, since they understand "flesh" not for Christ's flesh, but generally of what Paul speaks of [1 Cor. 15, 50.]: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" and Christ [Hoh. 3, 6.]: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," well then, let us consent to Augustine's interpretation, according to which he understands the flesh as Christ's flesh; but so much is lacking in it that he should confirm your opinion, that he almost nowhere overturns it more violently.

57 For thus he writes to the sixth chapter of John, What is it that he adds: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh is of no use?" We want to speak to him, because he carries (*patitur*) us, since we do not contradict, but wish to know: O Lord, dearest Master, how is your flesh of no use, since you said, John 6:53: "Whoever does not eat my flesh and drink my blood has no life in him"? Is life of no use? and why are we what we are, but that we might have eternal life, which thou promisedst through thy flesh? what is it then: it is of no use; "the flesh is of no use"? But how did they understand "the flesh"? Certainly they understood it as it is mangled on a corpse or sold in a meat market, not as it is made alive by the Spirit. Therefore it is said, "The flesh is of no use," as it is said, "Knowledge alone puffeth up" without love, therefore it is added: "but love mendeth." Therefore, add love to the

Knowledge added and the knowledge will be useful, not by itself, but by love. So it is here also: "The flesh is of no use," that is, the flesh alone; but let the Spirit be added to the flesh, as love is added to knowledge, and it is of much use. For if the flesh were of no use, the Word would not be made flesh to dwell in us. So far Augustine. What thanks, blessed Augustine, we owe you for teaching so clearly and so Christianly, inasmuch as it is of no use, for we shall be able to say the same of the body of Christ, which is made bread by the Word. For the body of Christ alone is of no use if it has been eaten without faith and, as Paul says, unworthily, for then it will do more harm. "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily," he says, "eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, because he distinguisheth not the body of the Lord." Add therefore the faith of the eater to the body, and it profiteth much. For if the body were of no use, why would it be given for us? why condemned to death? Likewise, the body of Christ alone profits nothing, but because it is given for us, but because it is the life of the world. So the blood of Christ alone is of no use, but it is of great use because it is poured out for us for cleansing, and this is even the only reason why we eat the body and drink his blood in the Lord's Supper. For if his body were not given for us and his blood shed for us, we would eat and drink in vain. Furthermore, that in faith the body must be eaten and the blood drunk does not take away from the bread that it is not the body. For as Christ was not without flesh for that reason, because Peter or another apostle ate him spiritually, so it must not be denied of Christ's body for that reason that it is in the bread, because it must be eaten spiritually. By touching the feet of Jesus, Mary touched the feet of the Son of God, who cannot be touched bodily (*carnaliter*).

(58) How then should it be inconsistent for us to confess that we eat the body of Christ, which cannot be eaten, bodily, by eating the bread of the Lord's Supper? For no one has denied that the body which he eats in the bread by the word must be eaten spiritually, just as no one is so limited that he should deny that the word of the gospel must be received spiritually, that is, in faith, however much one may receive it with the bodily. And just as faith takes the word that is received with the ears, according to its own nature, so it must be taken in spiritually.

In the same way, the body that is received through the bread is received according to the way of faith. Just as a sulfurized cask that receives tasty wine does not receive it according to the manner of the wine, for the wine is tasty, but according to the manner of its sulfur, so the bodily body of Christ is received by the heart, the mind, the faith, only according to the manner of faith, which is spiritual, however bodily it [the body] may be.

59.. From this it is easy to see with what accuracy you cite the passage John 3:6: "Everything that is of the flesh is flesh," as if faith really receives the body of Christ in a fleshly way. But we want to see in a more reliable way what the opinion of this passage is, so that one can see in how forced a way it serves your opinion. Nicodemus disputes with Christ about righteousness, because he thought that the righteousness of the law was the true one, but meanwhile he heard that another righteousness was preached by Christ, namely that of faith and repentance or regeneration; therefore he goes to Christ to inquire about the true righteousness. Therefore, two kinds of birth are presented to Nicodemus by referring to some elements of the world (*mundi elementis*). One is from the flesh, that is, from the earth (for the flesh is earthly), a coarser element, as it is said in the first book of Moses, Cap. 3, v. 19. is said, "Thou art taken from the earth"; 1 Cor. 15, 47. "The first man is of the earth and earthy." The other is of water and spirit (*aere*), and, as it is elsewhere said, of fire, the finer (*subtilioribus*) elements. This, therefore, is the correct interpretation of this passage and Christ's opinion. Before that Adam, created from the earth, became earthly, coarse and carnal, and all who are reproduced from him are born earthly, coarse and carnal, so that this procreation is not very good. For all become flesh and earth from the carnal and earthly Adam, grasping and understanding (*sapientes*) nothing but flesh and earth. For since they are cast down into the workhouse (*ergastulum* - penitentiary) of the flesh, they cannot grasp true, high, heavenly and spiritual righteousness. For this is not the true righteousness which is enforced by the law or the tumult of the law, nor is it the righteousness which is enforced by the hypocrisy of the flesh, for if it were the true righteousness, the first birth, fleshly and earthly, would not have gone forth to evil. Since now

the true righteousness comes from heaven, so the other birth and the rebirth will be necessary, but from finer and higher elements than the earth, that is, from water and spirit (*aere*). For Christ uses absolutely carnal words at this point, in that he understands something far different by the image (*metaphora*). For the fact that he says, you must be born from above, has not yet from the outset (*prima facie*) its intention on the heavenly rebirth, but on the rebirth from the so-called higher elements, that is, what is born from the earth and the flesh, that is not suitable (*male cessit*), therefore another birth must be sought, which happens from higher elements than the earth, namely from water and spirit. But what should he understand by this fleshly speech but the true rebirth, which is from on high, from heaven, which consists of the water, that is, mortificatione, and the wind, the spirit, or the air, which is the life of the athmians, that is, the quickening of the spirit? This is otherwise expressed by the one word repentance (*resipiscentiae*).

(60) Now let any man come and make great words (*glorietur*) that Christians become carnal because they eat the flesh of Christ, for in this passage, "that which is of the flesh is flesh," he will find no protection for his opinion. For it is different to be born of the flesh of Adam than of the flesh of Christ; those who are of the flesh of Adam are flesh and earth. But those who are of the flesh of Christ, that is, who not only eat the flesh of Christ in the bread of the Lord's Supper, but also believe, are of the Spirit. For eating the body of the Lord will do little good, and much more harm, if one does not eat in faith; just as the gospel: what good will it do if you do not also hear it in the spirit? But will not the outward gospel be gospel for its own sake, because it must be heard in the spirit? In this way, who would presume to conclude that the bread of the Lord's Supper is not the body, because the body of Christ must be eaten in faith?

(61) Now, what is said in Matthew [Cap. 15, v. 11], "What enters into the mouth does not defile a man," overturns yours rather than ours. For if the bread, according to you, were not the body of the Lord, the food cannot defile. Why then does Paul say [1 Cor. 11:27], "Whosoever eateth of this bread unworthily, or drinketh of the cup of the Lord, he is guilty."

in the body and blood of the Lord"? And afterwards [v. 29.st. "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, lest he should distinguish the body (he does not say the sign of the body) of the Lord." Do you want to say to Paul: Why do you make a great clamor about unworthy food, since what enters a man's mouth does not defile him? Watch, dear Oecolampad, lest we learn through you as predecessors (autoribrm) what it means to make sophistries (τῷ σοφιστεῦεν). But the eating of the bread of the Lord's Supper is to be understood thus: inasmuch as it is bread, it does not defile, nor does it sanctify; but inasmuch as it is the body of Christ through the Word, it defiles the unworthy eater, and sanctifies the worthy and believing eater, since indeed Christ says [John 15:3.], "Ye are now clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you." And afterwards [John 17:17.], "Sanctify them in thy truth," that is, by the speech which is truth; but the loan is taken for the word's sake in the bread of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, as the word sanctifies the believer, so also the body; and as the word defiles the ungodly, so the body defiles the ungodly eater.

62 For the fact that you also add to your auxiliary forces what is written in Matth. 24, 23: "Behold, here is Christ, or there," will not help you; you will be defeated by this army, according to all judgment about foreign auxiliary forces, because it has an entirely different weapon than is appropriate for your battle. For there it speaks of the false prophets, who take captive the kingdom of Christ in the conscience, which otherwise is free, bound to no place, to no time, to no person, and, as Paul says, has brand in the conscience. Otherwise, if it were to be understood of the outward Christ, or of his fleshly body, no one could have said of Christ as he sat at the supper: Behold, here is Christ, or of his body as he hung on the cross: Behold, this is the body of Christ. Even after the transfiguration Stephen should not have said, "I see heaven open and JEsus standing at the right hand of GOD." But it is well that Christ Himself freed His own from this misgiving (soiupulo), saying in Lucas [Cap. 17, 20.], "The kingdom of GOD cometh not with outward gifts"; for the kingdom of Christ is a kingdom of freedom; we are dealing here with the body, not with the kingdom. Something else is the kingdom of Christ, something else the body, of which that great and admirable (θαυμαστός) evangelist of Christ, Luther, speaks enough in the second chapter.

Book against the false prophets 1). But, you say, Christ has departed and is seated at the right hand of the Father, and has sent the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the disciples. For he says [John 16:7], "If I go not away, the Comforter cometh not unto you." Listen! Has he then departed in such a way that he has left us nothing of what is his? Has then also the forgiveness of sins departed? Has sanctification and even all righteousness departed? Has the Holy Spirit also departed? for all this is Christ's. Then we are still sinners, still condemned. We wretched people, who will deliver us from the devil's jaws? But we thank thee, O Lord Jesus Christ, that thou hast not withdrawn thyself from us in such a way as to leave us nothing of thine. You are seated at the right hand of the Father, but in the meantime you do not deny us your gifts and do not hide them from us as an envious person. Is not the Holy Spirit most closely related to Christ (LKuatissimus - the closest relative) and completely inseparable from him? For he says in the prophet [Isa. 61, 1.]: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, therefore he hath anointed me"; and elsewhere [Ps. 45, 8.]: "Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness, more than thy fellows." Christ, however, shares his Spirit with the godly and sends it into their hearts, and meanwhile remains seated at the right hand of the Father, in no respect separated (disjunctus). But how does he communicate it? Through the Word. Thus you read Apost. 10:44: "While Peter was still speaking these words, the Holy Spirit fell on all who were listening to the word." By what did it fall or through what vehicle (vehiculus) was it brought? By the word of the gospel; for the word is the vehicle of the Spirit. Why then is not the Holy Spirit given to all who hear the Word? The reason is obvious (*in promptu est*). For the Word is scattered among all nations, but the revelation of the Spirit of the Word the Lord has reserved to himself alone, that he may open it to whom and when he will, for he says [Ex. 33:19. according to the Vulgate], "I have mercy on whom I will." Since the Holy Spirit is brought to us through the Word, as a vehicle, while at the same time He remains intimately united with Christ, who sits at the right hand of the Father, why should not the Body and Blood of Christ be given to us through the same vehicle, the Word?

1) This refers to the second part of Luther's writing "Wider die himmlischen Propheten" (No. 5 in this volume).

Since we speak in this way, the Holy Spirit is much more closely connected with Christ than His body and blood? Do you still have imaginations of a kind of future (adventu) in lowliness and glory, as if this were a new future of Christ, when either the Holy Spirit, or forgiveness of sins, or righteousness, or his body and blood are sent to us through the Word? For this is not a kind of Christ's future, as he came in the flesh in the beginning and will come in glory on the last day, but a sharing and dispensing of the gift, since the Word preserves and dispenses to us that which was brought to us and acquired through Christ's first future. Acquired is the forgiveness [of sins], which is preserved by the word; brought is the body, brought is the blood, not such things as Adam has, but life-giving and sanctifying things. These are preserved by the Word, while meanwhile the chief bishop and priest, Christ, remains at the right hand of the Father, and is not divided into many Christs; for Christ is One, so also is One Body of Christ. And as by the great number of those who believe in Christ there are not many Christs, so by the [great] number of those who eat there are not many bodies. Is not the word, which is heard from the mouth of a man, one, which nevertheless remains with the speaker, and is thereby distributed among many hearers, while its unity also remains? In the same way, the One Body of Christ is distributed to many eaters through the word in the bread, while it remains with Christ, who sits at the right hand of the Father, and the unity of the body also remains.

By the way, what is quoted from the second letter to the Corinthians, Cap. 5, 16, is quite insignificant and not at all relevant: "We know no one according to the flesh; and though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him no longer. How now? Does Christ therefore not have flesh, because we no longer know him according to the flesh? Let that be far from it. For if he were not in the flesh, he would not have been truly resurrected, nor would he come to judgment in the same form in which he was taken away from our sight. Therefore Paul's opinion is: now we must not seek carnal things; the old has passed away, everything has become new, one must seek spiritual things. For in this passage, "to have known Christ in the flesh" does not mean to have seen and known Him face to face, but to have sought carnal things in Christ, such as worldly dominion,

The apostles did before Christ's suffering, which is evident from their argument, Matth. 20, 20. ff. Is not Christ still man today? but we do not know him in a human way (secundum hominem), that is, we must not look for human things in him. Thus the bread of the Lord's Supper is the body of Christ through the Word, but we do not seek in it bodily or carnal things, for we do not eat to fill the belly but to nourish the spirit (mutiny).

64) Do you still dare to claim that these are the sayings: I am the true vine; I am the living fountain; I am the living bread, like that which happened at the Last Supper: 1) "Take and eat, this is my body"? Have you not yet lost the conceit of a vain speech (tropi)? We appeal, dear Oecolampad, to your own conscience, whether you can constantly cherish the opinion with yourself that these speeches are the same? But what do the secondary circumstances in the words of the Lord's Supper prove, which do not take place in the speeches mentioned before? For the fact that it is written, "Jesus took bread, and brake it, and said, Take, eat," all this clearly proves that the bread is not to be understood figuratively. That now it is added, "which is given for you," is a secondary circumstance, because it is understood that "body" is not taken figuratively, but in its original meaning 2); in the other speeches you will find nothing of these secondary circumstances. For he did not take a vine in his hand and say: I am this vine, nor the fountain, that he said: I am this spring, nor elsewhere the bread [since he said], "I am the living bread." But supposing the speeches were the same, is the body then taken as a vine, as a fountain? But the vine and the spring now already do not mean a natural vine or a spring of water, but have been taken away from this original meaning. Therefore also "body" in this speech: "This is my body" according to your opinion would no longer be taken for the natural body, but for a spiritual one, as Christ is called a spiritual vine, source and rock; but what could be conceived more inconsistent? Is there then a spiritual body given for us, and not the bodily? What news do we have to hear? What will finally become of Christ's body? Furthermore, since one

1) Instead of 8unt, read 6st.

2) Instead of WQotiueatlouk, read kiMiueatioQk.

that which is heavenly (supsrna), not earthly things, moreover, in the holy action we are called: "Lift up your hearts", not: "Set your hearts on the bread", should not the bread be the body of Christ? A strange art of conclusion! For in this way one would never have to hear the gospel, nor even seek that which is the brother's, since we are to seek that which is above. Or do we not seek in the Lord's Supper that which is above? We seek the body that was given for our sins, we seek the blood that was shed for our cleansing. Are not then the forgiveness of sins and the cleansing and our sanctification heavenly things? Here we hear with our ears the Gospel, in which is life, blessedness and the power of God, but because we pay attention to what is said, what gifts are brought to us through the Word, do we seek earthly things? So we seek in the bread of the Lord's Supper, for the sake of the Word, don't you hear? for the sake of the Word, peace, joy, life, forgiveness of sins. Who will slander us now that we seek carnal things and not spiritual things?

Therefore, human reason, away with the carnal quibbles, away with the spiritual forces (*al ψυχικά* virss), yes, with the evasions, which are even more dishonest! Having carefully contrasted the reasons, we are forced by the spirit of the Word to confess that the bread of the Lord's Supper is the true body of Christ, neither a tropical nor a hydropic one, 1) but the very one given for us, in the meantime not tearing Christ from the right hand of the Father, but receiving with the greatest gratitude of mind the gift of the body and blood, which is entrusted to and preserved by the Word, and is added to the bread through the Word.

66 For not to pass over this either, although it is a small thing that in Marcus, Cap. 14, v. 24, these words: "This is my blood of the new testament" are read as if (were)

they] spoke after they had drunk from the cup: of this the other evangelists testify that it is the figure of speech of protk^stsrn 2); this is quite frequent in Scripture (non infrequens). So also Joh. 18, 24: "Annas sent him bound to Caiphas", what is said later should have followed immediately after these words [v. 13]: "They led him first to Annas? It follows: "Annas sent him bound to Caiphas", because the denials of Peter, which are inserted between these two sentences (clausulas), happened according to the testimony of the other evangelists in the house of Caiphas, so that the interpreter should have said here [Joh. 18, 24.] in a clearer way: he had sent [him]. So also in the other place in Marcus [14, 24.] it would have been clearer: he had spoken [to them], than: "he spoke," for and ἀγέσσειν are aorists, to which the meaning of the plusquamperfectum 3) is not remote.

Now, beloved brother in Christ, Oecolampadius, what we have gathered about this matter of the Lord's Supper has been moved by the booklet you have published; it is not eloquent, but strong, not learned, but godly; if you receive it according to love, we will give thanks to God. But if thou shouldest reject it, or despise us, far be it from us that we should make provision for it to thee, we will nevertheless beseech the Lord to make his grace shine, and to bestow that which is for peace. For what conflagration will the devil cause in the church, if in this different view 4) we should lack the [helping] hand of the Lord? Therefore, by the consolation that is in Christ, by the leniency (solatium) of love, by the fellowship of the Spirit, we beseech thee, on this occasion, to give no offence to the gospel that is just arising. Let the truth be too holy, let the word of the Lord be too sacred, to be stained by fleshly adinvention. The Lord be with you; pray for us. Farewell. From our assembly, Schwäbisch-Hall, October 21, in the year of the Lord 1525.

2) xxxxxxxx a figure in grammar, according to which the last is said first.
3) Instead of xxxxxxxx should read xxxxxxxxxxxx
be
4) oollattons 86" ratiunum.

1) hydropicum, i.e. a water addict. The out print is chosen because of the pun with tropioum.

15. D. Mari. Luther's preface to the first German edition of the Syngamma. *)

Before August 1526.**)

Martinus Luther to all dear friends in Christo.

Grace and peace in Christ our Lord and Savior.

A Latin booklet, called Syngamma, has gone out through the preachers in Swabia against the new rats, who bring up new dreams from the Sacrament 1) and confuse the wager. This pleased me so much that I was willing to translate it, because otherwise I would not have been able to write something special in a hurry. But now that it has been delayed, it has been translated by my good friend, Magister Johanne Agricola, pedagogue at Eisleben, 2) so that I am now relieved of the effort.

(2) I was also careful at the time when I wrote against the heavenly prophets and attacked Carlstadt's Tuto, that there should still be those who should distinguish themselves with the *est* and *significat*, and especially such learned men, because it is such a childish, inept reason, which has no example in Scripture; and if it already had an example, nevertheless it could not be proven that it should and must also be taken so in the words "this is my body". That they will never prove, I know for certain. For it is very different when I say: This may be called so;

and when I say: This must be called so and cannot be called otherwise. Conscience cannot rely on the first, but it can rely on the second.

I also thought, and still think, that I have established this matter in my booklet against Carlstadt so that no one should overthrow it, and I do not yet see that my reasons, laid out there, are rightly attacked or moved. But my writing is despised by the high spirits, that they do not look at the [reasons], think that if they only wave 4) against it, then it is all bad, and must write differently about it.

4. Since I do not yet have the time to write against this spirit in particular, I will testify to my faith with this preface, and whoever wants to be warned, I will faithfully advise them to beware of these false prophets, who call our God a baked God, a baked God; they call us God's flesh-eaters, God's blood-drinkers, and I do not know how many more horrible blasphemous words, and yet they are patient, gentle people who suffer great persecution and rightly recognize Christ. The devil, however, 5) is the patience and litter that overthrows faith. But I hope that such abominable blasphemy will soon come to an end with them: even though we have well deserved such miserable creatures and sects through our ingratitude and persecution of the gospel, and

3) In the old editions: "sihe".

4) Jenaer: me. That "only" is the correct reading results from § 15 of the next following writing.

5) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers; Erlanger: wolte. That the reading "walte" is correct follows from § 20 of the following writing.

1) Wittenberg and Jena: Lord's Supper.

2) Wittenberg and Jena: "Germanized by another". The name of Agricola is probably omitted from these editions because he had caused trouble through his antinomianism and his participation in the Augsburg Interim.

*Luther wrote this preface to the German edition of the Syngamma, which was published by Agricola in 1526. Oecolampad already mentions in his answer to it the letter addressed by Luther to the Christians at Reutlingen on January 4, 1526. In the editions: in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 117 b; in the Jena (1556), vol. III, p. 340; in the Altenburg, vol. III, p. 473; in the Leipzig, vol. XIX, p. 386 and in the Erlangen, vol. 65, 180. According to the latter, which brings the original print, we give the text comparing the Wittenberg and Jena...

**This writing is of course earlier than Oecolampad's answer to it. Compare what is said in the note to the superscription of no. 16 about the determination of time.

still earn Aergeres, that also unfortunately! will come. 1)

At first, this sect is so fertile that it has gained five or six heads within a year. The first was D. Carlstadt with his Tuto. The other was Huldreich Zwingel with his significat. The third is Johann Oecolampadius with his figura corporis. The fourth reverses the order of the text. The fifth is on the track, shifting the words. The sixth is still in the process of birth and dices the words. The seventh will perhaps also come and shuffle the cards. Everybody wants to become a master here.

6) See if the Spirit of God does not warn us sufficiently against these sects, which are so divided in their beginning. 2) Where else should this image belong, but among the animals in Apocalypsi [Cap. 13]? 3) There are also some animals that have one body and many heads, just as these sects in sum are one and the same body. But to show the causes and reasons, every sect has its head 4) and its way, yet all set up to blaspheme the one solitary Christian truth. He who is not offended nor warned by the horrible image and God's admonition is worthy to believe that in the Sacrament there is not only bread and wine, but also chanterelles and fairy tales 5).

(7) Secondly, the right spirit not only avoids contradictory reasons, and always presents one reason in all his sermons, even in all the world. For he is not a God of ambiguity, but of simplicity; yes, he also lays down consistent reasons, so that the longer one fights against them, the firmer they become and increase. 6. But in this animal things are different. The first

Head, Carlstadt's Tuto, is lying low, and may not have had a poof, that they themselves must confess that he was absent, and that the spirit was not at home there; and no sparing helps here, that holy people sometimes stumble in faith and life, as it is true. But to lay the foundations of doctrine, especially when it is to arise anew, he has never 7) left his teachers wanting. He lets them 8) be weak, but not fall nor succumb, but, as I said, increase and surrender, not like Carlstadt's Tuto fell and lies.

8) The same is true for 9) the signet of the Zwingel, which has hung down its head and dies freely. For one cannot bring a significat in the Scriptures to 68t. And even if one were to bring it up (as they cannot), they may never bring it up in the Lord's Supper, and so the spirit is also missing there, and lies. These are two great admonitions and warnings from God to all who fear Him and want to believe Him. Nowhere can the devil be known so well as in lies and ambiguity in faith; and nowhere can the Spirit of God be known so well as in truth. But it does not help. The world must and will be deceived, just as in Arius' time such lies were found as a warning, but nothing helped.

(9) Thirdly, this spirit is especially a fleeting or floating spirit, which does not remain on any piece, as I have tried them both in writings and words. When it is demanded of them that they should prove this saying, "This is my body," or the like, that it is to be understood in their opinion and otherwise than the dry natural words are, they looked at another little song, according to which they are full of words and thoughts; therefore they say from John 6, how 10) two kinds of food are spiritual and bodily, as if no one knew this before; or praise themselves once, how they are pious and suffer much; or defy what it is useful for that

1) So the Wittenberg and the Jena. Erlanger: that will also come unfortunately.

2) So the Jenaer; Wittenberger: "sich so theilet". Erlanger: "so sich theilet".

3) Here the Erlanger has reprinted from Walch's old edition: 13, 17. which does not fit.

4) Wittenberg and Jena: jre Köpff.

5) "Morche" - the nightshade. From the composition with chanterelles it can be concluded that a mushroom is meant, perhaps "morels".

6) Erlanger: "constant". The next scripture, § 39, confirms our reading.

7) In the following scripture § 39 and in the Erlanger: never. Wittenberg and Jena: not.

8) So the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers: "the", namely the teachers. Erlanger: the reasons.

9) "also" is missing in the Erlanger.

10) In A 47 of the following scripture and in the Erlanger: wie; in the old editions: dass.

Christ's body and blood must be there; or else they tear something in, so that they do not have to stay on the words, otherwise they would be caught; thus filling leaves and ears with vain words, so that one must grasp, as Satan fears and changes into all shapes, lest he be caught in his 1) lies.

I say then, such digression and evasion does not matter, they should stick to their words, and there, in that place, prove their opinion from the text. Yes, I have the eel by the tail, they lead me again into the 6th chapter of John or otherwise on a monkey's tail, that one however comes from the matter by much chatter and yet does nothing. That is a real Satan's art, to hover like the night fires in the evening in the field.

(11) Therefore, I say my judgment, even though it is highly distorted, yet I know that it is true. For in this case I know faith and the devil well. There are two reasons for their error. One, that [it] is almost an unskillful thing by reason. 3) The other, that it is unnecessary to be Christ's body and blood in bread and wine, which is *absurdas et nulla necessitas*. They have grasped these two things, and have 4) thus passed through Satan's temptation, as oil passes through the bones, Ps. 109:18, 5) that they may not be rid of it. 6)

1) Erlanger: his. The old editions and K47 of the following writing have the reading given by us.

2) Erlanger: they shall me. In K 47 of the following script: "only" instead of "me". In the old editions both are missing.

3) So the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: "is".

4) "are" put by us instead of "ares", according to K 50 of the following scripture.

5) Here the Erlangen edition reprinted from Walch: Ps. 109, 8.

6) The words "that they may not get rid of him".

Twelfth, then, having such painted spectacles before their eyes, they come rolling to the Scripture, seeking how they may carry their sense into it, and draw the Scripture to their opinion. Then the words do not have to be understood as they are; they have to be stretched and bent, as a tuto, as a significat, as a figura, as the words are inverted, as the text is shifted, as the text is mixed like a map. Behold, that is where the sects come from. But if they remained on the words as they stand, and 7) proved from the text and sequence, or otherwise with good reason, that the words were to be understood differently than they read, then they would not cause any sect.

If they want to confirm their opinion, they will have to take up the sword in a different way. The writings presented, whether *subsidiū* or *antisyngramma*, 8) will not do it. They may seduce a lot, but they will not achieve anything thoroughly.

(14) I also want to admonish all devout Christians to beware of these sects and to stick to the pure, honest words of Christ. We have the advantage that we, like them, may not stretch or bend the words. Please also read this booklet diligently. If God gives me time, I will write about it in particular. However, thank my God that He does not allow the devil to bring up stronger lies than these. May God's grace be with us all.

are in the Erlanger and in the following writing, but are missing in the old editions.

7) Erlanger: or.

8) About Zwingli's book *Subsidium* compare the note to No. 13, § 2. - Oekolampad had let his book *AntisyngraiQMa* go out before the end of 1525 against the Spngramma. Seckendorf, Nist. I^{utk.}, vol. II, x. 35, (2).

16. Johann Oecolampad's response to Luther's preface [to the Syngramma],

sammt einer kurzen Antwort auf das Syngramma der Prediger in Schwaben. *)

About August 1526.

Johannes Oecolampadius to the famous Doctor Martin Luther. Grace and peace from Christ, our one and only Lord and Master.

Dear Martine! If you praise and command some Swabian preachers' books, written by the words of the Lord's Supper, with serious judgment in a preceding epistle, but unbrotherly attack, slander and condemn me and others besides; that you have also cursed yourself in several other of your epistles, namely, to those at Reutlingen 1) and others; however, praise be to God, without all my fault; and God would that such had happened without your and many others' injury: I do not want to keep quiet about it and leave the matter completely, because it is not mine, but the Lord's, affecting the truth and purity of our faith. I would also not like to be considered such a one, and even less to be the one for whom you are blowing me out, 3) God forgive you.

2) How I would like to be relieved of your unpleasant letter! For I do not like to lie against you, whom I recognize as a well-deserved and dear servant of the Gospel, through whom God has opened the eyes of many to discern the true way of truth, and yet now makes it known to us that you too, like a man, may fail and fall. I did not like to turn it around. You were kindly asked and welcomed. But you threw all admonitions to the wind, despising them not only as foolish but also as blasphemous.

(3) It is the same with thee as with many others, that I would gladly say with Jeremiah, Alas, my mother, why hast thou born me a man of strife and discord in all the earth? I have neither given nor taken usury, and they all speak evil of me. I would gladly bring forth the complaint of David and of our Lord Jesus Christ: With them I walk in the house of the Lord with one accord, and they lift up their feet to overthrow me.

4 This is commanded by God, who tries and proves us in many ways, and perhaps you yourself, with such an occasion, seek a favor and a trial, whether Christ will speak through me or not. And perhaps you are waiting to see if this truth will also suffer a puff (as you speak). That is why I say this, because I would like to interpret your matter in the best way,

5) Now, my Martine, in my opinion, such unequal understanding is a kind sending and warning from God, to me and to everyone, that we should open our eyes and learn, each one of us, to be of small and insignificant fortune, how it will soon be over with man, when the Lord removes his hand. Let no man become infatuated with men, 4) who all lie with one another. Look to the one Master in heaven and to the truth itself, with a gentle and teachable heart, there will be the way to peace and unity.

6 For your sake, I am still confident that you will be kinder and more cautious in this matter than before, remembering that others are also allowed to speak in the church of Christ; and if you are a co-worker, you will be ashamed to tyrannize among us. The Lord

4) "Larre" will probably be "teaching"; this form is chosen because of the rhyme.

1) This letter to the Christians of Reutlingen from

4 January 1526 is found in Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1913.

2) In the original: but.

3) In the original: "ausspläsenerest."

*This writing appeared in German in 1526 at Basel under the title: Billige Antwort Joh. Martin Luther's report of the Sacrament, together with a short concept of several preachers in Swabia writing about the words of the Lord's Supper. I ask for interrogation." We reproduce the same according to Walch's old edition. The approximate time determination results from the following: In § 1 of the second section of this writing, Oecolampad says: "Therefore, at the end of the year [i.e., about a year ago], I have presented my mind to the Sacrament of the Altar"

2c. This was said with reference to his book: De genuina vordorum Domini ote. expositione, which gave rise to the Syngramma Suevicum. Luther, however, mentions this writing of ours already on September 13, 1526, in a letter to Nicolaus Hausmann, Walch, old edition, Vol. XVII, 1919.

The Lord's authority is ever. On the other hand, I request that you kindly put an end to this displeasure that has fallen upon me 1) (which I cannot avoid), and in doing so, do not forget Christ's command to give disgrace word after disgrace word. It is enough for me, if I reject your incompetent judgment and admit that in the discernment of spirits you are at this time shooting far beyond the mark.

(7) What the speech is about, you yourself may well accept. It looks to me as if you wanted to make me and others false prophets in the matter of the sacrament, and call us seductive and rebellious enthusiasts and devilish, and with other dubious names, that you prepare a pit for yourself and your followers. And in 'the points touching the sacraments (for I will not speak of others), I do not know how you may escape being considered [as] an unhappy dreamer yourself, who complies with the instructions of the flesh and the counsel of the erroneous spirit, and who subsequently, among the understanding, does not burn a small measure 2) to your wholesome previous teachings, that you almost pity me. Nevertheless, I must reply to your writing, which I will do in the shortest and truest way.

1. 1) Initially, you call me and others with me, who do not follow your opinion, new hordes, raising new dreams and confusing the world.

2) This is your friendly greeting, which we should not thank you for, we are not known for such things, either, 3) Here is neither innovation, nor redirection, nor dreaming, nor confusion of the world. All our things are based on the fact that one remains with the teachings of Christ and the apostles, and as they were initially believed and accepted by the church. Now the apostles' teachings are not dreams; they do not bring redirection, but love and peace and agreement in Christ; they do not confuse conscience, but resolve what was confused by the teachings of men. That [it] is so, 4) shall be found in the scriptures hereafter, whether you or we introduce more of our own jealousy into the scriptures here.

3. 2) You say further that you like the syngram so much that you yourself were willing to translate it, although this is superior to you because of business.

4) It might have been good, because you might have been warned not to touch me so unkindly; but few would have thought that you would praise it so, much less that you would interpret it yourself; although it is easy to think that their kind will might not have displeased you. 5) I suppose that you still consider this booklet to be a man's writing, and will not count it among the rules or books of holy scripture, to which alone you have so far earnestly directed us.

5. 3) You also say, "At the time when you wrote Against the Heavenly Prophets, you foresaw that there would come some who would excel in *this*, especially such learned men, because it is such a childish, inept reason that has no example in Scripture.

(6) It is no wonder that this has been before you, for it is the truth, and has not remained behind; indeed, this interpretation has not been behind, but has always been seen by those of understanding on the way, even though the devil and Antichrist have fought hard against it and still will. Hasn't it also been discussed in school for a long time? And does not the interpretation also stand with the master of high senses? and he meets it quite badly, yes, rather confirms it, because he overturns it. Does one not read [in the] 1st book of Moses at the 40th chapter: Three baskets are three days? of which St. Augustine says in the first book of the discourses: "This way of speaking is to be noted, that some important things are called by the name of the things they signify, and therefore the apostle says: But the rock was Christ. He does not say: the rock signifies Christ." Up to this point Augustine speaks. And he also introduces the reason to Bonifacio, so it should not be made herbaceous. Is it not also the custom of the church to call the bread of the Lord the sacrament, the body of Christ, because it is a sign of the body of Christ and signifies the body of Christ, or else there would be no sacrament?

(7) Not much speech is needed. In these words of the Lord: This is my body, there is an interpretation of the ceremonies, then especially used, from which the matter requires that one should interpret such speech after the manner of the interpretations of the parables, parables and other hidden speeches. But if it is against thee, it must be a childish, unprofitable, and unfounded thing; but if it were with thee in it, perhaps it would be glorious.

5) In the old edition: their friendly will you not have 2c.

1) rayed - carried, brought, weighed down.

2) "Measure" here is probably - blemish, spot. The word "unbemaßget" occurs in Zwingli in the meaning: unblemished.

3) Perhaps confessed.

4) In the old edition: "That therefore be."

and delicious; which I do not dislike where it wants to be with God.

8. 4) To this you say: Let it never be taught that one may accept such an interpretation here, and that one should call it so. I would have to agree with you, if it were true to be haderic and quarrelsome and not to judge the Scriptures according to the instruction of faith and comparison of other Scriptures. For even so would a man fight, that it should never be brought to pass, that it should be a figurative saying, when the Lord saith, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you. Now the scripture shall not suffer it to be thus compelled upon the dry letter, as thou knowest in the place.

9. 5) You also write: Although examples may be presented, it still does not want to be proven that also in the words: this is my body, the little word "is" should or must be taken thus, we will never prove that. It might be, Martine, if one did not want to hear the counter-answer, that one did not create, 1) and before that, because you state our case thus. What do you say? We do not speak of it in this way, as you say: The speech may be used in one place or two, therefore, it must be accepted in this way in all places. But we say, "Speech may be interpreted figuratively, and may not be interpreted figuratively, and speech that is not figurative may not suffer the words, therefore it must and should be interpreted figuratively.

(10) Therefore it will not follow that on this understanding of ours conscience will remain without consolation, and in your understanding it will find consolation. But the contradiction will be there. Even though, if it were to be understood in principle, the consolation of the soul does not lie in how the word "is" is interpreted in that place, it is very important that the promise in the words that the body is offered for us be obtained. The art of interpretation in the Scriptures commonly inflates rather than comforts; but in the promises there is comfort; indeed, if the promise is obtained by faith, the soul is comforted, although the ceremonial custom of the supper would be set entirely in one place. Such a custom is also instituted beforehand for the sake of the neighbor-man, that he may be united with others in love in proclaiming the good deed of Christ.

11. 6) You continue in your writing and think that your book against Carlstadt stands firm.

1) "nicht schüf" - did not accomplish anything.

2) "conscience" - the conscience.

12 But it is not surprising that your opinion is lacking, because in your writings Against Carlstadt, your old Adam is too prominent, and the evil words beat the wholesome doctrine back and forth, understood therein. At that time, when I read it, I might well have suffered that it had been better kept, so that [it], if I or another had wanted to receive your opinion from the common man, might have stood. I still say it, if you like the same writing, if you would not write differently, you would not create anything. For the sake of the word tuto (τούτο), you have argued something against Carlstadt in the matter. Otherwise, in the resolution of some arguments, you are not equal to yourself, because they are not sufficiently resolved.

13. 7) Item the four reasons from Scripture do not help you to maintain your opinion, because you apply them in a misunderstanding, as Zwinglius and partly also I have indicated, and with short; afterwards I will give it further to understand.

14. for these four sayings thou layest to a foundation. First, from the three evangelists and Paul: "This is my body" 2c. Secondly: Is not the bread which we break communion of the body of Christ?" Thirdly, "He that eateth of the bread, and drinketh of the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Fourth: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, if he distinguish not the body of the Lord." But the sayings are about, and soon will be even more, answered to all.

(15) But here, that you reproach us with words, that we think, if we only wave, it is completely done, you do that here yourself, and it is not well believable to me that you have read our scripture with half diligence, because you thus scornfully make us hateful with scornful words in this and other epistles. But the scolding and contempt and other pompous words shall not frighten us for a long time, if God wills it. If it seems to you to be a beckoning, if your argument is dissolved and overturned, you do not accept it, and thus you want to silence us with words. It would have been cheaper and less suspicious if you had attacked us with writings earlier, after they had answered your letter in your honor by concealing your name.

16. 8) But what is this, if we are waiting for scripture and doctrine from you, so you testify to the matter?

With your faith, as it were, to build on your faith or another man's faith, which we do not know whether it is a righteous faith. Now I consider your opinion to be a delusion, not a faith, because it is based on a misunderstanding of the word of God. Yes, truly it is a conceit and a dream, yes, a seduction it is considered more reasonable, in which we know well that you have spent a long time, whether you would not have let such and such a protestation and judgment go out. If this were true, the papists would also cry out: they believe in transubstantiation. And if you were to go for the faith of man, the large number of bishops, universities and monasteries would also do something about it. But here they do not respect your faith, because we would be building on a rotten foundation. Nor do I think that you can expect us to do so, for you also bring the reason for your faith.

17. 9) We must be false prophets and blasphemers to you, and bring some causes. Namely, that we call your God the baked and fried God, and you: God-flesh-eaters and God-blood-drinkers. My Martine, how I would like the matter to be presented as it is in itself. It says: Outside the matter of the Sacrament, we praise you as faithful co-workers and preachers of the ineffable majesty and praise of God. But here in this matter you are going out of the way. Therefore, if we denounce your misunderstanding, even such unseemly clumsiness follows, 1) who then bring such words with them; otherwise we are not comfortable with mockery. Therefore, the disgrace does not fall on the high and true God, whom we usually confess with one another, but on those who turn divine honor into lies through their carnal mind.

(18) Well, my dear Martine, if it is the truth as you speak of it, you should not let the words err, but take them for your great honor. But if thou wilt be ashamed of the names, thou shalt make thy doctrine suspicious; for if thy doctrine be suspicious, how shalt thou escape the names?

19 Christ's body, to which the Godhead is agreed, was crucified. Now no Christian is ashamed to confess this; indeed, he considers it his honor to preach Christ crucified, even though the Jew resents it and the pagan mocks him for it. Now if the body of Christ is essentially bread, and the Godhead is not separate from the body, let us be honest in confessing a crucified God as well as a crucified God.

1) Clumsy - inconsistencies.

God, although the Godhead is neither crucified nor blasphemed. But if it is not so, the blasphemy does not come from our mouth, but from yours. We have to complain, and not you. For your opinion puts the body of Christ, which after the ascension is to be found in glory and in the most honest place, also in such a small breadbasket, and in the hands and power of sinful priests. We are to say yes big Gramersi 2) to it! or against it may not turn up our noses. 3)

20. 10) Here you sneer further and say: "And yet these are patient, gentle people who suffer great persecution and know Christ rightly. But beware of the patience and gentleness that overthrows our faith. But I hope that such abominable blasphemy will soon put an end to them, although we have well deserved such miserable creatures and sects by our ingratitude and persecution of the gospel, and deserve even more trouble." These are your words, in which little spirit of Paul or meekness of Christ is felt. In my opinion, you answer with these words some brothers who have approached you in a friendly manner, and have desired to act in matters so that one might report to another in peace, and that much trouble among the people might be stopped; perhaps you have also been told that we are not so bad people as they make us out to be, that we do not write so harshly, that we would allow ourselves to be reported. You might have thought that we would also be proven by the cross, that we would know Christ.

(21) This has so spurred your arrogant spirit, (4) that it gumbles and beats, and may praise neither the rough nor the litter in us, and when one discovers his insanity, he speaks with piteous words: one overthrows the faith, and it is atrociously blasphemed, that God may not tolerate it, and speaks that it is a miserable being and punishment of the persecution of the Gospel. But the Christian reader may well assume that these are the words of an enraged man who cannot help himself; if he has escaped from him, he thinks that there is no greater sin and evil on earth than that he has been touched. There then is a wretched being, and heaven and earth fall down, that it is said to him that he also may err as a man, and that those who rely on him may also fall short. Thus the whole faith is overthrown. Oh not so, my brethren, let us not think that the Holy Spirit is bound.

2) Gramersi - grand msroi, beautiful thanks.

3) to ruffle - to balk.

4) "gespet" --- spurred. - gumpet" -- jumps.

To Jerusalem, Rome, Wittenberg or Basel, to your person or to another. In Christ alone is the fullness of grace and truth, of which now to one, now to another is imparted; as you yourself bear all this well knowing.

22 It is no less, spurning the truth awakens the wrath of God. But do not follow, who does not follow Luther, that he hates the truth. If God wills it, it shall not happen that I set myself against the truth; I may never be served more than with teaching and spiritual food, which is why you have been so dear to me until now. But the fact that I do not follow everyone now makes it clear that they do not want to pay me. I and Zwinglin have not yet acted unkindly toward you, but we have taught and written against insanity; perhaps you will shake your coat. If some of your followers, who cried out so horribly, had given and received a friendly report, things might be better. But what is to become of them, if they continue with us, as the papists did with them, in banning of books, in expulsion, in raging vituperations? just as if greater heresy had never arisen in Christendom. God grant that they may yet remember; it is not yet proven that we are false prophets or seditious, as they may cry out and write.

23. 11) After that, you introduce three tests by which you certainly judge our spirit as seductive and command others to judge, which we will see with what reason they are brought forth.

(24) First, since those who are not subject to your error do not compare themselves in the interpretation of the words, "This is my body," and one interprets it thus, another takes it for "means," and another seeks another way, you compare them to the seven-headed and one-bodied beast in Apocalypsi, which sets up seven heads of interpretation against solitary Christian truth, and consider this probation a great warning of the Holy Spirit.

(25) Well, you should come with such strikes, that you yourself may be struck; for then you will not strike me, nor others, as I hope, not depending on your madness.

Twenty-six: You would like to turn us into robbers, and we know nothing about it. You are struggling to fulfill the number of seven, and yet you do not exist, and you know that the number of seven is a number of perfection and of the whole multitude. We are, if God wills, not in the dragon's body, but in the body of the sorrowful woman.

How can you ascribe many heads to us for the sake of such an interpretation? As far as I know, the reason for all of us is one, that Christ has gone to heaven with a true body, from which he will judge in the future. This reason and the head of our cause is an article of faith, taught by apostles and founded in the Scriptures.

28 But you and yours, and with you the popes, want to keep such articles besides the article of faith; and if one were to look at your division, one would find almost seven and seventy changes, not only in the interpretation of Scripture, but also in some fantasies. The popes have their transubstantiation, but you have the supposition; for both places you need the Scriptures, as is fitting for everyone.

(29) To him Christ is glorified; to him he serves; to him he is given; to him bread is a sign; to him it is not. The one should not remember Christ's presence; the other also wants him to be worshipped. The other wants badly, one should say it is the body, and not decide whether it is essentially there or not; and there are almost as many senses as many heads, and one puts this now to us.

(30) But our case is this: Our foundation of faith is one with Christian truth. But the weapons to fight against the sentence that is contrary to this foundation are not equal, and one hits better, the other worse. But how is one to do it? We are not all equally trained and equipped to resist the enemy. It is, I think, the same among you; your disciples do not all find themselves so skilled in writing as you.

31 Therefore, one has not yet completely missed the faith, if one does not even meet the *est*, or *hoc*, or *corpus*, in the interpretation; if he alone truly recognizes the promise of the merit of the suffering of Jesus, and does not deny the use of the sacraments besides.

32 Dear, if I Christianly confess with other Christians that we are not able to do anything by our works 1) and I have for myself the saying of the Lord: "Without me you are not able to do anything", and by this saying I contradict the Pelagians who claim the power of free will. I suppose that my reason is firm with all Christians, but a Palagian, who admits to his powers the effect of good, leads the saying from the 5th book of Moses at the 30th chapter: The word is almost near you in your mouth, and in your heart that you do it; there the Pelagian rejoices.

1) "nothing" set by us instead of not.

The heretics of the world look at these words as if he were The head, the tail from the sky, also throws the stars from able to penetrate heaven with his own strength, and say the sky and the apparent saints, and the sorrowful woman that they are clear words. Then he is contradicted by the 1) is smothered. As if we were outlawing the Christian truth. faithful, that this and other sayings should not be Now the simple faith and truth of Christian unity does not understood in this way; and one Christian interprets the stand in that the body of Christ is essential in bread. But saying of Moses to mean the incarnation of Christ. Christian truth is that the body of Christ is in heaven with Another says: Moses did not say that the power is in us, honor and glory; but here on earth he rules his church with although the knowledge is given to us by God. The third his spirit and with his grace, to whom he bequeathed the comes, and also brings an interpretation, and yet all three memorial and sacrament of his body, that it may remain do not meet in the same way. Would the Pelagian do well, united in love.

therefore, to accuse the Christians and call them My Luther, you do not want to speak to us more harshly. degenerates and seducers and false prophets, since Well, do you ever want nothing else, but that your careless every Christian has the next ground of Scripture on which zeal becomes a poisonous, envious anger, and you he builds? So it is here also. Our reason is that the body become a carnal from a clergyman, if we are already of Christ is in heaven, which is now certain and not patiently silent, then the spiritually intelligent will well see lacking. But that the saying, "This is my body," is brought who throws down the stars from heaven. They will see who forth contrary to it, it is to be rightly understood; and if not the red and blood-colored beast is, and which heads have every one obtains it, yet love requires that it be instructed two little horns.

brotherly. For although it is said, "This is my body," it is 37. 12) I would have let the speech fall, if you had not not therefore said, "This is essentially my body," and brought it on the way. And you present them with such every anointed priest, by preaching the word, serves that splendid words that whoever does not believe them is the body may come into the bread. worthy that in the sacrament there is not only bread and

(33) Oh, it would be mighty evil in the Christian faith wine, but that there are chanterelles and morels. that no one would believe rightly except those who might (38) What do you mean by these words? You leave the interpret all the Scriptures in the most artificial way. If one common man in the opinion, as if I taught no difference did not keep a side ceremony in the church like the other, between common bread and the Lord's bread, which I there would have to be divisions, and God would have never taught. I have often excused myself of this, and here nothing to do with it. without need to deny it; 2) but now I say: Because and as

34 Therefore I like the saying of Saint Augustine: long as bread is a sacrament, that is, as long as it is used "Have faith and love, and walk fearlessly in the in the act, it is in substance only bread; but because of Scriptures, for all the law is satisfied in love, and faith in thanksgiving, and because of the institution of Christ, which Christ is the fulfillment of the law. And further Augustine is a sanctification, for the contemplation of the passion of says in the book of Christian doctrine: "Whoever takes Christ and of our holy covenant of love, it is much more than such a meaning from the Scriptures, which is useful for bad bread, has its worthiness, and should not be called the edification of love, and yet does not say evenly as he morchen or Rübschnitz. Therefore your test is useless. But of whom it is written supposed, does not therefore lie where it makes me guilty, I would gladly let myself be altogether, and is not great harm in it, though he already instructed and myself warn everyone of the doctrine; misses." Here it is to be checked that one can bring up besides, I am of good hope that where Christian love counts about many interpretations at once from one place for something, people will not be embittered by your words without any harm. Therefore, the seventy interpreters are and let themselves be prevented from knowing the truth.

not always the same as Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, Jerome and others. And yet they are not seditious, or masters of the mob.

35 Therefore, Doctor Martin, you forget about us, brotherly love, that you may compare us to the evil animal for such a reason.

1) "Durchächet" put by us instead of: "durchächet". "Durchächten" as much as pursue. Cf. Revelation 12, 13. In Scripture No. 23 of this volume, § 9, the form "durächten" is found.

2) d. i. repeat.

39. 13) Likewise, the other test is also incompetent; not in itself, but against us, if you say: the Holy Spirit lays down constant reasons, so that the longer one fights against them, the firmer they become and increase, especially if they are to go up anew, he has never left them. It is all true; but that you say in addition that it happens differently in the animal, and understand us thereby, therefore, that Carlstadts could not keep a whorehouse, which we ourselves confess; and according to your legend, Zwinglin's, or also my Significat hang the head and die freely there:

(40) If thou wert true to our one reason here, thou wouldst not speak thus. The fact that Christ is in heaven is an enduring reason, and may suffer all blows. But if we had based our reason on the words, "This is my body," then your test would be in part, and you and yours would not yet have become beautiful. For a long time, your opinion has also had its head hung by papal authority, and is the process of transubstantiation.

Item, what we teach is not a new original, 1) but was taught and kept by the apostles; therefore, it does not arise first of all. But whether the Significat dies from the power of Lutheran challenge, I cannot yet feel. But if everyone were free to say what he believed, and had heard both reasons, things would soon be different than they are now.

Some of your people may suffer the popes to be sold in public, but forbid us to answer your reproaches in the matter of the sacraments, in which there is not so much invective as in their booklets. It would not depend on whether my booklets are also put up; but I do not see how it is right to condemn and not to interrogate, to hear complaint and not to hear answer, as the popes have also long dealt with you and yours. But it is not a wonder if it is dark where they shut the stores. Therefore it does not seem what the test creates; and yet you make a great warning of God from it to all who fear him and want to believe rightly. As if you said: He who does not believe, does not fear God, has no right faith.

(43) Then every ignorant man will say that he believes before he wants to be in the suspicion that he does not fear God, and does not believe rightly. And he would do just as the king who had given money to an ignorant painter, to

1) Urhab" - to begin. Cf. Col. 492, where the word is used in different meanings.

When he had spent the money and painted nothing, he said to the king: He who could not see the painting was not born in wedlock; then the king said he saw such a painting as the painter stated. Not everyone will allow himself to be overawed by the words 2).

44. teach beforehand that we have brought a new doctrine, and prove that *it* must be taken substantially; and if thou mayest make it an article of faith, say then, he that believeth it not, is not godly.

45. 14) It is also true that you write afterwards that the devil cannot be known better anywhere than by the truth; and that the world wants to be deceived and must be deceived, just as in Arius' time.

My dear Martine, where did you find me, still in a lie concerning faith, or elsewhere, that you write thus? Now I desire no less that the truth should come to light than you do. Is this not rashness on your part, that you speak such shameful words to me 3)? I mean, if you wanted to say it even more roughly, it would have to come out. The truth shall testify that I do not speak from the devil, and Arii Rumor is not raised by me. Arius took the honor of Christ; that I desire to admit; Arium punishes the Scripture of his insanity; that will not be thrown at me. Punish me of the lie and destruction of the peace in my doctrine, and then need your angry words, as long as you want, you may answer it differently with God.

47. 15) The third sample you give thus: "This spirit is especially a fleeting or floating spirit, which does not remain on any piece, as I have tried them both in writings and words. If one demands of them that [they say this: This is my body', or the like, to prove that it is to be understood in their opinion, and differently from natural words, 4) they looked at another little song, according to which they are full of words and thoughts. Therefore they say from the 6th chapter of John, how there are two kinds of food, spiritual and bodily, as if no one knew it before; or they praise themselves once, how they are pious and suffer much; or they deny what it is good for, that Christ's body and blood must be there; or they tear into something else, so that they do not have to stay on the words, otherwise they will be caught; so they fill their ears and leaves with vain words, so that one must grasp, as Satan is afraid, and in all the flesh they will be caught.

2) "overthädigen" well - to dupe.

3) "wichest" - bürdest. Cf. Col. 584, § 6.

4) So put by us instead of: "shall" according to ? 9 of the previous scripture, which is repeated here completely.

He is not to be caught in his lies. I say then: such circumlocutions and evasions do nothing 1) to the matter, they should only stay on the words, and there, in the place, prove their opinion from the text. Yes, then I have the eel by the tail. There they lead me again to the 6th chapter of John, or else to a monkey's tail, that one only gets away from the matter by a lot of chatter, and yet accomplishes nothing. That is a right Satanic art to hover, as the night fires drive in the evening on the field." These are your kind words.

Here, first of all, I do not know who the two are of whom you say; whether you mean Zwingli and Carlstadt, or Zwingli and me. Well, as you have recognized others, I leave it, I answer for myself. I first kindly requested you and other Wittenbergers with writings, but invented bad report. Accordingly, I have publicly said in a congregation how the words according to your interpretation are not founded, but your spared; and do not yet know any fleeing, your sword in this not so sharp. But to set one place of Scripture against another is unreasonably called a flight, or a going round like the night fires. The Scriptures must not be set against one another, but compared with one another, according to the manner and instruction of faith. But where this is not permitted in the Scriptures, no insanity would be so great, it would find its handholds, and would want to be shielded with tenacity. It is well known that where the spirit is fleeting, where we desire to compare Scripture with Scripture, and say how the body of Christ is in heaven, we are answered that it may be in many places, and that in the bread it is an insensible body, and that God has recommended this to the priests in words. And if we ask for the Scriptures, we will see where we are told and how we are told.

48 To ask: what is the use of bodily presence in bread? is not out of the way, the teaching should be different. Our God teaches us useful things, as Isaiah says. Now, if there is to be great benefit here, we should reasonably know it too. But I am sure that neither you nor yours can teach such things on the basis of divine Scripture. For by faith we already have what we need, and it is not in the rote custom. But this benefits 2) the

Next [turned], will have to be memorized and comprehensible; but the body is not there like that.

49) For the last, that they may exalt their own holiness and persecution to thee, 3) I hold to have been done, as reported above, by some for the sake of peace. And would it be so wrong for us to be called devilish and rebellious, and to confess, as Christ also says, that we have no devil, and are peaceable, or the like? For my own part, I know well that I am a sinner, but I would like to help proclaim the praises of the Lord, who forgives my sin, without offending all men. That I must say, because you attack me so harshly, and desire to make me hateful to all men; and not only a sinner, yes, also a devil, or in the least, that our doctrine is devilish; and thus we are considered the devil's instrument. Knowest thou the devils as well as thou wilt, thou knowest none in me for the matter of things, and in the trial thou hast failed one thing.

50. 16) According to your judgment, you bring two reasons for our error, as you say. One, that it is almost clumsy in reason; the other, that it is not necessary to be Christ in bread and wine. And you say that the two pieces have seized us, and have thus passed through Satan's temptation, as oil passes through the bones, so that we cannot get rid of them. After that, when we have such painted spectacles before our eyes, we come rolling to the Scriptures, and draw in our mind, and draw them to our opinion.

(51) Here it must be assumed where you are going, and that you do not want to be told our reason; for we do not put here the reasons that you present, but the articles of faith according to the content of Scripture, and the glory of God, whose goodness is not felt where no benefit follows; and if no benefit follows, and Scripture does not urge us to it, we should not put wonderful things that are contrary to reason, nor should we make them base. And so unruly things are set forth against reason, that in the Trinity itself such incomprehensible things are not used. Well then, if one is diligent about these things, and takes note of the glory of God, and does not allow himself to be persuaded by inadequate 5) Scripture, it is called giving the devil his due. Yes, if I were to think otherwise, you would have reason to think that

1) "nothing" put by us instead of: "not"; according to the preceding Scripture, 10.

2) So put by us instead of: to good.

3) to lift up - to reproach. This refers to § 4 of the previous scripture: "and yet are patient, gentle people who suffer great persecution" 2c.

4) but one - again.

5) "undemanding" put by us instead of "undemanding".

to complain to me. Other writings of mine will show whether I have put my mind into writing or not.

52. 17) In conclusion, you tell us about sects. Now we are not satisfied with the dispute over words. Where we signed (your doctrines) to you, it would be pardonable for us if something inconsistent were already going on in your writings. But must we therefore be robbers, so that we do not give our minds captive to you? Yes, it is captive to Christ and his words. In that way, you and those who follow you would also be sectarians to the pope. We are no more fond of sects than you are, and also desire to remain in the faith preached by the apostles in all the world, and what is imposed on us against the article of faith we do not like and do not want to bear.

53. 18) And that you exhort that one remain with the pure words of Christ is thus exalted by you, 1) as if we would like against the word of God, and we contaminate it or bend it, and also do not have clear words of God for us.

Dear D. Martine, it would have been unkind, it is more said to you earlier that you do not only wield the sword of the word of God, we have such clear and serene 2) sayings of our reason that you cannot deny them. But that your saying is dark is evident; and no darker incomprehensible one would be accepted than the understanding you bring, which 3) never compares with preceding and following, yes, even contrary Scripture and articles of faith. You put forward the pure word, and thus lead to unlearning 4) and word controversy. If it is to be so, then each one will receive his own error. Oh how there will then be sects with heaps!

55. 19) My answer to (the) syngamma does not apply to you. Now it wants to be too long in German, therefore I will draw it into a Summarium to the shortest; perhaps others will also see in it whether I have written in vain, and whether it is enough with your book against Carlstadt, and the Syngamma.

56. 20) But if you were willing to write, I would suffer that you had already written; indeed, you would have done it long ago, since we are harmful people to the Christian community. Why did you let the fire get out of hand? Why hast thou alone with reproaches, words of reproach, and words of oppression brought many to unhappiness?

and you watch with a laugh. So that a legend goes out from you: you want to let us run riot, and afterwards you will make it up to us in one fell swoop. Ah! you see us going astray, why don't you lead us home again? you would owe to your enemy's donkey according to the law of God. If the right true spirit of God had not left you at this time, and if you knew something that would benefit us, you would not do it. Well then, I still wish you from the bottom of my heart that the princely, slain and joyful spirit of Christ may return to you. And if thou hast any good thing to do for the glory of God and the benefit of thy neighbor, teach with all meekness, according to the commandment of the apostle. That I do not speak, that I doubt in the main matter of the doctrine, as you probably blaspheme about the ears, as if they were devil's lies. God forgive you.

Dear one, if you want to teach, then leave your scandalous words at Wittenberg. They do not improve your cause, nor do we need them; nor do I know how you will answer for them to God. May He grant you and me to continue in the knowledge of His Son. Amen. To Basel.

Answer of Johannis Oecolampadii to the Syngamma of the 14 Predicants in Swabia, about the Lord's Supper.

To Christian readers.

Grace and peace from God the Father through Christ. Beloved in Christ! If it were possible to joke with divine truth, as with temporal possessions, I would have kept my writing with good Christian conscience last year and also now. But you know that the truth is the greatest treasure of Christians, for which they should leave all their possessions in order to possess it; and it must be known by us, if we want to know anything else about Christ. Christ, who is the truth himself, if we are not to be rejected as unknowns at the last day. Therefore I have presented my understanding of the sacrament of the altar and the words of the Lord's Supper at the end of the year, as it is learned from the oldest teachers; in good hope that no one will be offended by it, but that many will be improved by it.

Now my writing has been received more unkindly than had hoped, and some have written against it most bitterly. Among others, a number of preachers in Swabia have written. The first booklet of this kind was published in the year 2000.

1) d. i. held.

2) serene - bright.

3) Set by us instead of: them.

4) d. i. what cannot be assumed.

D. Martin praises it as if it were the thorough truth, but in many places it is erroneous, and scolds me and others who do not agree with him in the matter of the sacrament as seductive. Therefore, the love of truth causes me to continue to give account of given doctrine, and to answer for such counter-accusations. In this, my opinion is no different than that the light of truth should shine forth more brightly; and I would not like to see D. Martin and other preachers reported as being ungrateful to others for their Christian teachings 1) or that they should suffer any harm from it. They think of me what they will; about my request is to them and all readers, want to hear the Scriptures with impartial minds, and be most favorable to the truth itself, it will let itself be seen, I am undoubted. The Lord grant mercy.

But so that my and the opponent's matter is presented in the clearest and shortest way, it is unnecessary to answer the whole syngramma, as I did in Latin. For such a thing is too much for the common reader; but in a short term, and that in four main articles, they shall be answered.

4. first, I will tell reason and cause why the bread is not essentially the body 'of Christ, with rejection of the counter-accusations.

(5) Secondly, I will set against it the adversary's cause, and show that he is unfit.

6) Thirdly, I will answer for other counter-accusations and features, conceived in their book.

7) Fourthly, I want to decide in which way we want to be or become one.

The first part.

Our reason and understanding is based on the fact that the Word of God became flesh, born of the virgin Mary, and wanted to serve us here on earth, in his body, which he also gave in the most shameful death of the cross. To whom the Father also gave the highest honor and clarity when he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven. For Christ, according to his soul and body, is entitled to the best and highest goods. Therefore it is said of him that he sits at the right hand of his Father, and let every tongue confess that he is the glory of God the Father, according to Philippians, chapter 2. In heaven he has his throne, from thenceforth to judge the living and the dead.

These are articles of the ancient undoubted faith; this is what the apostles preached, this is what the prophets prophesied, this is what the Scriptures record in heaps.

(3) This reason is firm, and may not fail us; and what is contrary to this reason we may not accept in any way. For we have a rule for interpreting the Scriptures, in which we are commanded not to accept anything that is contrary to the articles, or that is not according to them. For these are the secondary doctrines which are forbidden, Rom. 16, Gal. 1, 2 Pet. 2. Let not the articles of our faith be obscured with the superstitious secondary doctrines, as, confessing the articles of faith, yet speaking of those things which break in beside them, let them also be believed; as the Popes do in their doctrines. As when they say: Marriage is not forbidden to anyone by God; but marriage is still forbidden to the priest. Christ is a single mediator, but the saints who have died are also mediators. Christ has suffered and done enough for our sin; but we must also do enough here or in purgatory. These are secondary and superstitions. Therefore, in the main matters of faith, one must be firm, constant, and not let oneself be rejected anywhere. We have an article that Christ was born of the virgin Mary. Although it does not speak of the eternal virgin, 2) the believer may not hear that Mary had other children than Christ. And if anyone, together with the heretic Nestorio or others, should want to make a statement that Joseph did not know Mary until she gave birth to her firstborn son, Matt. 1, or that Christ was said to have had brothers, he should be rejected as a heretic, for he takes the Scriptures against the article of faith, and does not help him anywhere by saying that Mary was a virgin when she gave birth to Christ, and therefore her opinion is not contrary to faith. No, we cannot accept this. Item, we have in the faith an article, resurrection of the flesh. Now if someone wanted to introduce here the saying of Paul: The flesh and the blood will not possess the kingdom of God; or from the first Psalms: The wicked will not rise in judgment; and wanted to introduce a gloss next to it: They rise with the body to the judgment, as the article of faith holds, and the same body remains invisible in other places than in the grave and in the same way.

2) "of the everlasting virginity" = of the everlasting virginity.

1) "verschupft" - disregarded. Cf. Col. 489, § 26.

he does not possess the kingdom of God. Such glosses may not be suffered in any way. For all other sayings must give way, and their interpretation must be such that they are not contrary to the articles in any way. For that thus creeps beside it, all is suspicious. Therefore, that we certainly believed, the summa of our faith is in little, and if we did not let ourselves penetrate further, one would remain satisfied. What are all heretical doctrines [other] than secondary doctrines in the Articles? So here, too, we have three main articles, in which we are told about the honesty and glory of Christ, and also about his body. Therefore, if one wants to introduce something next to it, and make an aberration, 1) we cannot hear it; but if one says: Christ with his body is in heaven, this is our faith, because by this our hope is strengthened that we may also go to heaven through him. Therefore, the gloss may not be accepted: His body is essentially in the bread, or is therein insensible; or any other gloss.

4. it is also a mighty thing that God has taken only mankind out of all creatures to His divine nature, yes, He has not even dignified the angels in this way, as it is written in Hebrews, chapter 2: "He does not accept angels, but the seed of Abrahah". Now, if the bread is essentially the body of Christ, as the opponents say: then the bread is also accepted by God, and will be more worthy than the body of the Virgin Mary, or the body of a man, yes, more holy, than the hands, which present the bread to us.

5 It should have such holiness. For though bread has no understanding by its nature, yet it has such honor, according to the co-existent soul of Christ, which is to be highly praised above all that is. Therefore, whoever wants to be sure, let him keep the old undoubted faith, which we began to confess at baptism.

Now let us see whether the strongholds 2) may also stand against the adversaries.

The preachers, almost at the end of their book, introduce such an answer to this: "Dear one, what do we hear now, if Christ has thus departed from us, that He has left nothing of His own behind, then the Holy Spirit and forgiveness of sin, and all righteousness and the word of God are accepted.

Response.

(7) This is an inadequate, even pitiful, comparison. Are spiritual things to be likened to bodily things? It is not said that Christ left nothing behind him. That which he left behind him he confesses to be his peace. Item, the Holy Spirit he sent. Spiritual things, by their nature, without any harm, may be divided into many parts, and remain unchanged in their essence. The nature of the body is to be in one place. The body does not want to be considered a true body, which may be in many places at once. A body has one place, or let the Scriptures teach it otherwise.

8 And that it is further said that it is not so with the insensible body, which is invisible in many places. Yes, where it is said that the body is so, it is not a natural, essential body, which has this in its nature, to be in one place. Would it also follow that no natural body would have suffered for us, and would be our gift, not a body according to our body, for which sake we may call it our brother, a bone out of our bones; or it would give us the insensible, and as it is sensible and truly a body, and in which it is our brother, it would retain it. Therefore they have not that they say to it. Above that, to receive the spiritual gifts, we may not at all receive the bodily presence of the Lord; indeed, the Lord says the contradiction, and says: "Unless I go away, the Comforter will not come"; that is what he speaks of his body, and not of the Spirit or his divinity. Doctor Martin Wider den Carlstadt shows the next way, and says: "We are not commanded to inquire how it comes about that our bread is or becomes Christ's body. But it does not apply, where something besides faith leads along, that it is not proper to ask. Then they want to pay us with other empty words, and say: God's word is there, and we abide by it and believe it. And on the speech all that they write in many little books, and is their reason the words, "This is my body," they will do it; and is quite another mind: either they must come entirely to our opinion, or it is a trumperty that they speak. Not that the words of God are despised, but that they interpret and expound them unfaithfully.

(9) For this reason I have taught in the booklet which has just gone out, that it is impossible that the sentence should be interpreted according to their mind; therefore our foundation shall remain firm and immovable, but they have nothing on their side.

10. there are three excellent pieces in the way, such as

1) Aberle - an objection.

2) Forts - fortresses.

I have said in my first booklet, so that their interpretation "This is my body", is spoken to the bread, therefore will may not stand. First, the articles of faith, and other not make the miraculous work, as they have wanted to Scriptures compared against them; as is also now said. answer for it.

For the words must be interpreted according to the instruction of faith, and not again, faith according to the words; as it is written in Romans, Cap. 12: "He that hath prophecy, let him have it according to the instruction of faith"; as Tertullianus *de praescriptionibus* clearly states.

11) Secondly, the preceding and following words of the evangelists do not allow this to happen, as: if one hears the custom of the paschal lamb, the bodily departure of the Lord, the order of the evangelists does not really insist on the same words; and other pieces more, which I have written at length to the well-learned Billican, prebendary of Nördlingen, that I have not brought my own sense into the Scriptures, but the Scriptures have given it to me, if I consider one and the other.

Thirdly, there are many clumsy ones on the path that cannot be admitted, and therefore their opinion does nothing against us. However, there are a few particular clumsy ones that follow from their opinion.

The clumsy, so follow when the essential body of Christ is in the Sacrament.

(13) First, they give greater and more incomprehensible miracles, such as the creation of heaven and earth, or the incarnation of Christ; yet the Scriptures do not tell us of such miracles. Neither did the apostles follow them when the supper was instituted and the words were spoken. It is not the custom in Scripture to invent miraculous signs. I have referred to Saint Augustine, who clearly indicates that there is no miraculous thing that happens when something changes or a person appears in another creature, as one should say here. And St. Augustine spoke this with seriousness; he did not write it without reason. For in the bread, outside of the meaning and sacrament, he does not want anything essentially new to be invented there. And since this is the case, Luther's excuse, and that of other people, is soon answered, who want to have everything answered. One should not ask, it happens miraculously and unspeakably; and is but that of the first, that one does not pass it. 2) They shall bring it. Item, that the word:

14 Secondly, it has been said that the bread of the Lord is a sacrament, that is, a holy sign; therefore it signifies something. Now it is abominable in all understanding that the sign should be one thing essential with that which is signified thereby. This they can with no justification contradict; for even in the holy trinity one must not entirely exclude the two ways of speaking, of substance and relation. For it may not be said that the Son, who is the antitype of the Father, is the Father, though he has all the substance of the Father. Item, if the Scripture and the faith say: "The Word became flesh", we may not say that the divine nature is the human nature essentially, although they are agreed in one person. Nevertheless, this way of speaking must not be excluded here. Do we then speak Calecutically, that one may not compare it against the other?

(15) Thirdly, I have brought forth an awkwardness to them from Chrysostom: there would be much Christ; this no Christian can endure. For there is not one loaf on many altars; and if each is said to be essentially the body of Christ, it must have another form than that it is One Christ, and have such an example:

(16) If the divinity and the soul of Christ were also united in another body, not conceived by the Virgin Mary, then it would be said, for the sake of the matter, that there were many Christ's; and if then the body with the soul and divinity were united in many divided loaves, and that essentially, then it will give many persons, for the sake of the multiplicity of the loaves. They never say that the body has the bread on it, like a clinging garment, because they cry out: essential, essential!

17 And if one of their hands is caught in the bosom, they should say, "The Lord's bread is not a sacrament;" as I know preachers in a large city, and they give me nothing in response but, "I give too much to the woman Hulda, human reason, and all things happen miraculously; that is so much, one wants to persuade people by force, that it is not proven.

18) Fourthly, there is another unfortunate thing that would follow: that the sacraments of the old and new law would not be of the same content for every law minister, and we would be more blessed than the sacraments for the sake of the sacraments.

3) "themselves" set by us instead of: "they".

- 1) Clumsy - unrhymed things.
- 2) exists - confirms, proves.

Abraham or Moses, or other ministers; for there is no other difference between the sacraments of the old and new law, except that those in the old mean that 1) Christ is coming, and those in the new teach us that Christ has already come. Therefore, as little as it was necessary for those under the old law to eat Christ bodily in the paschal lamb, so little is it necessary for us now to have Christ essentially in the bread and thus eat him. The ancients ever had one faith with us; they are also of one worthiness with the saints in the new law; they were also saved by faith, just as well as we are; their ministers ate the body of Christ, which was not yet there, just as well spiritually as we do. For spiritual enjoyment may also enjoy what is not yet there, let alone not enjoy what is not present in the place. And if our sacrament were so superior to theirs, certainly Christ would not have withdrawn it from his own, he would rather have been born in Abel's time.

Your answer.

(19) Here they have not answered, but with unrighteous reproaches, and they draw it hard, with such words: If you proceed in this way, Christ will not be Christ afterwards; for who would prevent the wicked from making such arguments as these, to prove that Christ did not become man, and thus say, "The holy fathers were saved by faith alone; therefore neither St. Peter nor St. John saw Christ, nor was he ever bodily with them. For what need is there of Christ becoming man, if we are saved by faith alone? But if he was ever bodily present, his bodily presence was of no use.

Rebuttal.

(20) Lords have no need to worry; they soon know how to answer the ungodly and others. For, they say, the ancients were saved by faith; if they be asked, Whether they also in their faith were not assured of Christ, they must answer, Yea. Well then, it follows that Christ had to come to save them. But if it be asked, Did the fathers also wait for our Lord's supper? they may not say: Yes. Neither do we desire that the custom of the paschal lamb should be kept again. There is a great difference between Christ and the ceremonies.

1) Thus set by us instead of: significant.

Another counterclaim.

021 Behold, they say, we also are better than the ancients; we have the gospel, which must now also be preached unto us, because they lacked it: shall we not therefore have Christ for meat in bread, because the ancients lacked him?

Response.

(22) But it is not fitting, for the ministers of the law were never without the gospel, and Christ dwelt in their hearts; for because they prophesied all these things before, they were not altogether ignorant. Of course, they also understood themselves, and that which they believed they spoke. They also recognized something further, because the predicants say that they saw with the spiritual eyes, the same could have been admitted to their children still underage, but that would have been too little for Abraham and his kind. Unless I do not understand the words of the preachers, this is not appropriate. The old fathers also waited for the gospel to be proclaimed in all the world; therefore it had to happen, and they had their part as well as St. Peter and St. Paul. But in the bodily supper they had no part, neither did they wait for it; but in the change of ceremonies with Christ they might well have considered that One Faith, One Church, One Lord and One Spiritual Food. With that, however, they have not escaped the clumsiness.

Fifthly, it is a great misfortune that no benefit comes from such a wonderful work; for through spiritual enjoyment, without bodily presence, one has no less than if there were bodily presence, and I suppose that, according to our stupidity, there is also more.

(24) Here they turn to and fro, and know not how to raise anything, and have for evil that it should be desired of them to know; but God wills it,

2) "shall" here stands in the meaning of "aligns, serves"; compare § 14 of the following scripture.

That we may recognize his good deed, proved to us by him, and therefore give him his praise.

(25) Here they murmur, saying, "If the sacraments are discontinued altogether, they are of no use. Answer: Who says that the sacraments, instituted by Christ, are of no use? It is another thing to say that bodily presence in the sacrament is of no use, or the sacrament is of no use. We know many benefits of the sacraments, in edification of love, in purification of the churches, in exercise of faith, in joy of thanksgiving. But all this happens as perfectly with the bodily absence as with the presence.

26 To this they add: O the world has become negligent, since it has believed that the body of Christ is present, it will become even more negligent if it does not believe this. To this I answer: God does not need our lies to increase His praise. What the memory and faith in the suffering of Christ do not accomplish, it will accomplish even less that I remember and want to think that the body is in the bread. Can anyone have greater love than to die for someone? What is this kind of love in the burning? One feels what brings improvement, for believing that the body is in the bread, or not believing that it is in the bread, does not bring improvement; but discernment of the body of Christ, believing that such a divine body is given for us, and practicing all Christian good works out of the impulse of the Spirit and love: therein it is, and not in superstitious dreams.

27 They come again to their inconsistent similitude, and ask: why should the bodily hearing of the gospel, which the ancients did not have? But I answer as before, that the gospel was preached to the ancients also, to some also quite clearly. I think that Isaiah and David emphasized the glory of Christ to us. But what the preaching was good for, I will tell you later. Since I also do not let them down in any way, that in the outward word the inward or eternal, or God's word stands essentially, and in a different, but clearer way; as in the same they have mischievously 1) mishandled it. Have no more than patience, and read on.

28) And if one presses them further, and tells them that no benefit of bodily presence, to eat in bread, may be shown, for he would otherwise have to lie, who says John on the 6th, The meat is nowhere useful: so they shake themselves from it with a loose solution, and is but the saying with the true-believers sufficient, their opi-

1) "desert" put by us instead of: "would know".

nion. It does not help that they say that the flesh, that is, the carnal mind, is of no use; for the very thing they teach is of a crude kind of mind. What is that they say: Yes, the body is not broken, or bitten, as Pope Nicolaus speaks of it? There is no escape. Rather, if one were to say: The king has not been murdered, but otherwise he is hidden in a basket, without his body being put under the swords; would he not still be in dishonor? So it is according to the common sense in this matter, one does not eat the body with the teeth; but now, if it is essential in the bread, it is under the teeth. Is this supposed to be a high Christian understanding? That is why St. Augustine still says: "What hast thou prepared the teeth, and the belly? believe, thus hast thou eaten." It is the natural understanding of the whole chapter: that to eat the flesh of Christ bodily, whether in bread or out of bread, sensible or insensible, is of no use; but to have such faith in the merit of Christ's death and bloodshed, makes the soul fed and fattened with the flesh of Christ, for he is dear and acceptable to it, and comforts and refreshes it. Now if it be considered that the body is in heaven, that our place also may be prepared for us; for thus the soul is made drunk with joy; then reigneth Christ with his Spirit with power, which is shewed us by the evangelist, saying, How then shall ye see the Son of man ascending into the place where he was before? But it is even a deviation to turn faith to incarnation; which all true ministers feel to be true.

29 These are the adversities before which the Lord's words may not serve their purpose; but they must give way to the article of Christian faith, and take a pure mind. Several more mishaps could be counted; they have to be resolved in those.

Many examples show that Christ's speech: "This is my body" should and may be a figurative speech.

(30) If our foundation is firm, and their weapons, according to their reckoning, do no mighty thing, it is strange and odd to some that the Scripture should be thus interpreted, "This is my body," that it should be said, this is a figure or signification of my body; or, that it is just so much, it signifies my body. And because it is thus unfamiliar to the untrained, I have gathered many examples in which figurative speeches are invented, and are not drunge, 2) or un-

2) drunge - clumsy.

but dainty and intelligible speeches, and amusing to the readers; and if I did not put them all on, that they should serve just for that reason, the preachers have picked them all up quite closely, and with many speeches have left none unshortened, and have tapped me with many little key words. Now that I have looked into them, I find that they all serve to some extent for the figurative kind of speech: "This is my body", to interpret it: this is a meaning of my body, or means my body. Now because they are so strange about it, I have to take them in hand again.

First of all, the saying in 1 Corinthians 10, where it says: "The rock was Christ", must be suffered; and I have interpreted: the rock, indeed, the very mountain of the rock, means Christ. There they want, and before that D. Martin on Sunday Septuagesimä 1): that the spiritual rock is essentially Christ. But his interpretation may not stand. For Paul says before: "They all drank from the spiritual rock, which was their companion." In that place is not called the spiritual rock, which the Spirit drinks with faith, or which is understood by the Spirit.

32. but therefore it is a spiritual rock, that he gave the water obedient to the commandment of God, which is a spirit, or to the working of angels. As also that an angel is called bread, that it is prepared of the angels in lust. From it all have drunk, young and old, good and bad, all who had passed through the sea. If the rock were to be understood as Christ Himself, then even the unbelievers would have had Christ. But Paul says immediately afterwards that many perish in the wilderness because of their unbelief. And the rock is called a companion, because the water of the rock followed the people in the wilderness. Now when Paul tells a hidden story, he interprets it as follows: "The rock was Christ, as if he said, "Do you want to know what the rock means? And this rhymes exceedingly well with the words, "This is my body." For after Christ had taken the bread, had broken it, had given it to the disciples, and had hot them to eat, [so] he expounds to them what he signifies by the ceremony, saying, "This is my body"; that is, this bread, broken, signifies that this, my body, shall be offered and broken for your salvation and feeding. What is unskilful in all this? And the Lord himself commands us the interpretation, when he says on it, "This do in remembrance of me."

33. after which they have undertaken to prove in another speech, not useful here,

1) Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XII, 406, § 19 ff.

namely, which I brought from the 2nd Book of Moses in the 12th Cap. [V. 11.], where it says of the paschal lamb, it is the phase, 2) that is, it is a remembrance or meaning of the phase, or leaping over and passing over. And the paschal lamb is called the phase, or the passing, or the passing over, or the passing over, because the angel of God passed in Egypt before all the houses at which door the blood of the paschal lamb was found, without harm and strangulation of the firstborn, or, according to the Hebrew, passed by. Here they say, "We do not accept your interpretation; the Holy Spirit interpreted it afterwards, and we will listen to him, who says that it is a slaughtered sacrifice of the Lord's phase; and they make a feast out of the lamb, as if he wanted to say, "Yes, it is a sacrifice for the Lord's paschal feast.

34 I will not argue much about this, although it is better to call it the paschal lamb than the paschal feast, since it is not the feast that is slaughtered, and the evangelists subsequently call the paschal lamb Pascha, that is, the transgression, as it is also called in many places in the old law. Be it as it may, so also in the other saying a figurative speech must be assumed, that this sacrifice is a remembrance of the paschal lamb, or the Easter, which took place when the children of Israel were redeemed and remained unharmed by the angel. And if one wants to draw it to the day, then the festivals have their figurative meaning, because if I say: Today is the day of the Ascension, I cannot deny that on today Christ goes to heaven again, but today is the commemoration of the Ascension of Christ; but then a figurative speech is invented. But so the speech of the paschal lamb is much more clever to understand the figurative speech. For as the lamb was called a lamb of the transfiguration, and was not the same lamb: so also the bread of the Lord signifies to us the body of Christ, though it is not essentially the body. So there is another thing that this figurative speech serves our purpose.

35) The example of circumcision, which is called a covenant in the seventeenth chapter of the first book of Moses, is also unimpeachable, and yet it is a sign of the covenant, as it is also called in the same place; although they suppose that the Scripture should have interpreted itself here.

(36) It would be enough to explain where to accept it, for the Lord says, "Do this in remembrance," so that it will ever be a memorial sign. Therefore, if the Holy Spirit interprets a ceremony, we should be able to interpret other ceremonies from it. The

2) i.e. Passover; Hebrew: xxx.

The way would be prepared for whoever wanted to walk in it. So they let the wine be a sign of the testament, and interpreted the hidden scripture with a clearer one; the testament will not be fulfilled in the blood as in the cup, but when it is poured out on the cross; only the death and the shedding of the blood are seals of the covenant and testament with God; but how we will be made a part of it, I will save until the end.

The Scripture also instructs us with the other ceremonial sign of baptism how we are to conduct ourselves in this sacrament, as it says in the epistle to the Romans and Colossians: "that in baptism we are buried with Christ. What is being buried with Christ other than that we have received such a meaning? And for this very reason external baptism is a bath of rebirth, that it means that we are born inwardly and washed away from the filth of sins. But they do not want to let this remain, and everything must be spoken to them without figure. The word must give it to baptism that it is essentially rewashing, but the word alone gives it the power to signify. Neither the Holy Spirit, nor the grace by which we are inwardly born, is bound to water, let alone that it is essential to baptism. It is quite a lot of talk to be essentially a thing. And so, what wonder is it that the Lord's bread is a signification of the Lord's body in the Lord's speech, when he says, "This is my body"?

(38) Neither have I yet repented that I have used the saying of Matthew concerning John the Baptist, "He is the Elias that was before. For the name Elijah is spoken in a figurative way by the evangelist and Malachia.

39 And therefore, John 1, John himself says that he is not Elijah, that is, in a natural sense, because for the sake of figurative speech he was Elijah, and the soul and body of Elijah was not John. So here, for the sake of figure and memory, the bread is the body, not that the bread is essentially the body.

(40) Likewise, the saying that John is a son of Mary is that he represents a natural son, and therefore he is not the natural son; and Mary proves maternal fidelity to him, even though she is not a natural mother, and yet for the sake of fidelity she is called a mother. Therefore, it should not be so strange to one, although in others similar speech was also encountered. In the words: "Take note, he is your son," a disputant would also take an argument, and not let himself be wise, and speak: Christ would be the essential

natural son of Mary, who died on the cross, and yet by a miraculous change would also have become John. It would hardly be a great miracle to say that the bread is essentially the body of Christ; and it would also be a gloss that the body may be in two places, in one place dead and dying, in the other place sensitive and alive; but what would that be but to will to go astray, and to lead other people astray?

(41) Nor is it right for them anywhere that I should introduce the saying of Matthew 11, where Christ says of himself, "He that is less in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he"; and likewise 1) they take exception to the saying of Matthew 25, "From him that hath not shall be taken away, even that he hath." If I say that the speeches are figurative, they interpret them to me strangely and lastly, 2) and they leave the first saying behind, if they have spoken many words, that Christ, who is less than John according to the mind of men at the same time, is truly greater in the kingdom of heaven. Now is not he actually called the inferior, who is considered inferior according to the conceit of men, and who bears the figure of an inferior? so it is ever found that the name is diverted from the natural understanding. But the other saying is interpreted by the evangelist Lucas in the 8th chapter: "From him who does not have, even that [he] thought he had, is taken away from him", one sees how it is clearly interpreted, that one thinks one has, is called in Matthew, one has. They are each indications of a strange 3) speech. So then, what evil and unheard of thing is it to call the figure and sacrament by the name of the thing that is signified, and to take the meaning there?

(42) In the end, I am also well aware that I said: The Holy Spirit was called a fiery tongue, a breath, and a dove; but he is not a dove, nor a breath, nor a fiery tongue, but he was signified by them, as a sign. But they suppose that it does not take place here, because the little word of the parables stands with it, namely [he] says: as a dove, and divided tongues as fire. But it is not in the word of the Lord: as a body, but badly "body". This is ever exactly sought, if it would help. St. Augustine interpreted the example of the dove in this way in the epistle to Evodio; for I not from my own mind thus

1) "to be resisted by" - to be resisted against.

2) letz - wrong.

3) strange - dark, unusual.

The face is called by two names, as if it were the image of a dove, and signifies the Holy Spirit in Christ. For the vision is called by two names, as if it were one name, namely, the image of a dove, and signifies the Holy Spirit in Christ, just as if a living dove were a signification of the Spirit. Likewise Apost. 10 we read, "The Holy Spirit fell upon them," since without doubt the fiery tongues, the signs of the Spirit, are called the Holy Spirit. Behold then, if the Scripture should say, The graven image is the Holy Ghost, would it not be like saying, The graven image signifieth the Holy Ghost? or, The fiery tongue is the Holy Ghost; so much would it be said, The fiery tongues are signifiers of the Holy Ghost; and therefore follow not that they are essentially the Holy Ghost, which would be right blasphemy, to say that God is essentially a creature.

Item: In vain is their going forth 1) In the breath of the Lord, because the Lord hath not said: Take ye, that is the Holy Ghost. Now this is spoken more strongly, "Receive the Holy Ghost," and he speaks of his breath, wherewith he offered them; wherefore it was no less, than if he had said, Receive, this is the Holy Ghost. Where now the Lord would have said in the supper: Take, eat my body, their speech would have even more credit than if he had said, "Take, eat, this is my body." Therefore the examples are all still of good value, not only to show that Scripture is accustomed to speak figuratively, but also that one may thereby be nicely introduced into the understanding of the nature of this Scripture, what it speaks, for it is not so strange as those who say of it, yes, even well to hear that the ancients, according to such understanding in the words of the Lord, afterwards had in common usage to call the sacrament the body of Christ. But some naughty people do not want to understand this, and from the time they read no more than Corpus Christi with the old teachers, they must have spoken of the essential body, and want to shout over everyone with the great pile of books: the church has kept it almost fifteen hundred years, as Eck and Faber at Baden 2) also cried out. But you, Christian reader, may well have heard what my, indeed the Christian reason; how weak all counter-accusations of the adversaries, how completely not strange [I] am found in the speech. Prepare now to hear the reason of the adversaries also; and is he then

1) Extract - Evade.

2) At the disputation in Baden in May 1526.

firmer than ours, according to impartial judgment, fall to them and not to me, indeed neither to them nor to me, but to the truth.

The other part.

44 The reason for the opinion of our opponents is not based on an article of faith, but they boast fiercely of the Word of God, which would truly be on their side. In spite of some creatures that they opposed it. Primarily they base themselves on the words: "This is my body", as they are found in the three evangelists Matthew, Marco and Luca, and also in the apostle Paul. Otherwise they still have three sayings from the tenth and eleventh chapters of the first epistle to the Corinthians; but where they lack the first reported saying, they are already shot with the other three. Therefore, let us look further at what the first one can do.

(45) They show the power of the saying very subtly, and it is no wonder if someone's eye is covered by many words. As far as I understand them, they hold it thus: They hold that bread is bread, as indeed it is, although the papal church has always believed that it is not bread, but only the things pertaining to bread, in which we are with one another against the papists, and among ourselves not against one another. But further they speak: Let the bread be as the word is that is spoken to the bread; and if the word is, "This is my body," which is given for you, let it follow that the bread is essentially the body, for the strengthening of consciences.

(46) They also say that in such words the body is wonderfully made up, so that whoever accepts the word and believes has and essentially holds the true body of Christ. For the word has power to carry the bodily body of Christ to us, and so it also has power to carry the body into the bread, and so the word holds the body in it, and brings it into the bread, and also brings it to us who hear it.

(47) They mitigate it thus: the body is distributed by the bread, not as it is bread, but as it has the word, "This is my body"; and as it is bread, it is the sign, but as it has the word, it is also the body. They prove this with many examples, namely, how the Word brings clothing and food, peace and forgiveness of sin, resurrection and God Himself. With these words they fill their whole book very close 2). The

3) i.e. almost, "even close" put by us instead of: "even yet".

Words have an appearance and favor, and a color is to be painted on them. For the divine word has cheaply a great favor. God is omnipotent. By the Word he created all things; by the Word he governs all things, and by the same we must be saved. Therefore also the marvelous things are to be admitted to them cheaply, and is much of the splendid speaking. But now listen to my answer to this, and you will see how firm their foundation is, and how it disappears like the wind, or they will also have to compare themselves to my faith.

Opposite answer.

(48) Let it be said beforehand that I do not speak against the omnipotence of God, for no one who knows that God exists denies it. Neither shall I speak of the eternal word that is with God, as John speaks. I also do not mean that one wanted to drive here with it, because it should not 1) ever. But of the power of the temporal spoken word, how far it extends, shall be spoken, because it admits to the same so much, even too much.

(49) First of all, I would like to hear from them, from what Scripture they would prove that Christ has given such power to the outward words, that they should have his body, and bring it 2) essentially to us. Did he ever sit and say, "Where you speak these words, they will have my body and offer it to you or to others who believe? I do not believe that there is a letter of this in all the Scriptures. Therefore the next way, as the words are spoken without probation, so let them go. Nor is it otherwise in the nature of words that they are able to do this, but they have the nature of bearing the meaning of those things which before in man's mind were an inward concept, or an inward word; for what the outward words have over the sound, they have from the inward mind and from the inward word. In the same way, in the inward words in the soul of man there is essentially the body, which inward words are nobler than the outward ones. But I have not yet heard this from them. Dear, to what or from where should the external word have such worthiness? We men have fellowship in the body and blood of Christ through faith, that man may be brought to heavenly worthiness through Christ. Will the

Words and bread finally also blessed? Who believes for them? We believe for ourselves, not for the words, nor for the bread or wine.

How? if ten Christian mutes were gathered together, who had the inward word and not the outward word, would they not think that they would be equally and perhaps more grateful for the signs?

(51) Here they would like to say: Well, it happens out of the divine order, because as God once said: "Let the earth bring forth grass and seed"; thus, according to His order it happens, and therefore it should be understood here, because it is the order of God, but as long as the words, that is my body, are spoken. Therefore, one does not have to be aware that the words are spoken by a man, but on divine order.

52 But with the answer a good part of their speech will already come off; and although some of them seek such intrigues, they will not be satisfied with it, and without Scripture will not believe them that this is God's order. They must not run to the words "this is my body", in which the order is not proclaimed, for they have taught the command 3) before. But where to take?

(53) But let us see what the words themselves can do, for we do not like to make a jugglery out of words.

(54) The words, "This is my body," are not bad historical words; for so it would not concern us, as little as that Christ went to the mountain of oil, in that he does not now go for it. But if there is to be a commandment and order of God in the words, show the word of the commandment. One does not say here: Bread, become my body! as of the creation of light the Lord says: "Let there be light!" and to the leper: "Be cleansed." And where there would already be a semblance of a commanding word, where would be the order for the future time, so that it should happen, as it is said in prophecies? Therefore, turn and interpret the words as you will, and they will not show themselves otherwise than that they are interpretative words of the ceremonies, then instituted by the Lord. Learn what the bread and wine mean, and the promise will be found in the sign and in the word, and the sign itself will be a visible word, that is, by its meaning it will proclaim the very thing that the word proclaims. For there is a promise that Christ's body will die for us,

3) Geheiß - command, commandment, as can be seen from § 54. In Zwingli, the word "command" means promise.

1) should - served.

2) "him" put by us instead of: in.

to bring us life, and his blood is shed for our sin. But because such words signify the signs, and are as it were a voice of the words, so also by the signs it is learned: for bread is broken, it shall eat; and wine is emptied, it shall drink; so to bring us into life, Christ's body should die; and still so must some have been led to believe in the Scriptures.

55 The promise is not given to bread or wine, but to us, but the signs are capable of words, that they may interpret and admonish. Therefore the Lord said: "This is to remember me. So it will not be a miraculous word, but a badly sanctified word, which after its institution has the same power as when it was spoken by Christ, to signify, admonish and remind. They also go on with Paul's saying to the Romans: "The gospel is the power of God, which saves all who believe in it. There the "is" must be interpreted essentially, that is, that they want to unite the power of God with the external word.

(56) And the preaching of the Gospel is no more than an instrument of God through which His mercy is revealed, as Paul's following words also testify, when he says: "In it is revealed the faith that is valid before God. How can we attribute this to the outward words, that the divine word has been inwrought into the outward? Since the apostles themselves want to be considered as nothing, confessing that they plant and water, and that they are nothing 1) but God, who gives the flourishing; he is the one. In the Scriptures the word is not known at all, and what is it that God works in all things all things? He is not therefore essentially the same things, or his instruments are not God. Nor does the example of a master serve this purpose, whom six hundred hear, and take his mind from his words, so ever sees his mind in words. I say that in words alone stand the signs and meaning of the things that are signified, and the mind is not essential in words.

If you want to know how it is, listen, and you may understand it differently. The inner man is created according to the image of God in his being, has a mind that inwardly gives birth to intelligibility, which is compared to the eternal words of God, through which inner speeches are made, which also have no more than images, so far as the mind now lets intelligible power work. Where now the will consents, so

The external word also has this meaning, as do images. Now the outward words are nothing but signs of the inward ones, and are therefore called the mind. Even if this were true, it is still a false comparison to compare physical things with spiritual things. A word may be used to describe a thing that has never been, but should the body also be sent to such a place? Oh, it is not a directory!

So also that they say with much talk: In words be and be distributed peace, forgiveness of sin, yes, God Himself. I am glad that they are attacking it highly, perhaps it will be more detrimental to unity. I know well that the apostles proclaim all things in their words. But that the things in words drive here to the believers, I will not permit yet, because the honor is God. We also read of Jeremiah that he would plow up kingdoms and also plant them; but God works this, not in the words of the prophet, but by the power of the kings. He needs the prophets to proclaim such things; thus also the apostles exhorted. But the Spirit of God teaches those who mend their ways inwardly.

59 They still wanted to preserve the rotten ground with pleasure. But he may not resist. They say: "Faith is of the hearing", as Paul says Romans 10, and the word is a counter-throw of faith. Here, however, one wants to be the tool master. No one denies that preaching should not proceed from divine order. But why? So that man may hear the true teacher Christ inwardly, who teaches with the Word or long after it. For neither the outward word, nor any creature, nor painting, nor ceremony, nor sacrament, can actually teach; but to exhort one to go within himself and hear the inward teacher, who will show the goodness of God and his truth with the inward word, and thus give and increase faith. Many hear the outward voice, but they do not believe. To believe is to be taught by GOD and drawn by the Father. "No one will speak: Jesus Christ, but in the Holy Spirit"; who does it, to speak with the inward according to his will.

(60) But they think that the spirit is involved in the words and is not separated from them. If this were so, no teaching would be in vain, the spirit would not be idle. But the inward consistent word and the outward are as far apart as the law and grace. Now grace is not included in the law, and as it is spoken of outward words,

1) "nothing" put by us instead of: not.

The word may also be used for ceremonies, paintings and sacraments. Although the word is more powerful, because it is closer to the inner word. However, all together 1) they may not teach the least, let alone do anything greater. Only to mean, to admonish and to remind is their office. Here you can see where the devil lies, who gives the sorcerers and superstitious people such insanity, that there are secret hidden forces in characters, signs and words. The suffragan bishops, priests and monks have helped a lot in the sorceries, yes, they themselves have been involved in them. Now at the opinion they would reach a good hand. Babylon must always have magicians, so that she will not recognize God. Jerusalem will put her hope in God, her Lord.

But one would like to cry out: "Do you see now where the devil is? he would like to stop all preaching, because if he pretends that the external word does not teach, then no book, no scripture, no ceremony, no priest, no teacher, no preacher is needed. This I contradict, for it will nevertheless be exceedingly necessary the preaching of the outward word of God and ceremonies, instituted by Christ, and their faithful ministers. Adam, our first father, was created in the image of God, in marvelous illumination of truth and sincerity; so that he was little less than the angels. But through sin the light in him and us has corroded, and we with him have fallen into deep mire, and become quite animal-like, in contempt and ignorance of divine things. Now, that we may be renewed again in the spirit of our minds, and be driven out of the mire, we have great need of spurs, goads and arrows; these are the trials of the cross, and the fervent preaching of the word. They make a man lively, so that he goes into himself, seeks the inner light of truth, by which man is enlightened. Where there is contempt for the Word and a cowardly life of lust without any cross, as is commonly the case with the rich and belly servants, and those who presume they know everything beforehand, God is not to blame, they want to be stuck in the cesspool and in the thick darkness. In particular, the word has a way of exhorting. Elijah's words burned as a torch. The words of the wise are as a sting. And there is no one on [the] earth too wise and prudent for him who does not need admonition and remembrance. For though the words do not teach us to speak of them, yet they find exhorting signs, which provoke us to seek in ourselves the things which are signified by the words;

1) with one - together, with each other.

Not that we learn them through them, but that we seek the truth in ourselves, and are thus taught. From words we may not ever understand further, because the sound and the voice, if we did not know before, inwardly in us, what external words meant. Inwardly, inwardly it must be accepted by faith.

(62) Therefore the outward word does not give faith, but Christ does; it does not comfort, Christ comforts; it does not honor, it does not enlighten; but our inward, secret, heavenly teacher is Christ; as Augustine famously established in the book of *Magistro*, and there put down all contradiction. So then it is certain that the outward word has no other power than to exhort and remind through meaning: how then will one admit to it higher effects and the marvelous thing? That is why all talk falls: that something is essentially included in words and brought about. And even less will it exist that the body or blood of Christ is given to the words and is brought by them into the bread and wine; so also their interpretation, which they desire to apply to the words of the Lord, will disappear.

Short rejection of three sayings of the adversaries.

63 Hereafter, since their first sentence may not stand according to the reported meaning, the other three may not stand either, to which we answer in the shortest way. The first sentence is found in 1 Cor. 10 and reads thus:

64. "The bread that we break, is it not the fellowship of the body of Christ?" The saying is called by them a thunderbolt and a medicine; but let them boast and go forth with high words, a lump of wool beats harder. May one not have the fellowship of an absent thing in a sign: must therefore the corporeal and essential be in the sign? If ten heirs had a letter of testament before the judge and said: This letter which we hold behind us, is it not a community of the abandoned inheritance and treasure of our father? But should the letter be taken to mean that the field and the mats 3) are essential? should it be taken to mean that it says: "It is"? Will one strengthen the conscience with it? If we speak in this way, it will follow that we are essentially one body, my body your body and yours my body.

2) Shouldn't "teaches" be read?

3) Mats - meadows. In the old edition: painting.

For it follows: "We many are One Bread and One Body, inasmuch as we are partakers of One Bread?" Would one not also like to cry out: are, are, are? But it would not be right to cry out, for when one deals with sacraments, one should take the interpretation that serves the sacraments, otherwise one will not lose the truth. Item, when he says hereafter: "Behold Israel according to the flesh, which eat sacrifices, are they not commoners of the altar?" Shall we then make the food of the altar also essentially an altar? According to the sacraments we testify that we have fellowship in the body of Christ, and if we do not lie, we have part in the body, for he is our own, he was born to us, he suffered for us; yes, he is also ours in heaven. Need of the essential inbroden 1) not at all. But if it is the case that we are in the church according to the sacraments, but without faith, we are still not in it, and have no true fellowship of the body of Christ; as John says of the anti-Christians, "They went out from us, and were not of us," therefore they have not truly had a part in the body of Christ. Judas may have received the sacrament, that is, the sign, but he may not have eaten the body of Christ, otherwise he would not have been a Judas, nor would he have died in eternity, John 6: "He that eateth of the bread shall live forever."

(65) It is also easy to answer the other saying. It is found in 1 Corinthians 11, and reads thus: "Whosoever eateth unworthily of this bread, or drinketh of the cup of the Lord, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But there is a splendid glorification and boasting: one may not pass over before the saying. One should be surprised that the matter is so certain that one goes along with such defiant words. But it should be no wonder; where equity is not enough, one must resort to great clamor, so that it may be seen that one can speak powerfully, even tyrannically; for they speak: there no one can muster up some semblance against it. Oh, not only appearance against it, there is no true appearance that can be obscured. Look no further than the words. Paul says, "eat of the bread," "become guilty of the body"; he does not say, eat the body, for he who eats the body cannot become guilty of the body. Christ says John 6: "He that eateth of my flesh, and drinketh of my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. He who eats of my flesh and drinks of my blood has eternal life.

1) So set by us instead: Inbrodes.

Blood, he abideth in me, and I in him." Now the Scripture does not indicate any other eating of the flesh and the blood. If the eating of the bread is not accompanied by the eating of the flesh, then there will be no eating, and the flesh will not be in the bread. Why should it be in the bread, if it is not there for the sake of eating? But if it is to be eaten, it cannot be otherwise than as the Scripture speaks of it.

(66) They say that the manner of speaking is a great constraint, that he who eats unworthily is guilty of that which he eats; therefore the body must be in the bread. Answer: Where sacraments and sanctified signs are spoken of, it does not compel speech: he who eats unworthily of the bread is unworthy beforehand. Therefore it is said afterwards: "Man proves himself, and so he eats of the bread. But how is he to prove himself? "He distinguishes the body of the Lord," that is, he eats the body of the Lord spiritually beforehand, and believes that the body, which died for him and suffered for him, is united to the Godhead, and tests himself whether this draws him to love his neighbor. If he finds such faith in himself, he may eat of the bread and be included in the number of the elect. But if he holds the body of Christ in such low esteem that he has less trust and love toward God, does less or leaves less on account of Christ, neither if any bad man had delivered him from temporal danger, he is ever unworthy to eat this bread; not for the sake of the bread, but for the sake of his inward unworthiness. So the punishment is not for eating, but for being unworthy, and yet he is like Judah, as if he were also a faithful disciple, and loved the Lord above others, but is nothing behind it; he is ever guilty of the body and blood, because it was shed for him in vain; such a one, if he had been there when Christ was killed, would also have helped to crucify him.

67 This is as far as the speech will go, for a sign may be dishonored, and the Lord will not let it go unpunished. For example, one who breaks a prince's messenger box, whose son has suffered much for the fatherland, and has painted such a good deed in the box. But the wronged man commits sacrilege by breaking the box. The prince takes the disgrace so much more highly, so much and greater the good deed proved to the country, and the offender becomes guilty of that which he has suffered. But it is not because it does not say here that he is guilty of suffering. For it is more explicit what is meant by the signs, namely, body and blood. One finds such speeches in Zech. 1:

"He that offendeth you offendeth the apple of mine eye." And to the disciples, "He that despiseth you despiseth me also." Item 1 Cor. 11: "The man who covers his head defiles his head," that is, Christ. Should Christ therefore be essentially in the head? Therefore they have not yet brought forth from the Scriptures and other writings. Well then, you may now yourself set both reasons and causes against each other. For myself, I see no solid reason on their side. So on our side is the article of the Christian faith, beside which one should not let anything break in.

The third part.

68 There are some traits in the preachers' booklet (which I would rather leave unanswered than let them proceed much, because I do not like to quarrel), which I will now also answer for in the truest way.

69. First, they make me [a] beginner of quarreling. I say: teaching the truth, apologizing, pointing to love in those who are eager for truth, there is no suspicion of quarreling. Now I have, and still desire, to be diligent about it; that some take offense at it, I cannot help, for I would even be silent.

70 Secondly, they say that I am again raising Carlstadt's, the hypocrite's, matter. I say: If Carlstadt is a hypocrite, I will let him answer to God, his writings have seemed too noisy to me; however, where he adheres to the truth, I will not leave it for his sake.

Third, they complain that they are counted among the popes. Answer: I wanted them both to keep right from the Sacrament. They 2) are therefore not popes.

The fourth: Because of idolatry and other abuses, they themselves confess that one has hardly sinned in this; why then should I not have done it? 3) Because of worship, they are not one with the thing itself. Pirkheimer wants to have the worship.

Fifthly, they accuse me of overthrowing the Scriptures, and the devil's wicked cunning is seen, who desires to make a sign and figure out of the body. And so it is brought to some people, as if I said that Christ had no true body at all.

74 You may well see, my Christian reader, whether it is not necessary for me to be responsible when I

with knowledge I have never spoken dishonestly of sacraments, and still less of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ. And is not the Scripture overthrown, though I say that the bread of the Lord is a figure or signification of the body of Christ. Neither does it follow that the body of the Lord is not a true body, but a fanciful one. And that from this it may be drawn that sin is a figure of sin, hell is a figure of hell, and all things are nothing but figures, as they most grievously attract. They do not need the worries at all, they have more interpretation in the Scriptures, so here also is an interpretative speech. How is it then that they are so almost afraid here, and have done it nowhere else?

You say: Yes, it is nowhere written that the body should be called the figure of the body; I say: It is true, the body is not taken for a fantastic body, I do not say that either. But the way to interpret it in this place is not clumsy. Likewise Christ is nowhere called a figurative Christ, and yet nothing less, so in the interpretation, when Paul says, "The rock was Christ," it is interpreted that the rock was a figure of Christ; not that the name "figure" is attached to Christ, although in the interpretation it falls on the very word Christ. For the rock is the figure, and therefore Christ is not. So that in another example one may hear: If I point to a king's figure, and say that the painting is the king. It is not the opinion that the true king is therefore not a true king, but in the interpretation of the words, so it happens: The painting is a figure of the king; and is the king a king, and the painting a figure. That is ever clear. And as I also said: the painting is the king who won the battle; is not the opinion that a figure of a king won the battle; but the king who painted there won the battle. So also it is to be interpreted here, "This is the body which is given for you," that the true body, signified by the bread, is given in death for us, and therefore it does not follow that the bread is a figure given, or a figurative body. Behold, whence cometh a lamentation and a reproach?

The old teachers were not ignorant of the interpretation, although they commonly called this sacrament the body of the Lord, by which name I would also like to call it. 4) For the ancients, by the name of the sign, wanted to point from the sign to its meaning, and make a spiritual people, and still want to free the people.

1) go ahead - go there.

2) "You" put by us instead: Hie.

3) d. i. repeated.

4) In the old edition take; nâme - name.

No true Christian should be considered to have testified to himself by the bread alone, but also to be famous in that which is signified by the bread. It would be a great and unpleasant dishonor to be accused 1) of having received the bread or sacrament alone, for then he would also have fellowship with Judah. Therefore every believer wants to be famous for having received the body of Christ, even as Christians received it, through faith, that is, he wants to consider himself a believer. Therefore, it is not surprising that this sacrament, even because of its name, is so highly praised among the faithful. Indeed, all my writings and teachings should have made me free from suspicion. And because they speak of the devil's wiles, I must also report that the devil would gladly make something out of nothing, even a corpse out of a sign, and give words strange power. My opponents are watching, and they should know that in their opposition the gospel and the truth are also opposed 2). May God bring it to a good end. No authority may be disposed of by our preaching, for we teach obedience, patience, peace, love and voluntary service. Neither shall the true preachers dispose themselves, for we teach and point to Christ crucified, and lead away from the elements of this world to heavenly things.

Sixth, I am also accused of having attracted the old teachers in the same way. 3) I thereby desired to be superior to the evangelical preachers with their authority and reputation, and should give preference to human doctrine over divine doctrine. Thus, one can interpret all things in the most evil way; and this is done in a friendly humble opinion. If I had produced an opinion of my own, how would I have been scolded? And if I had not followed my head in interpreting the Scriptures, and had actually looked to the teacher's opinion, I would have been judged to have acted with malicious speed. What will become of the world afterwards? They say that one should interpret the words of the teachers by the words of Christ, and not again. It is a good opinion, where the. It is a good opinion, where the words of Christ would be brighter; but if a darkness is found in them, because of our stupidity and foolishness, and the gift of prophecy and interpretation is given to some of the fathers: why would I not perceive what they would have held in it? Now is

- 1) aufrufte - moved up.
- 2) So put by us instead: Refuting.
- 3) equal sam - as if.

but the chip 4) almost completely in it, we bring something new; but that should not invent itself. Therefore I say that Christ's words and those of the old teachers agree, where they are rightly understood. However, some of the old ones, where they are read above, are more in line with the opinion of the adversaries, but basically not. Therefore St. Augustine and Chrysostom, attracted by them, are in good sense not contrary to me, as is found where they are also read in other places.

The Theophylactus, which is almost entirely Papal in the matter, is said to have unconnected me, although I brought it in Latin for the first time, as far as I know.

79] In the seventh, they urge that Paulum and Lucam be interpreted by Marcum and Matthäum. But this is a wrong order, to interpret the clearer by the darker. Paul and Lucas are much more understandable in many places.

80] Eighthly, they ask for stiff arguments and only the word of God, against which the gates of hell are not able to do anything, with the disregard of proven speech. Answer: If only proven speeches had been used, this complaint would have been justified. But with the articles of faith we should be sure enough, if we only believed it. Here I exhort them to look at Paul. Has he not also, together with the word of God, often used proven speech, and in himself not so mightily used blessedly? They also want to consider whether they do not sometimes let go with the word of God in their sermons some proven speech that does not go against the word of God? About this, the common proofs, also indicated above, are not so much zedauzen. 5) Doesn't it concern them to leave so many miracles in vain? Does it not concern them that the old fathers of our times did not know custom and insanity? Don't you think that in the physical presence no usefulness has been shown? Shall we not hear natural causes, where no miracle can be set? and therefore regard them as pagan? as that one body in two places, and two bodies in one place?

(81) Ninthly, they 6) hide the question whether the body of Christ is in humble or bodily form in the bread, and confess none of these; but they say that it is therein given and bestowed. But there my question still remains: whether he glorifies us or in a humble form there is a gift.

4) Span - dispute, discord.

5) "zedauzen" probably as much as: geringachten, verwerfen.

6) i.e., to hold in low esteem, to shun, to spurn, to reject.

The body of Christ is a gift, or both. They should also remember that the body of Christ is no less a gift and offering to believers absent than present.

82. tenthly, they make a mockery, when it is said to them that the remembrance of bodily presence is inferior to the remembrance of suffering, which is commanded us by God. And they mockingly answer, "Let someone break his teeth, so that he will not remember the bread. The mockery should not take place. Shall one compare the miraculous bread to the noblest body of Christ? Item, how honest would be the presence of Christ, which we should not remember? 1) How would the true believer refrain from doing this, whether they make a mockery of it or not!

83. eleventh: The sayings of Scripture do not have to apply to them, if they remain unresolved by them. The saying of John on the 5th still does something to them; 2) of which is said above. To the saying of John Cap. 3: "That which is of the flesh is flesh," they say that one should recognize the fleshly and spiritual rebirth. But with this they have not done justice to the saying, for it is a saying that extends in a common way. And it follows that bodily things feed the body, and spiritual things feed the soul. Now this is certain, that the body of Christ does not feed our body, but the soul is fed through faith into the body of Christ. Where then does the body of Christ go? When does it separate from the bread? does it separate before it enters the mouth or the body? ei, it is not eaten.

84 The saying in 2 Corinthians 5, "Though we know Christ, yet know we him not after the flesh," I know not that I have put it on for an argument; bring it to the natural sense. But nevertheless, if one has it for a common rule saying, it is also still against it. St. Augustine interprets it thus: "As soon as we have learned the work of salvation through the flesh of Christ, we should not hang on to the flesh, but we should rise to the higher things of the Godhead"; this is still against them.

85] Lastly, when it is said to them, how that one should seek heavenly things, they say, they seek not carnal things, though they desire to have the flesh in the bread essentially. But who will believe that one seeks a well and does not seek water?

86. these disgraceful words and clumsy have

Nevertheless, I would not like to leave them unanswered, even though they do not almost annoy me. If I knew something that would serve love and friendship, even unity, I would turn to my utmost diligence, so that complaint would not be on me, as far as that would be without harming the truth. Now, to come to a decision, I will look around to see if something would compare our two minds, so that peace could be achieved with the truth at some point, otherwise there would be enough crosses.

The fourth part.

I ask of God, through Christ, the Prince of Peace, if it is possible, that I may reach peaceful agreement on the matter of the Sacrament, not only with those who have written against me, but also with the popes; and, in my opinion, means may be found therein which will stand with Christ and the truth. But there would have to fall, first of all, a dispute of words, as soon as one would have taken the right opinion.

On the other hand, what are foolish fables and fictitious dreams should remain unchallenged.

Thirdly, it is not allowed to establish a new article of faith in it. Which would be superior to Christian freedom.

90 Fourthly, that the sacraments be considered sacraments. For where one remains on the way, I do not know how peace would be with us. Now I will see in my adversary's words what serves peace.

91 You have given me thanks, as I hope, without mockery, for two parables given by me, from which the sense of Christ's words may be taken: one, of keys; the other, of royal scepter; and are not at one stroke. The parables thus bring them forth.

92) If one gives someone the keys to the house, one also gives him the power to the house, and thus one makes the keys, which are an instrument to open the house, the 3) power of the house. Without doubt, however, not because the keys are an instrument, but because from them it is said to someone: See, here you have the power to the house. There the keys are not alone, and remain the authority of the house, not as the keys are, but as the word is said to them, and they have received the word. Why then would it not be permitted to speak thus of the bread and wine of the Lord's supper, that the bread, when it has the word, is the true body of Christ?

3) "the" put by us instead of: to the.

1) "remember" put by us instead of: consider.

2) The meaning is good: the spell still gives them some trouble, gives them an opportunity to express themselves further.

These words of theirs they carry out almost throughout the whole book, and so they say: That the multitude and multiplicity of miraculous signs cease; thus they say that the bread is the body, as it has the word, and therefore the bread of the supper, as it is the body of Christ, by virtue of the word, has nothing at all of the bodily incidental things, but retains the same incidental things in it and in it, as it is bread. Thus they also compare it to the brazen serpent; thus they say: that the body and the blood are written in the words; thus they 1) speak of baptism, and of other things more.

Now God wanted it to remain with the words, so the chip would have a whole end, and would be a beautiful explanation of the words of Christ and the sacraments. For it is ever true, as St. Augustine said: "If the word goes to the element, or to matter, it becomes a sacrament." Which is also the speech of the old bishop Irenaei, when he says: "Like the earthly bread, when it takes upon itself the invocation of God, it is not a badly common bread, but a Eucharistia; which consists of two things, namely, of the earthly and the heavenly." Here Sacrament is called Eucharistia, the matter or element the earthly; the Word and thanksgiving the heavenly. Therefore, from its most honest part, that is, from the Word and thanksgiving, it has the name that Sacrament is called Eucharistia.

95 But this is a hindrance to many who will not be content with what has been reported; for them the bread must be essentially the body, and completely, as if I were saying, "Christ is God"; that is, throwing the axe too far. They are not justified in adding the word essential to the words of the Lord: "This is my body. Well then, I hope that they will allow themselves to be invented with good will; for if not, this would help a great deal of evil, and a strange intrusion into the Scriptures would take place.

(96) The likeness of keys does not lead us to say that the key is essentially a power, but that through it, as a sign, the power given is recognized by the word spoken from the key, namely, that one says, "Here you have the power. There it should also exist that the words are not given more than is given to them in themselves. Now the outward word can do no more than signify, and in the meaning admonish, or remind, as said before. But that it is to be

It brings everything to the one to whom it is spoken. Now the word "body" is not the body, but signifies the body; and the speech, "This is my body," does not hold in it essentially, neither the bread, nor the body, nor their joining together essentially. But it holds the meaning in it; therefore, if it is said or added to the bread, and the bread and the speech become a sacrament, the sacrament has its meaning, as do the words.

(97) Now here will be the very power of the sacraments, which is that of words, namely, that they signify, and in signification exhort, that we seek in us that which they signify. For in the memory of man are the images of the things signified by word and sacraments, and if they are sought within, they are found; or they are brought to our knowledge, as we have known before. Therefore the Lord said, "It is good to remember"; and so the Lord wants the bread to be a memorial sign. It would not be so if it did not signify. Hence it is that the sacraments are called by scholars visible words, as well as the Scriptures. For as the word is to the hearing, so the sacraments are to the eyes; images which are carried by the senses into the mind, and there are recognized. This is not to say, however, that the signs or words are essentially that which they signify, but that they are meaning.

So, according to the essence of what sacraments are, we would be well satisfied. But now, for the sake of use and enjoyment, I have invented some words for them, but if we were to stay with them, we would come to one mind. For they speak: We eat the body and drink the blood of Christ, not so that we bite the body with our teeth and drink it with our hands. For they say, "We eat the body and drink the blood of Christ, not so that we bite the body with our teeth and break it with our hands, as it is written in the recantation of Berengarius; but we act upon the bread, as it is bread, by breaking it, eating it, and crushing it with our teeth; but we receive the body in virtue of these words: "This is my body. As one has spoken of it quite beautifully: That which we eat goes into the body, that which we believe goes into the soul. So they say. Oh, if one were to leave it at that, and understand the words, the matter would be simple.

(99) This is a Christian saying, for bread is indeed bread, and is meat for the belly; but the promise of the word, by which it becomes a sacrament, if one believes it; that is, if one believes that Christ died for our sins, and by the shedding of his blood was sufficient for us: this comes into the soul, and feeds it; for the promise of the word is a sacrament.

1) "them" put by us instead of: him.

2) gang-comes.

The bread, if it is believed, is the food of the soul. But the delusion that the bread is essentially the body of Christ is not the true food of the soul; it leaves man as he is and does not make him more foolish and evil. But to know and believe by the words and signs that God's love for us is so great that He gave His Son to die for us, that rejoices and feeds and keeps the soul in life. This is spiritual feeding and enjoyment, and through it people become better and more spiritual. And therefore Christ Himself is food or bread of life to our souls, which came down from heaven; if God would that we would teach in such a simple and careful way! The noble body of Christ, dwelling in the most honest place, will not ever enter our belly and maggot sack; but with his word and with his promise he will comfort and refresh the soul, which is just as much as feeding. For by such consolation, when it is found in us, man is strengthened, becomes fervent in love, and exercises himself in all kinds of good works.

In the end, if we were to understand one another about the giving of the testament of the forgiveness of sins and the acceptance of grace, the truth would be more peaceful. They say that the forgiveness of sins was obtained on the cross, but that it is distributed, offered, and given in the sacraments and words when the gospel is preached.

But I will rather speak thus, and hope more truly and clearly: From eternity, before the creation of heaven and earth, the testament was given out of divine mercy to the children of God, ordained for eternal salvation and inscribed in the book of life. No one with understanding can deny this.

In time, from Adam until the last righteous man, such a will of divine alliance 1) with the faithful has been proclaimed and inaugurated by the outward word; as also in the Lord's supper at this sacrament: so it is not presented otherwise, but by proclamation, what is decreed and ordained for all the faithful, by the true God, before all time.

103. further, the most sufficient assurance of such a will has been accomplished at one time through the shedding of Christ's blood and his fervent sacrifice on the cross on which our sins are hung, and the handwriting has been erased. But these things are accepted by us, and taken as our own, if we believe the assurance in the cross, which for death's sake is called cheap, to be true.

1) So set by us instead: Verbindniß.

becomes a testament, believe. We may not fix the faith from divine providence, which before the creation of the world chooses and decrees what belongs to each one. For divine secrets are ignorant to the flesh. And even though the Father's mercy is faithfully proclaimed through the Word or Sacrament, as a testamentary letter, the flesh is still so timid about the abomination of sin that it does not fully believe, and does not want to be assured of conscience until the attached seal and the testament, accomplished through the highly meritorious death of Christ, is recognized by it.

How is it then to be done to him? Thus: where I hear 2) not only the word of God's gracious will, considered from eternity, opened in time; but also sealed with the death of His only begotten Son. For if there is faith, the words of the promise will gladden and comfort the soul, which is nothing else than feeding. But this does not require the bodily presence of Christ, which the opposing party himself confesses that the soul receives, even as often as the word is proclaimed in the Gospel and accepted with faith. But that the promise is accepted is thus: in the outward sound of the words or outward appearance or matter of the sacraments, the promise is not essentially attached. For, as stated above, both words and sacraments are signs according to their nature, and from their office they admonish or remind us of divine mercy and promise. Which, if it is thus communicated to us through the outward gospel or sacrament, and we come within ourselves and listen to the enlightening word with which Christ teaches His own, and opens to them the goodness of the Father, there is the true effect of the Holy Spirit, who brings trust and faith in God, together with the subsequent joys, consolations, and fruits of faith. There then is the reception and acceptance of the graces and the testament and covenant with God. Those who have been taught about the anointing and have learned from the Scriptures will testify to this. 3) For this is the order of God, to deal beautifully with human stupidity.

105 Therefore it would be fine and good, without all danger, and I think, permitted by both parts, to send themselves to the reception of the sacrament, as to the hearing of the gospel; because, after

2) So put by us instead of: hear.

3) "erturen" probably as much as "erdauren" - to accept, to receive, to put up with.

According to the legend, the Gospel is the most important thing in the sacrament, and the only difference is that in the sacraments the neighbor is served. For the reception of the sacraments is to be done for the neighbor, for the testimony of the things that man possesses inwardly, by the effect of the divine word. O God, that they would be practiced in such a way, and remain unmeasured 1); as this happens in many ways through the anti-Christian Baalish Mass servants. Their ungodly ways are even more harmful, than if one had the Word of God faithfully, and no Sacrament any more; for with them neither faith nor love can be felt, which should be practiced especially and diligently, because we want to accept the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus in hearing the Word, through faith. So also

The lamentation is silent, as if we were deprived of our body, our treasure and our food, because in this way alone our salvation is wrought and such goods are obtained. But I pray to our God that we may thus be able to receive the word, so that we may practice love diligently. For I know that the very things which Paul received from the Lord and taught us, or gave us, are just as many. Wherefore, how soon would it make us of one mind! Yes, if word controversy and superstition were a thing of the past! And would God that we were awakened by the rote admonitions of the holy words or signs, and thus truly learned to recognize Christ as a Master, so that all honor might be given to Him, and to no creature, at all times! For he is at the right hand of God the Father, ruling and upholding all that is. To Him be honor and glory forever and ever, Amen.

1) "unbemaßget" untainted, not contaminated.

Here are to be looked up two letters against which the following writing of Oecolampad is directed, viz:

Theobald Billican's letter to Urban Rhegius, of the words of the Lord's Supper and the different opinions about it. 1525.

Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1922.

Urban Rhegius' reply to Theobald Billicanus. December 18, 1525.

Ibid. Col. 1945.

17. Johann Oecolampad's responsibility against Theobald Billicanus. *)

Feb. 1, 1526.

Johannes Oecolampadius wishes Dieboltzen Billicano, Predicanten zu Nördlingen, peace and grace from Christ.

Dear brother, I guess my letters, of which there is more than one now, which I sent you some time ago, as one good friend to another, are convenient witnesses of how much you have counted with me so far. But now that 2) this your

letter has come to light, in which you find me, I think, 3) unvirtuous, and but reject the Christian opinion of the Sacrament, as if it were not the most Christian, in it, I might be considered to be acting contrary to my office and use, if I left it unreported,

3) "I" put by us instead of: not. Oecolampad inserts this "halt ich" more often. According to what is asserted in the 9 against the end, the "not" seems to us not to be permissible.

2) "now" put by us instead of "and".

*) This writing was published together with the "Antisyngamma" and the two following sermons in 1526 (without indication of the place) under the title: XpoloMlieu 4o. Oseolumpnclli. The special title of this writing is: .44 Tüednclciuin Uillwunuin; Huinum in Verdis eosnue ulisnuin ssnurn intrmnü The translation is by Ludwig Hetzer. That this translation was already published in 1525 (Walch, alte Ausgabe, Vol. XX, Einl. p. 44) is probably an error, as is evident from the date of this writing.

how much I would have liked your writing. For my part, I would have been content to open my mind to you with special letters, like one benefactor to another (as happened about more than once before); now, however, business requires that I act publicly and with you in particular (as you have also done).

My previous book "on the true understanding of the words of the Lord's Supper" did not require anyone by name on the plan. But you offer me politely with the Tertulliano. Well then, I am still undoubted in the matter 1) (as the business of truth is serious, and is not made secret with mockery of the false, 2) nor with admonition of those who look only at human glory), and give account of my faith willingly, 1 Peter 3, secretly and publicly, where the occasion of the matter allows it, and especially to those who require it of me. It is not that I am not moved to silence, or that I am moved to it by contentiousness; no, my conscience gives evidence before Christ that I am hostile to contentiousness. But I write for the reason that I ever think it would be detrimental to the truth if I let it slip unaccountably. I pray Christ that your honor and reputation for teaching may not diminish but increase from this. If it should turn out otherwise, that would be exceedingly difficult for me to hear; for I do not undertake such antics, which I know to be foreign to Christian love. As far as I know your doctrine, it is irreproachable in all other articles and worthy of all glory, but in this matter of the sacrament I may not agree with you, unless it were Christian to write another and confess another with my mouth; this I will not do. I should also not remain silent about it, since it is undoubted with me, from the memory of holy scriptures and the Spirit of God, that the truth is on our side. The fact that you recently let it go out publicly in your writings, I think it flows from a diligence to fathom the truth. I would also prefer to regard it as anything else, neither that it happened out of free will. For as I understand you, I do not yet completely stink with you. So I have not yet misjudged you at all, 3) because I hope that as soon as and 4) you will confess our way, that is, our opinion of the Sacrament to be the more certain one, that you will move over to us in our camps from now on without delay.

3) It does not have the opinion that your good fame and praise will be made. No, it is my desire that your praise be even greater; and this will certainly happen if the truth shines even brighter in this chip, 5) although there is no doubt in my mind that you have long ago despised all the greed, 6) as human glory 2c. By the truth, I would consider it honest if the truth prevailed and I were overcome. Now God forbid that I should be a cause for the desecration of the excellent pounds and the manifold gifts that the Lord has bestowed upon you. May God forbid that all your goodness should wither because of my writing, whether you already stumble in this one article according to the ways of men, or that your practice, which you need according to holy scripture, should be diminished because of me, or that your ardor in preserving the praise of Christ should be considered colder or weaker, or that your bravery, which you need against the enemies of the faith, should be weakened and praised less because of this; may God forbid. I grant you all honors and good things. Yes, I desire that all the gifts of Christ remain unharmed and untouched in you.

4 Well, you worry, if you do not write, that you do not do enough for the evangelical ministry; and this has aroused you to write. This is also what urges me to answer you. I think that those who either do not understand or do not read the next book I have written on the right natural understanding of the night meal, and yet condemn it and judge about it in an unwarranted manner (without doubt because they are still prisoners of their previous rusty opinion and delusion), these, I think, should and must be overcome with patience, with sedan chairs and with silence (because they allow themselves to be told neither wise nor better); or else one must at least suffer with them. But against those who publicly have books printed, with which they require us to be told of our faith, as you and other Swabian preachers have done; unless this is done out of superfluous elf or out of courtly courtesy, I do not know how I would answer for it if I said nothing to your letter.

5. I know that I have wronged you, so be pious, where I have known truth, as that would be; so it will be a service to you, if I

1) Marginal gloss: The truth does not lie.

2) "Verrumpfer" put by us instead of "Verumpfern".
Verrümpfer - "smoocher".

3) d. i. abandoned.

4) and - as.

5) glazed - shining. - Marginal gloss: This is the desire and triumph of all Christians.

6) Gaucherie - foolishness. - "sämliche" - such. Cf.
§ 7 of this writing.

I will not be deterred from my task (to open the recognized truth) by any dangers. It is no less, it has frightened me that the thing with the first book has not turned out to be the very best. However, it will not deter me. Indeed, I hoped that the next book, in which I had compiled the opinion of the very old teachers about the Sacrament, would be written much more chastely than that my friends should scold it. I had persuaded myself, which is even more, that it would also cut off all cause for my angry adversaries to be angry with me, if they, eight [me], wanted to restrain themselves from anger; considering that I had such a great stir out of love in the same book, and used so few abusive words in it, which I also want to do this time, even if I would not yet obtain from my patrons that they accept this writing of mine of the opinion in which it is written. Yes, I say, since I ever thought that I had shunned all restraint, there have nevertheless been some who have not been ashamed 1) to make of me, a peace-seeker, a rebel and a zealot; of a lover of truth, a blasphemer; of a faithful expounder of the old teachers, a dissolver. So that I may also answer them, you give me good instruction. I will also answer them plainly, and set forth my innocence apart from some deceit and strife, bad as it is in himself. God forbid that we should be reproached for what has been thrown at our adversaries, which has almost completely ruined their cause.

We do not want to fight with quarrels, it is up to old wicked women. We don't want to deal with wicked wiles; the children of the world shall need it. The full cones 2) shall mock the people. The papists, they shall call the tyrants' rages. Let the Jews stop up their ears, if one wants to teach them. The sophists shall practice useless tapering 3) and chatter. The worldly wise have their smooth words for them. Let the magicians blind the eyes of the sighted. We have none to do. What is it? That we should take care to testify that we are believers in Christ and disciples of Christ, and that our Master, Jesus Christ, who is merciful to our sins and pours out his heartfelt mercy on us, should do this so that it may serve the glory of his name. This is what I desire.

I ask you, dear brother, not to deny me all the patience to listen that you also require from others.

(8) Well then, let him know that this suspicion (of which you take much pains, on which you also begin your letter, and with which you also conclude it),⁴ to write to you and to me, is an original one. Namely, this suspicion that we do not bring into sacred Scripture the understanding that it requires of itself, but that which pleases us. This suspicion you do for and for. I am no less hostile to this main vice (namely, giving holy scripture an alien mind),⁶ nor even to the greatest vice that may be on the face of the earth. Rather, what would that be but mixing wine with water, as the innkeepers did, of whom the prophet Isaiah writes? Isaiah 5: Or what would it be but to set up abominations and idols in the house of the LORD, as Jeremiah saith? Jer. 7. In sum, what would it be different, neither to counterfeit the word of God? It would be nothing else, but my conscience does not condemn me, yes, it absolves me, because I am innocent of the main sin. But we want to consider this deal even more diligently, so that it may become clear whether you or I are following the strange understanding of the Scriptures. 7) And this is the whole sum and action of this writing of mine.

9) It may be that I have given a cause for this suspicion in that I have considered the Sacrament trade according to the 8) writings of the ancient teachers. This is also the reason why you call me a supporter of Tertulliani, 9) who, I think, is not too important a teacher. But how is it that you do not call me more an assistant Augustini, who is still more clearly of my opinion, and whose name would be less suspicious? Yes, why did you not name me as more of a supporter of the general Christian church, which also agrees with us that neither blood nor flesh is essential in the sacrament, as we have declared and still want to declare? Have we not long since renounced the name of the sect and given leave? I want to be Tertullian just as lützel 10) as you are Lutheran or Carlstädtian, although we do not reject them if they teach something sound; which you also do, as I can see, because you do not yet despise the old fathers at all. Not the less

4) i.e. such, the same.

5) Urhab - beginning, origin. Compare § 41 of the previous scripture.

6) Marginal gloss: Forging scripture is a grave sin.

7) nachhetschen - to follow.

8) "the" put by us instead of "he."

9) Marginal gloss: They are rhetorical pebbles.

10) "eben als lützel" - just as little.

1) Marginal gloss: This is our gratitude!

2) Cones - drunkards.

3) "Tabernacle" is synonymous with "chatter". Compare § 14 of the following scripture.

You should not have been hurt by the diligent reading of the old teachers' sayings, 1) in which 2) more work is needed, neither courting 3). We have also never placed our hopes in the old teachers. But since I could notice that their great reputation was held in higher esteem by many people, and that everything they said was regarded as true; item, that to this day they are less suspicious of interpreting the Scriptures, that they are also generally regarded as more faithful than the new teachers, it was necessary for me not to keep quiet about it, but to indicate freely that the old fathers together with the Christian church were not against us. I am well aware that I have not completely failed you in this, although I have not yet served you according to my will, as I would have liked. Therefore, I will now use the old teachers' testimonies more moderately, neither pre-painting, because you refer to the very words of the Lord's Supper, and besides that you block your ears, and do not want to hear the convenient statements, the good causes and counter-reproaches. All the reasons that Christ may not be in the bread are of no value to you. The secondary arguments with which a Christian may be told that bread may not be flesh, that wine may not be blood, these you advance. You do not pay any attention to the unkindnesses that result from your opinion, and in other places you can beware of them. The idle, useless and unbelievable heap of so many miracles, with many other inconsistencies, does not concern you (as you say).

10 Now, even if you do not respect all these things, I will not consider you the less worthy; indeed, you will be all the more dear to me in that case that you call me to the word of God, thinking that one should fight only with the exquisite weapons of the spirit, that is, with the loud word of God and not with the teachers.

(11) But why should I be upset, since even the words of the supper protect me and are superior to you? I trust God, you will see that even in this case our cause will be more steadfast, and your cause almost weak, yes, even out.

I have presented enough writings before, which have not yet been approached as they should be; nevertheless, it is a greater pleasure for me to deal with the Scriptures, neither with the old teachers. Cause, which did not want to air baß,

to drink from the well neither from the murky streams?

(13) Therefore, let us submit ourselves simply, so that this suspicion may be removed from your heart and from the hearts of other people.

Before and before God the Lord pardoned me, I myself was a great spiritualist beyond measure, and so superstitious that I also contradicted the spirit of God that spoke in me, so that I would not oppose men all around me. As often as I read the order of the words of the Lord's Supper (which we are also dealing with here) in the Evangelists, it always occurred to me that there might be another little tale hidden under the bark, but so I knocked it out of my heart with a little struggle and thought, just as even today the majority of people think: "Hey, I thought, that's not supposed to be 5) anything, don't you want to be wittier than other people? You must believe that other people believe 2c., and so I have experienced enough that it is a great pity to be too much and without need to be pusillanimous.

15 Dear, what do you think that I sacrificed for a mind to the Lord in the temple? Oh, wretched me! I sacrificed my own mind to him. I also sacrificed a foreign mind to him. Therefore it was my own, because it was not almost Christian. 6) Yes, it was also my own for the same reason, because I am also a man, and am just in the habit of sinning (neither because I am prevented by the grace of the Lord), in which other men are also. I often shamed myself for it, before 7) I learned what was hidden in the hearts of other people, and thought: Are you alone rejected from the presence of the Lord, that you would set yourself against it, against which no one else sets himself? Ah, God, how did I now so thickly 8) subject myself to overcome my weakness by reading the old teachers' Scriptures? But how little I initially found in the evangelists, so that my weakness would be helped. The same happened to me when I visited the fathers for this reason. I often found it written: *corpus Domini, sanguis Domini*, the body of the

4) "all-around"--complementary.

5) "shall" --- applies, serves. Compare § 20 of the previous writing.

6) Marginal gloss: Everything that comes from flesh is all false.

7) "before then" put by us instead of: before and.

8) "thick"--often.

1) Side note: Why old teachers are needed.

2) "the" put by us instead of "their".

3) "hurt" - bumped, annoyed.

The blood of the Lord, but how it was a body, and how or in what way it was a blood, was discovered miraculously. And even if it was discovered at times, it was done in an exceedingly careless manner. And therefore I must not speak that I brought my own mind into the writing. But if I say that I have brought a foreign mind into it, I am not lying; and that for two reasons. The first: I only hang on other people's judgment. The other: My opinion of the sacrament was not in accordance with the Holy Spirit. So if someone brings into the Scriptures a sense or an understanding that he has borrowed from men, he does not bring anything different, nor anything wrong, although countless thousands of angels would be of the opinion. What else was this strange mind neither a human interpretation, which interpretation the divine scriptures, as Peter testifies, do not accept? What did I do differently then, neither that I built on the sand? Nothing else everywhere, for if I had found a different faith among men, I too would have said something different. However, when I realized that even the noble people, on whom special attention is paid, 1) teach falsely in many articles, and also allow themselves to be deceived: then their plastered face no longer counted for so much with me. The truth has never appeared clearer to me before. It was also unnecessary for me to bring the papal understanding (that Christ is essentially in the bread) into the Scriptures. No, it was not necessary, for the shining light came to meet me, which I might well have resisted, 2) if I had thought to turn back into darkness; I might well do so yet. But I do not want to do it. Why? Therefore, I am frightened by the terrible saying to the Hebrews in the 6th [and] 10th chapter, which is reproached to me there by Paulo, that it is an unavoidable sin to knowingly fall from the recognized light into darkness.

I would not bring anything foreign into the Scriptures by force, as if I were to bohlete it in with a noose or like a Scripture poacher, 3) [God] give it rhyme or not. No, I do not want to do that. I want to share that with others, so that I am helped to understand the sacrament correctly. There are still some who have

They want to prove in writing that they have itched to write me out of this deal with an evil conscience, and this they will do once they prove with gossip that the truth is a lie and the lies are truth. 4) But the things are not suitable here, because they are secrets of the hearts; but on the day of revelation, that is, at the last judgment, it will have power to prove that they do me too short and wrong. And therefore I will bring forward with more plain evidence, who they are that bring in the temple of the Lord unsullied and foreign men, that is, I will prove who they are that bring in a strange mind into the Scriptures.

It is true that Christ has indicated a purpose that cannot be 5) concealed, how one should act and interpret the Scriptures, since he was falsely accused of being a destroyer of the law. How will we therefore sufficiently thank him that he has strengthened our ears, which now have to hear the same things, with his injured ears because of this disgraceful speech? What is the same purpose? It is, Christ says John 5: "I do not seek my own will, but the will of the Father who sent me. If I bear witness of myself, my witness would not be true." He also speaks in another place: "How can you believe, who do not seek the honor that flows from the one God? Again John 7: "My doctrine is not mine, it is his who sent me. If any man will obey his doctrine, he shall judge the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He who speaks from himself seeks his own glory, but he who seeks the glory of Him who sent him is true, and in him is no unrighteousness." From these words of Christ, we will almost certainly determine which of us is more upright 7) and honest in dealing with the Scriptures. For if two were to fight with each other, and the one were to give much to God, the other little to Him, the first, who looks much to God's glory, undoubtedly gives the Scriptures their right natural understanding, but the other, who now and then balances the Scriptures for his own benefit, just like a horse-deceiver (ins-nAo). For by the truth, since God is the origin of the Holy Spirit of holy writings, he will also give his favor to it, so that it may serve for his glory, for he wants his

1) Marginal gloss: So it goes, if one does not *) look at God's honor.

2) entrathen" put by us instead of: errathen.

3) Marginal gloss: xx xxxxxxxxx x Hi-vMwos [i.e. like a Slinger or a bully. - In the old edition:

4) Marginal gloss: hoc est, nunquam.

5) verschupfen ---- reject.

6) "Like" ----- just such things.

7) i.e. more sincere.

8) i.e. after that.

*) "not" put by us instead of "only".

Have glory unharmed before all things. And the same will be the natural, and not an innumerable, that is, not a human sense. Example: We read how Christ the Lord could do no deed in his homeland except 1) to heal a few sick people by laying his hands on them. This saying now reported, Marc. 6, if it were to be understood badly according to the letter and according to human understanding, portrays Christ to us as if he were not omnipotent; that is, that his power was overcome by the malice of other men, that he could not do deeds where and how much he wanted, so that they were against him. It would have to follow that those who are unbelieving by nature would remain in unbelief. But the Spirit, who does not let the glory of God perish, improves such ungodly suspicions (that Christ is not omnipotent) from the beginning, and ascribes to God that which is most proper, and teaches that this is the highest power of God, that he may not do anything improper. For if GOD would have him do something unseemly, he would still sin, and that would be nothing other than sinning, and thus as much as not [liking] anything. Now the Spirit of God interprets the above text, that Christ might not have done any deed in His Father's country, in such a way that He might not have done any sign on account of it, as follows more closely in the text; namely, on account of their great unbelief, because of which Christ is astonished. For because they despised the greater gifts, which were given them by attendance, and by the doctrine of Christ, the lesser gifts were also rightly withheld from them. Yes, I say, as the evangelist says, Matt. 25: Those who did evil with the lesser things were not worthy to be set over the greater. So then the Holy Spirit wants to say that the ungodliness of unbelievers is such a great evil that they are unworthy of God's doing anything good to them, and it is not Christ's place to use his goodwill against all ungrateful people. If it is not due to him, it is certain that it is impossible for God to do it. And that is actually being omnipotent, although the external letter denies it.

16 This understanding will also not be contrary to the Holy Spirit, if we understand by this above-mentioned saying, [that] Christ had a displeasure because of the unbelievable hostility of his countrymen, that he was not able to do what he did not have a desire to do. In this way

- 1) Set by us instead of "neither".
- 2) sāmliche-----solche.

God also speaks through Isaiah the prophet Cap. 1: "I do not like," he says, "the iniquity and the boasting." Christ speaks in Matthew chapter 17: "O faithless generation, how long must I be with you? how long must I tolerate you?" It is also our custom to speak that if we do not desire or do not deserve a thing, we speak it: I may not do it. Namely, even the right-minded have to speak in the usage, saying: We do not like that, if we are not able to do it rightly. From this it follows in the same way, how in the first example of Christ the outward words, that he might not do deeds, gave the quarrelsome heathen cause to despise Christ, and how the Spirit guides him who is able to magnify the glory of God on the right path;

17 This is also the form it takes in our trade. How? So: The literal sense, saying: "This is my body", speaks to a small mind, that it is a rotten body of Christ; 3) but the spirit rubs his ear, and leads us to higher understanding, admonishing that we neither speak nor hold anything of Christ, which is not 4) honest.

(18) That Christ has ascended with his holy body into the heavens, and is seated there at the right hand of the Father in the highest goods, and that therefore he will also be hereafter, serves and shows the glory of Christ. Our prayer should be more that Christ with his divine power may be with us and helpful, and not that he may be with us bodily. Oh, it is much more honorable for our Lord Jesus Christ not to be with us in the flesh, and yet to assist us with his power, than for him to be with us in the flesh without some enjoyment which we do not have before. I pray thee, what increase is there in the glory of Christ, if we had his flesh and blood even as thou wilt in the sacrament? Or tell me, what benefit do we derive from it? 5) That is why I say that everything from which [the] godly receive enjoyment and benefit serves and is sufficient for divine glory; but from the bodily attendance no benefit arises for them. The Spirit of God publicly cries out against this, that the fleshly meal is no use at all. From this it follows that this will not be a human self-conceived mind, which confesses and claims to be a truth, against which no article of faith disputes, and which reaches more to the glory of Christ.

3) Marginal gloss: So Christ in the bread, is a true disgrace to him, because he uses nothing in it.

4) "not" set by us instead of: nothing.

5) Marginal gloss: I would also like to hear that.

19. Who among the ancient teachers has ever taken it for an article of faith? Which bishop ever swore that he would teach this for an article of faith, since he was made a bishop? None ever. Until the papa, who did not like to be called a bishop 1) came 2). Who has ever undertaken to teach this article (understand that the bread is flesh and the wine is blood) before the papal church, according to its pleasure in the Scriptures, has taken to courage, 3) and given its own dreams for certain sightings of the Lord. Woe to us if we presume to teach this article, which is not for the glory or honor of God. For thus says Malachias Cap. 2: And now, O you priests, this commandment is for you. If ye will not hear it, and if ye will not lay it to heart to give glory unto my name, saith the LORD of hosts, then will I send malediction among you.

20 [If you] want to speak: Yes, dear Oecolampadi, the wolves also clothe themselves with the sheepskin, for we usually vault all of the Lord's name or glory. Also the notarii raise their instruments in worldly affairs in the name of the Lord. Caiphas has also reproached God's name. What then will judge the matter between me and you? My no will be considered as much as your yes. Matth. 20.

21st Answer. Dear brother, I know well that there is hardly anyone who is concerned with divine business who does not also want to be considered an excellent, pious and faithful expounder of divine honors. We all have Christ in our mouths, but with different faith. But which is the pure faith, it becomes clear when one compares it with other serene writings, or when one compares it with unbelief. 4) For this reason, it is better to trust in the faithful and faithful proclaimers of divine honor. Therefore it is better to bring faith and unbelief out into the light of the scriptures. Since there are many dark and obscure sayings in the holy Scriptures, those who desire to teach have this as a common rule, that they always use the clearer sayings to reach the more obscure sayings of the Scriptures.

Here you may thank me for this opinion of mine, and base your opinion of the Sacrament from the beginning on the Lord's word "The Sacrament".

is my body", Matth. 26, Marc. 14, Luc. 22, and you already want to shout (as is the custom) as if you had won: Ho! Ho! what need is there for further testimony? Why darken clear writing with darkness? Nothing clearer can be said than this: "This is my body. Now hold still, the triumph will be even greater, if you will also judge my opinion according to the string of words, "This is my body". How will I be considered to have missed so far, if I call the sacrament a bread and the body of Christ a memorial, and the Lord says, "This is my body." How will this rhyme? So they speak on your side. I know well that you will also hear me patiently.

Speak thus:

(23) There are some things, as soon as 5) they are heard, that are quite clear and evident, and yet unknown, neither of which is good for one who desires to come to the truth. Now if anyone desires to fathom the truth, he will not be dismayed at this, nor will he lie straight thus at the beginning of the words. Oh no! What does he do then? He will remember the admonition of the wise Solomon, Ecclesiastes 7, saying: "The end of speech is better than the beginning. Since it seems advisable to a reasonable man to do so in daily affairs, how much more is it necessary in divine affairs to pay attention to the end of speech! It is true that if a careless person were to catch these dry words of the Lord, "This is my body," just according to their bad common sense, he would swear that the matter was already over, that the body of Christ was also bread 2c. But if he were to look with open eyes (as is usually said) at other writings, which can be regarded as if they were contrary to each other, and if he were to consider all the circumstances, then he would certainly see that this, which he had only just said was clear, was something hidden. That it is so, I will give a good example of another thing. The words that Christ spoke to his mother on the cross were bright and clear words that no one can deny: "Woman, behold your son," John 19. Now if there were someone who did not know that Mary was an eternal virgin, and John was a son of Zebedee, whom he had with another woman, would he not from that moment on take a reason to fight from these few words of Christ, which are brighter than the sun: John would have been born of Mary the Virgin? Yes,

5) "as" put by us instead of: and.

1) Pappe - poppy flower, or puppet - woolly seedling, which the wind carries away.

2) Marginal gloss: konttex, kulpikex [i.e. flesh maker. ?ulpa is the fleshy part of the animal body).

3) Willingness to be brave - willingness to be brave.

4) d. n bright.

Of course, if he would fight, and especially if he knew that Christ would not lie, John 14, such a one would not say from the beginning (as some of your people do): Behold, these are exceedingly bright and pure words of Christ: "Woman, behold, your son. There is no need for much glossing or guessing here, the words are clear, Christ has said it. Would not the opinion of the struggling man, that John was a son of Mary, also be confirmed from the words Christ says thereupon, that she calls Christ a woman and not mother, and again says to John: "Behold, thy mother!"? I think so. But if he should learn and realize that Mary is a virgin, and that John had another mother, he would not reproach the Holy Spirit for not having dealt freely with his things in public, even though he had no gloss on them. He would also confess that in this speech of Christ: "Woman, behold, your son", and: "Behold, your mother", there was a figure of speech. The opinion will have it also in the matter of which we are dealing now. The words of Christ, "This is my body," are cheerful words to one who pays no attention to the articles of faith, and who otherwise passes by all circumstances, item, who does not inquire further what the Scriptures say about them in other places. But if the whole order of things, what goes before and after, is decreed together, and if one holds other Scriptures against these words, "This is My body," yes, if one considers the glory of Christ, 1) then it becomes apparent that it is a dishonor to the Spirit of God to lie thus bitingly on the outer words, and now to quarrel about the letter, regardless of other interpretation 2) of Scriptures raised against it; and therefore one should and must not only interpret the dark ones with the words presented, but one must also put other scriptures next to them and thus explain them. One must also not disregard all other circumstances. 3) I believe that you will not go against this rule, and that you will not accept other passages of Scripture that are contrary to it, nor will you accept only a little saying. For though you find it written in four places, "This is my body," yet they stand just as if they were found in only one place, so that nothing can be gleaned from them that will serve a clearer understanding. Should we then reduce all other writings to this

1) Marginal gloss: This you consider, are [dul a Christian, the glory of Christ.

2) "gehebt" put by us instead of: gehabt. - rushed - held.

3) Marginal gloss: A good rule to the industrious.

some saying, "This is my body", penetrate and bend? No, we have not been taught that way.

(24) We would also mock if we wanted to prove that these words, "This is my body," were not figurative speech, but that the words "this is" must be understood essentially, and that the word "body" remains in its natural, proper meaning, that is, that it is called a true, essential body, and we would teach that: so we come to the point where it was begun, saying, "The bread has the word. Is not this that which was desired at the beginning to prove to you, that the bread was given the glory, that it began to be the body of Christ? Yes, it [is] truly [so], you shall teach it with scriptures! Do you think that this is what you mean when you say, "The bread receives the words in such a way that it is, or becomes, the essential body of Christ, and that it does not only mean the body? No, we are not to be fenced in this way. If, however, it is fair and honest to fight in this way, then we will fight in the same way, 4) that the drinking vessel is blood, and we do not want to allow any figure here, since the vessel is taken for that which is in the vessel, as the cup for the wine. But we want to speak: The drinking vessel has received the word, therefore it is blood; as you also speak of bread.

(25) Now what benefit would we get from the disputation? Quarrels and all other carnal things that are not supposed to 5) happen. What do I care if they cry out a hundred times: templum Domini! Temple of the Lord, temple of the Lord, Jer. 7. or also, which is just like the shouting: verbum Domini: the word of the Lord, the word of the Lord: 6) "This is my body." Nothing everywhere concerns me, it is a different matter, that here in the words the purity, which the spirit requires, is not sought. On the other hand, nothing is dearer to me, neither if one dealt with things honestly without deceit; but that will not hold anywhere. But let this be said to others, not to you, in passing. We will take what we have promised, namely, that it will come to light from the evangelists, even though we tear apart holy Scripture from our own self-conceived understanding. But we shall then come to the truth itself, when we come to the hidden Scriptures through the more public Scriptures. Now even the things in holy scripture are the darker ones, which are the first to be understood.

4) Marginal gloss: That would be a word fight.

5) "Not supposed to" will also be taken here, as in § 14 of this writing, for: not belonging here, serving nothing, proving nothing.

6) Marginal gloss: or: the church, the church!

are written. Note, 1) The prophets teach just what Moses taught, but they do not teach hidden and intricate things. The evangelists teach just what the prophets taught; that is, that God's word neither appears nor grows, but is and remains the same everywhere, yet the evangelists' teaching is full of light and clearer than the prophets' teaching. It was also noted that those who came after them always wrote things more comprehensibly, and made up for what was omitted by the first ones.

26 Well, who has been a more excellent teacher than Paul, who has been able to stand against all men, and has become all things to all? 1 Cor. 7. he is an instrument of Christ, Apost. 9; a teacher of the Gentiles, 1 Tim. 2; and a teacher of the wise and the foolish, Rom. 1. Who has been more learned, neither he who heard mysteries in the third heaven? 2 Corinthians 12: No one. Nevertheless, the matter may be considered that Paul himself in his subsequent epistles had improved a spiritual and a holy indiscipline, 1 Thess. 4. Is it not true that it was not wrong for him to have confused some who were slow of understanding with the first epistle to the Thessalonians, and to have given them a spark of error, as if the day of the Lord were already present? which could be seen in other of his epistles, where he wants living men to wait with fear for the future of the Lord, and promises those who remain until the future that they will run to meet the Lord, 2 Thessalonians 1. 1 Yes, I say, the error was not far, where he would not have admonished them with the other epistle that follows, of the signs that will be before the future of the Lord.

27 Thus the majesty of the things written before and first is great, but nevertheless it is not so great that it rejects the interpretation of the descendants who have attained the same spirit. Now everyone thinks that Matthew and Marcus wrote good, strong, brave things in the first place, and from the undoubted Holy Spirit of God; nevertheless, the things of the second part, which Lucas, John and Paul wrote later, are the clearer. As this is evident in many other things, so it is also evident in the things concerning the evening meal, in which the Holy Spirit faithfully comes to the aid of our slowness. Let us be of good cheer, there is still almost enough healing resin.

(The apostles, our fathers, have put enough great treasures behind us, as long as we, as righteous children, see what they teach and leave the quarreling behind.

(28) Although, I say, more light is found in those who are written last; for such things are not soon settled by the adversaries in the controversy, that they leave them alone: Well then, we will start right from him who wrote first, as one speaks; yes, I say, at Matthew we will begin the trade, and see whether our, that is, the general

Christian opinion of the Sacrament may be sufficiently understood and grasped. For, by the truth, if I read Matthew only about the supper, I will not be hurt, and yet I am not particularly versed in the Scriptures. Yes, it strengthens me a lot, even though nothing further is said about the words "This is my body", neither is this written in the text, and if one did not pay attention to the description of the other evangelists. Cause, the Christian sense opens also from the same some place 3) in Matthew, and does not allow that a foreign mind creeps in against someone, he would be completely sleepy, or overmastered with delusions. And it is quite a wonder how the wicked have so completely taken over. But why am I surprised? Our hypocrisy and ungodliness 4) have caused much, much more serious things. 5) Now God wanted it to be over.

Neither must we despise the things that have passed away before the supper, for the truth is much more fully revealed from the circumstances of which some pay no attention; for which reason it is not strange if they ever fall. Now Matthew writes about this:

From the night meal from Matthaëo.

On the first day of sweet bread they came to him, and said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover, or the passover, or the passover? And he said, Go ye into the city unto one, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; with thee will I keep the passover, or the passover, with my disciples. And the disciples have

3) Here we have omitted "in" which is too much.

4) i.e. godlessness.

5) Marginal gloss: O HErr, verleihs uns noch Gnad.

6) d. i. simply.

1) Marginal gloss: Do not despise this rule.

2) ferr == far; "not ferr missing" == not far missing.

They have done as Jesus commanded them, and have prepared the Passover or the Paschal Lamb. So now play from Matthew.

(30) I note here what the disciples understood by the name "Passover," transition, or paschal lamb. 1) No doubt they understood it to mean the lamb eaten with great festivity. And so they were immediately admonished by the name, what the Hebrew little word Passover, which we call the paschal lamb, held for a secret in itself, and from where it had taken the name. It was also not a common name of all lambs. No! for if at that time the father of the house had once met many lambs together in a heap, he would not have called them all Uebergang or Paschal Lamb, 2) No! But the one lamb, which was taken to the Begängniß of the old lamb, the same lamb was called in Hebrew Passover, in good German, Uebergang or paschal lamb, 1 Chron. 31.

(31) Why was he thus spoken of? Because it was a sign of the previous lamb, which had recently been slaughtered in Egypt. It is true that the wedding day on which the lamb was eaten was also called the Passover, but the day takes its name from the lamb more than the lamb takes its name from the day. In addition the scripture calls the day, or the feast, also often with the name Uebergang, or paschal lamb. As it is written in Deuteronomy 34: "Nothing of the sacrifice of the Feast of the Passover shall remain until morning. But that the Lamb is called the Passover is certain: as it is said in Exodus 12, 2 Chronicles 30, 35. 30, 35: They have offered up the Passover. By the little word Passover one understands the lamb, and one cannot understand the day with it; cause who has ever slaughtered the day or the feast? Just so it is in the place here in Matthew, where the disciples say: Where wilt thou that we prepare the passover, to eat the passover, or the passover lamb?" No one can interpret this to mean that the disciples meant to eat the wedding day. Or, if it is ever so awkward for us to interpret it, let us also make a wedding day out of the sweet bread and the bitter salts. Why is that? Because we also read: "the day of sweet bread", Matth. 26.

Thirty-two, that thou mayest remember the feast where the lamb was eaten,

If you give the name of the transition because of the lamb and the memory of the transition, you are doing the right thing. But if you turn it around, and want to call the lamb, or the memory of the once happened transition in Egypt after the feast, that would not be right. The Holy Spirit interprets this Hebrew word Passover for the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, and does not interpret it for the day on which the sacrifice of the Lord was kept. But how is the lamb a sacrifice of the transition? and what sacrifice is it? The Spirit also gives this to understand. How? Thus: It is a sacrifice of the passing over, or of the lamb that was sacrificed when the Lord passed over the houses of the children of Israel in the land of Egypt, and smote the houses of Egypt, but redeemed our houses. Here the children do not ask what kind of day it is, but they ask what kind of ceremonies, what kind of clergy and what kind of service it is, because of which this day is so honest and wedding day. And so the little word Passover, in German Uebergang or paschal lamb, right at the beginning has taken on a figure of speech, that the following lambs, which were eaten from year to year, and which were called the Uebergang, signify and indicate the first lamb, which was sacrificed in Egypt because of the Uebergang. Therefore, the disciples of Christ began to use the name Passover or Paschal Lamb.

33) After the disciples have undertaken to kill the lamb, which was called the crossover, they have certainly not gained a small cause to remember the great goods, which were given to the fathers in Egypt. They themselves may have helped them with this exercise of faith, so that they may be provided with even greater good deeds for the sake of divine mercy. Just as the fathers had faith in pleasing God in bodily external things, in that they provided themselves to God from the small temporal help of a greater one. No doubt (as it is customary) they greeted the lamb devoutly: "Oh, you innocent and simple little animal, how well you have protected the tents of our forefathers in Egypt from the plague with your blood! You unarmed warrior, you have averted the terrible devastating 4) angel, because your blood was sprinkled on the house thresholds. Thou dear little beast, thou hast been a healing physician with thy blood to our firstborn, to whom death was imminent. O thou art

3) "now" put by us instead of "and".

4) "devastating" put by us instead of: exalting.

1) Marginal gloss: Passover, transition, paschal lamb, is one like the other.

2) Side note: Read the history of Exodus 12.

We have been a long-sought avenger against the Egyptians, who have been repaid sevenfold for afflicting us so miserably with glue carrying and brick making, Exodus 1. We have no doubt that God has set you apart for yet hidden secrets, of which we know nothing yet, that you will prepare for us a wedding day, Exodus 2c.

34 Truly it is not unlike him that such words were used. Yet the disciples were not so grossly ignorant, or so ignorant of figurative speech, as to suppose that the lamb which had been sacrificed so many years ago in the land of Egypt had not been born again. Nevertheless, the disciples were not so grossly ignorant or so ignorant of figurative speech that they would have assumed that the lamb that had been sacrificed in Egypt so many years ago had come back to the earth by a strange Pythagorean rebirth and imagination, so that the very lamb to which they perhaps used such words, which they also killed, would be the very lamb that had been slaughtered in Egypt so many years ago. So they were not so foolish as to think that another lamb was killed and eaten in the visible lamb, and thus two lambs, the one that was seen, the other that was eaten long ago in Egypt. No, the disciples did not fantasize such things.

35 When they remembered the words of the Lord, who said in Matthew 26, "My time is at hand" (or how could they have forgotten the words, since they were commanded to tell the father of the house?), they realized that Christ was to be killed, for they had often been reminded of it, even though they did not yet understand the business of the resurrection and the calling of the Gentiles. Therefore it is similar to the truth, they thought to themselves: "Behold, if our Lord Christ must be put to death, he is truly no less innocent than this same lamb is. Now, by the truth, he is just as meek as the little lamb 2c.

36. I put it thus: If the disciples of Christ had also used 2) such (as now reported) imagination or contemplation, when they slaughtered the lamb, which Christ wanted to eat with them: nevertheless they did not say that Christ was in the lamb, or that he was present, who was still far from them on the way, although the lamb which they slaughtered was a holy sign; which John indeed recognized, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," John 1:1. 1. I also respect that it is Jeremiah, Jer. 11, Isaiah, Isaiah 16, and David,

1) neißwen - approximately.

2) In the old edition: joch.

Ps. 117, was also known. Paul, who uses figurative expressions at will, speaks beautifully in 1 Corinthians 5: "Christ our Passover," or our Easter and Passover, "is offered up. It is also known who say Revelation 5: "Thou art his worth, that thou shouldest receive the book with his seals: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us by thy blood." It is no less, the things now reported are not particularly solid prefabrication of the thing, nevertheless they fit on our nobleness. For those who want to study the holy Scriptures must be accustomed to figurative speeches.

37 Now let us look further at what Matthew says about these things, for there is not a jot or tittle, but it guides and leads us, even as by the hand, to the true understanding.

Now when evening was come, he sat at meat with the twelve, and as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were greatly distressed, and every one of them said unto him, Lord, is it I? He answered, saying, He that putteth his hand into the dish with me, the same shall betray me. The Son of Man leads away as it is written; but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed. It would be good for him if the man had never been born. Judas answered him that betrayed him, and said: Rabbi, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast spoken it.

38 Here one wants to speak: What does this rhyme with the interpretation of the following words? Doesn't Matthew discover the wicked 3) Judea with this place? Answer: It rhymes exceedingly well with it. But before 4) I show how it rhymes, let us consider how those who kept the passage had a habit. When they held the crossing, they ate of it quickly, 2 Mosi 12; they stood, protected by their feet; they carried staves in their hands; they needed unheated 5) bread, and sour salts, with which they contemplated the escape and the exit from Egypt. We are not to consider that they used the outward signs without understanding, and that they did not keep the things for which they were set up and appointed, because Matthew says, "He was at the table with the disciples.

3) Godless - godlessness.

4) "because" put by us instead of "and".

5) "ungeheflet" - without yeast, unleavened.

For the Scriptures indicate by the same saying that they prepared to keep the supper; some of them may have stood by it. There is no need for words: if they had omitted something from the noble commandments of the law at the same hour that Judas was paying attention to them, Christ would not have let it be good, and therefore they, who otherwise kept all things as they should, did not omit without care even the things that they were especially commanded to do, such as thanksgiving and the remembrance of the trade that they were commanded to do. They admittedly admonished themselves, one to the other, or Christ himself reminded them with the words spoken by Moses, Exodus 12, saying: "Eat, this is the Passover of the Lord". He does not call them the Day, but the Passover, that is, he calls them to eat the Lamb. Perhaps he still admonished them with clearer words, thus: Effect, that is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, since he passed by the houses of the children of Israel, smiting the Egyptians and redeeming our houses. Although in the words now reported there is a figurative speech, it did not hinder the disciples, because they could well realize that this lamb, which they ate with each other at that time, was now a sacrifice of the long ago passed over. That is so much, the disciples well understood that it should be sacrificed for a remembrance and a sign of the lamb killed before in the land of Egypt, and how the angel (which they should remember) struck the houses of Egypt, and thus the houses of the children of Israel passed by unpunished, having seen the blood of the lamb.

(39) Dear one, what do those who presume to teach us from the Hebrew the name Passover from the text of Moses throw at us, as if it were for use, and the lamb was not the Passover 1)? Do we not read according to the Hebrew: 2) "And when your children shall say unto you, What manner of service have ye? then ye shall say: It is the Passover sacrifice of the LORD, which passed over the houses of the children of Israel in the land of Egypt," Ex. 12. So much from the Hebrew text. Behold, here in this Hebrew text are two little words, the first is called "Abodah", in German: Gottesdienst; the other is called "Hu", in German: der, oder das. And these two little words cannot be drawn together, so that one would want to speak; the little word Passover, transition, is drawn to the service of God; would it not be more fitting

interpreted to the little word "shee", in German, "Lämmlein"? 3) Which is a sacrifice of the transgression to the Lord. Note also the mystery of who is the pure lamb without change, which should be a male, chosen and of age. And that is why the lamb itself, even the transition, is called by figurative speech. 4) And so, after 5) the disciples had performed the old custom, they sat down at the table to have the supper of wine and bread, that they might atone for hunger. In this, Jesus began to admonish his betrayer, and to open his suffering, which he had formerly blown in many ways about their ears; for it was exceedingly profitable for us, that his suffering was much commanded. From this also it comes that the prophets have foretold so much the suffering of Christ. John called him "a lamb of God", Joh. 1. Nicodemus heard of him, "he should be lifted up like the bronze serpent in the wilderness", Joh. 3. Peter, after he proclaimed him a son of God, also heard the secrets of the suffering, Matth. 16. Moses and Elijah also talked with each other on the mountain about the death of Christ, Matth. 17. Marc. 9. Luc. 9. Christ also foretold them of His suffering, not just one journey, when He set His face against Jerusalem, and purposed to go there, Luc. 13; namely, when the Pharisees accused Him of Herodi's deceitfulness, when He gave sight to the blind man, Joh. 9. Luc. 18; when He answered the sons of Zebedee, whether they would drink the cup that He would drink? Matth. 20; when he wept over the city of Jerusalem, Luc. 19; when he was anointed by Mary, Matth. 26, Marc. 14; when he taught about the wedding day in Jerusalem, that it must be raised, and the grain would not bear fruit, but would die or rot, as before, Joh. 12; item, when he indicated in parables that the temple would have to be dissolved, Matth. 26, Marc. 14, Joh. 2, and the son, the heir of the vineyard, would have to be killed, Marc. 12. In short, the closer the time of his suffering was, the less he hid it from them. And so he repeats it here in the supper, as if he were saying, "Behold, my beloved disciples, we are eating one lamb with another. Another lamb, much more gentle and much more innocent, must be killed. Yes, you will be horrified at the act, as if it were an atrocious thing, for it is a very great act, and it becomes man,

1) genämt = called.

2) Marginal gloss: We must be seen to be learned.

3) Marginal gloss: This belongs to the scholars.

4) Marginal gloss: Christ is the Lamb.

5) "now" put by us instead of: and.

6) "verjach" ----- verjahte, known.

who prepares it, to the greatest evil. But nevertheless you see, the thing is so certain, that also one of you, who eat with me from one bowl, will betray me, a lamb, and give me up to death. However, this is how it must be, because the scriptures refer to it, that they foretell how the betrayers and death will come upon me; because it is thus provided by the Father, for which reason it will also be shot for great salvation, and will bring you much more benefit neither the unreasonable lamb's death.

40 While the disciples still ate, and thus persisted in the memory of the old custom, and so the suffering was commanded to their hearts even more deeply. Jesus takes the bread, and when he has given thanks, he breaks it and gives it to the disciples, saying, "Take, eat; this is my body.

41 Christ now taught the disciples with words and sacramental signs, which he had often taught them with words alone; and that is why the things we see with our eyes tend to move our hearts more than those we only hear. 1) And for this reason Christ takes bread, which is food that neither a lamb may be given, and which is more needed; with which bread Christ commanded the death of another lamb, that is, with which he commanded his own death, which is the most innocent lamb of all. He gave thanks, and broke it. Why? Because he indicated that he accepts the breaking, that is, the death of his own body with thanksgiving. And so that 2) the meaning of the sign would not be unknown to them, he also taught them with the word, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body." What other understanding would the disciples have of these words of Christ than this, as if he had said to them, "Look up, this is how my body will be treated: it will be betrayed and broken, that is, my body will be killed"? And as they saw that he dealt with the bread, the same did they also learn in themselves, from the words of Christ, that it must be fulfilled in the body of Christ. 3) By the truth, this is a clear proclamation of the Passion, as hardly any can be clearer 4). But how useful and how salutary his death would be for them,

they learned in thanksgiving, and in that he commanded them to take it and eat it. Now if the death of Christ were not fruitful, and if Christ were not at all lost to us, who are commanded in the breaking of bread, we should also be afraid of the bread. But because the death of Christ gives us life, we eat the bread, which is a witness of the goodness of Christ, with great thankfulness and with great desire of our hearts. Just as it was a pleasure to eat of the lamb, so it is delightful for believers to eat of the bread of the Lord. Do you see, dear brother, how the meaning becomes clear, if one lifts the attached order of the words according to spiritual understanding against it? Do you see how no foreign sense breaks in here, if one does not despise the sense that is subtly simple? But if there is another sense or understanding behind it, it has not yet been opened to us; for this reason we are not allowed to teach it, but we disguise it as an alien foreign understanding. 6) What understanding is this that you have? What kind of mind is this, if you say, "this is my body", that is, in the bread there is the body of the Lord, or, the bread is the essential body of Christ? Now how can we imagine such a final 7) mind? Do you think that the apostles themselves imagined such a thing with the Passover, or with the paschal lamb? and said that the lamb, which was killed many years ago in Egypt, was and is in the lamb, which they then slaughtered at the feast for a sacrifice of the Lord's Passover? Oh woe! No, of course, they did not think so. Nor would it have been possible for God to have brought the same lamb that was slaughtered so many years ago in Egypt into the lamb that they kill year after year in remembrance, when he brings the body of Christ into the bread. 8) The lamb that they kill year after year in remembrance is the lamb that they bring into the bread. 9) It is certain that the apostles were not of this opinion. This will be an indisputable proof that they were neither mute nor fishes in such a great matter. If they knew and recognized that he was bodily in the bread, they were still negligent in all their service and thanksgiving, and did not keep it honest enough. But yet a pious simple heart easily confesses what the apostles learned by bread. I will open the bargain with a more skillful example than I think. Listen:

1) Marginal gloss: Read Jeremiah at the 19th chapter of the port he threw.

2) "so that" is put by us instead of: herewith.

3) Marginal gloss: Here [you] find a true mind of Sacraiment.

4) In the old edition: "Leides" and "klärerer".

5) In the old edition: wunfam.

6) spurn - reject.

7) letzen - reversed, "letzen" put by us instead of: last.

8) Year by year.

9) Marginal gloss: If you are a Christian, do not despise it.

Philip, the king, received a ring from his father Carl, on which the image of Caroli is engraved; he receives the same ring as a sign that he is dear to his father Carl and that he received his kingdom from him. Philip shows the same ring above the table to all his relatives and says: "Do you see Carl, my father, who gave me the kingdom and from whom I was born? So Philip calls the ring "Carl," because the image of Caroli, the great benefactor, is engraved on the ring. Now he lies there and wants to die; he shows his children a penny and says: You, my children, do you see Carl, who gave you the kingdom and from whom you were born? None of them who have seen the ring will say that Carolus has risen from the dead and has been brought into the ring. No; but they will all recognize this, as it is yes, that this ring is now a pledge 1) and a pledge of love, also a monument of good deeds. Well, if he kept this ring again, and drew out another new one, which no one had seen before, on which his image would be, and offered it around, saying, Behold, here I am, Philip; or, Behold, this is my face, have this in remembrance of me. Then some of his children would cry out and argue, "Hey, my father is a true man (unless he is omnipotent in that case), he said that the image on the ring is Philip, and therefore it must be Philip, my father, because he said it. Wouldn't the child be nonsensical? Would it not bring a strange mind? Yes, truly. And again, for what reason are those who recognize the commanded remembrance in the memorial called the rude ones? The same opinion has it with the things that got lost in the night meal. How so? First of all, the lamb was brought forth as a memorial of the redemption from the Egyptian prison. Now all the world knows well that it was not the lamb that had been slaughtered in Egypt long ago, but that it was no longer either a sign or a sacrament, that is, a signification; just as the ring of Caroli is. After that, when they are reported with the sign, they are also given the bread, which is the body of Christ, as a memorial of the new and greater good deeds. What is needed is to turn with a different new mind from time to time, and to speak differently of the bread that is the body,

1) Letze - Farewell.

neither one speaks of the lamb that is the transition?

(43) Now, if it is not a vexation to thee, hear another example: I show you an apple in the mirror, which lies over against the mirror, and say to you: Do you see the apple that grew on this tree or on that tree? Now no one will ever be so imprudent, unless he is even an idiot, who thinks that this figure of the apple, which I show you in the mirror, has grown neißwen 2) on a tree. Just so, no one will say that this lamb, although it is the transition, is the lamb that was killed recently in Egypt; nevertheless, this present lamb is the one that is not present and was killed many times ago, a figure.

44 Accordingly, if one showed a grape in another mirror, with the words: Behold, the grape there in the mirror gives wine, and the same makes the people drunk; which would now be such a fantasist, who would not let himself be reported with the grape, and would have been reported earlier with the apple in the mirror. Here perhaps someone would like to speak again and say: Yes, dear Oecolampadi, you speak well of the ring, but there is not such an image in the bread as there is in the ring or mirror: then I say yes to it; it is no less. Cause, it is bread by its own nature, that it feeds, and therefore it is given and broken, that it should feed. But that the bread is called a body, a believer will soon learn what the bread teaches to keep from the body. Namely, that it feeds the faithful with its breaking, that is, with its dying, and keeps them alive.

(45) Christ might also have put a lamb in the place of the bread. I also think it would not have been difficult for him if he had pointed to another lamb, saying: "This is my body. This would be just as much as saying, "Behold, as the lamb which you have just eaten, the lamb which was slaughtered in Egypt, and the sacrifice, is a memorial: so also the lamb which I now set before you to eat, my body which is slain for you, is a memorial. Since he did not take a lamb, but bread in his hands, and commanded it with words first spoken, it should not seem heavier to us, even if he had taken a lamb. It was also due to him that he chose bread, as a thing that may well be obtained, and is not inconvenient to signify his suffering. For just as a lamb is stung, that it may be eaten, so shall it be eaten.

2) Compare § 34; neißwen - about.

also broke the bread, that it might be eaten. See also this: the first lamb, which was killed in Egypt, would not have been so powerful by its own nature, as it is not yet, that it could have driven the destroying angel from the houses of the Israelites. No; but by the favorable will of God, who promised it, it protected the Israelites, and yet was only a figure of him who protected them. Yes, the same lamb does not protect. But our Lamb, who takes away the sins of the world, John 1, in whom the Father is well pleased, Matt. 3, 17, Mark 9, the same Lamb protects and shields, even though the rude would not know about him. The lamb was eaten; the blood of the lamb sprinkled the posts and house thresholds, Ex 12, the redemption happened; and although the redemption from Egypt only happened once, this custom is eternal: the people did not have to be taken out of Egypt even once; the firstborn of the Egyptians did not have to be destroyed even once; nevertheless the custom remained.

46 What does the lamb do? What was it good for? Answer: It brought with it the memory of things foretold, and admonishes the faithful to persevere in God's mercy. At the same time, just as the Lamb would not have been so powerful in itself, so also the body (in so far as it was only flesh) would not have been so powerful in itself that it would have redeemed us, even if it had been killed, if it had not been the very body of Christ, and offered up to the heavenly Father of good will in the Holy Spirit, Isaiah 53. Now the body of Christ has not been sacrificed more than once, but has finished us with eternal redemption, Heb. 9, and there is no need for the angels of the Lord to kill the firstborn again; that is to say, there is no need for Christ to overcome the world and the princes of darkness once more. And so, as far as redemption is concerned, the Lamb was a figure or a signifier of the body of Christ, which he faithfully displayed. But as far as spiritual training is concerned, the lamb of our supper was only a foreshadowing, and prepared the way for it. When we speak of redemption, we do not say that the body of Christ is only a figure of another redemption of ours, or of another Christ for whom we are still waiting. No, it is far that we call the body of Christ only a figurative body. For "Christ is the truth," John 14, he also has the truth.

He himself begat of his own true body, which was to be crucified and betrayed. But if one looks at the custom of the ceremonies, or at the spiritual training, then it is different. How? In the same way that the lamb which they ate together every year at a certain time renewed the memory of the other absent lamb, which was no longer present, so also the bread in the supper is a mystery, that is, a sacrament of the true body of Christ, which is seated up there in heaven. And as there was no more destroyer after the Israelites came out of Egypt, yes, even in the supper when they ate the lamb there was no visible angel, although they had a firm faith in the future redemption: just so also in the supper the body of Christ was not in the bread, nor the bread the body, but the true body sat there with them, in which body the angel of the great council, who became true man, Isa. 9, appeared, and on the same night he defeated the world and overcame it. The above things are ever clear, and should not hinder anyone. We also believe that the spiritual Egyptians, that is, all our resistors, have been overcome; and we eat the Lord's supper in remembrance of this.

47 There is one more example, which also serves to explain the matter. This, the raised serpent in the wilderness, would not have healed a man by itself, through its power; but that it healed someone, happened because God had promised it. She did not receive any inherent power at that time either. So also God, the Word, did not unite [with] the serpent; so that one might say that the serpent was the essential Word. But God works his work, and the serpent remains for a long time.

What did the serpent do? 3) It did nothing but preserve the memory of God's good deeds. But the foolish people, inclined to idolatry, thought that the erected serpent was something more than a bronze figure of a serpent, and thought that there was a hidden divine power in it. 4) The serpent was not a figure of a serpent. Then the good pious king Ezekiel, out of divine zeal, went to it, and sharpened 5) the serpent to them, so that he would muffle the idolatry. 2 Kings 18.

49 Look, this is how it happened with the bread, little by little, that it was taken for one's own use.

2) "now" put by us instead of: and.

3) Marginal gloss: The serpent's office.

4) neißwan - about.

5) "schleizt" - destroyed. 2 Kings 18, 4 - "dennen" == "from then on". Cf. § 58 of this scripture.

But if it is not to be taken for a memorial of the body, it is not to be taken for a memorial of the body. No doubt, if Christ had praised the figure of the cross, there would be no end to idolatry, since you will find many bad people who ever think that the wood and the image of the cross are capable of many things, and yet they have no word from God about it. Where does it come from? Therefore, the devil 1) fakes them so that he may extinguish the true glory of the cross. 2)

It is certain that the ignorant people, whom one first begins to teach the Christian faith, were not taught in the sacrament, that is, the mysteries, in the way they are taught now and in our times. So that it may be so, visit St. Augustine for this reason. Dear, let it be a good thing that I report a pious man who is well deserved in the business of faith. Yes, I say, they were not taught that way, as we are now. But which the ancients should by no means have omitted; is it not 3) such an abominable unavoidable capital sin, if one does not know that the body of Christ is in the bread, so that it is proper for Christians to rave and stir up on account of sin, 4) until it costs blood, and until cities are destroyed because of it? See how Augustine teaches, and where his words end. 5)

Augustine says: "The sacraments are visible signs of divine things, and divine things are honored by the sacraments. Also (says Augustine) one should not keep the figure, which is sanctified with the dedication, even, as one is used to do in other customs. One should also say besides [that] what the speech they (understand, that one teaches) hear means, and what it holds in itself, and what the sign means." So Augustine taught the Christians growing up. There is no doubt that he himself was taught by Ambrosio. One hears that Augustine says that things are honored by the signs of which they are signs. He does not speak that the signs conclude in themselves the essential things whose signs they are. No, but he speaks clearly and freely: The signs have a likeness of the things they signify.

And for this reason you must either say that the bread is neither a sacrament nor a sign, against the whole assembly of Christ, which considers it a sacrament. Or else you must affirm that it is only a sacrament, that is, that it is only a sign of the very body of Christ. If then it is conquered from you, that it is no longer a sacrament either of the body of Christ alone, well, then our mind, according to the mind of which the faithful have used themselves, will not be a foreign mind. But if ye say, Yea, it is a sacrament, that is, a sign, and yet is the body also; I speak thus: You will never prove that a sign and the thing signified by the sign are essentially one thing. How can a painted bishop and a true bishop be one thing? What is sacramentum different, neither only a holy sign? Indeed nothing different. Well then, if we speak of things, let us be taken for such theologians who have just come out of the shell 6). I beg you, dear, let us learn how the holy man Augustine 7) in the third book, when he writes of Christian doctrine, taught and instructed us in the articles, which are sacraments, in that he indicates clearly enough where it is proper to use figurative speech, or where it is not proper. He says, "Let us beware lest we adopt figurative speech according to the letter"; and on this he draws the saying of Paul: "The letter killeth, but the Spirit maketh alive," 2 Cor. 3.

Dear, do not take Augustinum for the man who has put on this saying of Paul in an informal way 8). For I know of some who put on some sayings in such an unpleasant way that they think it is an unforgivable sin, even in a disputation, where one does not quarrel, and where neither faith nor love is hurt. Augustine continues thus: "If a figurative speech is understood as if it were not figurative, then the same saying is understood carnally, nor can a thing be named if the soul dies before it, nor even this, in that it surpasses unreasonable animals, that is, if intelligibility is subjected to the flesh, so that it follows the letter; for he who follows the letter understands figurative or borrowed speech just as if it were not figurative speech, and interprets the thing as if it were a figurative speech through the

1) "fatzet" is probably as much as "fetzet," i.e., he hangs such rags on them, as in the idiom: "flicken und läppen," in this volume Col. 234, § 87.

2) Marginal gloss: Therefore, it should be done away with.

3) "icht" probably as much as: about.

4) Marginal gloss: They are quite gushers.

5) lenden - to steer.

6) geschlossen - hatched.

7) Marginal gloss: August de doctrina christ. op. 3. cap. 5. 9.

8) So put by us instead of: angezöge.

The meaning of the word "Sabbath" is the same as the meaning of one's own words, not another. For example, when he hears the word "Sabbath," he understands nothing more than a few days out of the seven days in the week that come and go. When he hears the word "sacrifice," he thinks nothing more, neither of the sacrifice in which cattle are sacrificed along with other earthly fruits. 1) And this is your miserable bondage of the soul, so that the signs are taken or understood for the essential things themselves, and that one may not raise the eye of the mind above the bodily creature to draw eternal light. Up to here Augustine.

Do you hear now, my dear Diebolt, how it is such a great pity, if I would make a figurative speech into an essential or a real speech? Do you not think that we need care, so that we do not turn freemen into servants? and that we do not deprive the soul of its glory, in which it surpasses other unreasonable animals, yes, that we do not kill it in the end? Other things that Augustine writes about the signs, I will also put here, saying: The Jewish people, who under the disciplinarian, the law, honored the signs of divine things for the essential things that were signified by the signs, are excused. Why? Because they did not know, when the signs were enough, why they were so eager to serve the one God, whom they did not see, before all things. But after Christ came, and the law ceased, people praised those who were closest to the clergy, even though they were still hanging in outward, temporal and human voices and signs, and did not know how to understand these outward things. Nevertheless, they were able of the Holy Spirit, so that they sold all their possessions and goods, and what they got out of them, they put before the feet of the apostles to distribute it to the poor, and they completely surrendered themselves to God as new temples, whom they had served before in the earthly image, that is, in the old temple. For it is not written that the Gentiles ever did the same.

54) The pagans are punished if they interpret their signs, that is, their idols, in such a way that they are no more, neither only meanings of the essential things. Why? Because it is a carnal bondage, says Augustine, so much so that one depends on the sign that is to be used.

1) Marginal gloss: Thank you, dear Augustine.

is inserted, holds, as if it were the essential thing itself, on which it is put for love, that it should mean. Is this true? Yes. How much more, then, is it a carnal bondage, if one takes the signs of things that are not meant 2) for the essential things themselves?

55. further, Augustine says: Christian liberty has disposed of all those whom it caught under useless signs (understand the Jews), and has interpreted to them the signs to which they were attached, and has directed them up to the things which were signified before by the signs; and hence the first churches of the Israelites grew up. [But to those who took Christian liberty under useless signs, not only did it destroy the servile service under all the signs, but it also destroyed the signs themselves, and turned all things aside, that the Gentiles might be converted from the shameful, unholy multitude of so many false gods to the service of the one God, that they might henceforth no longer serve useless signs, but that they might exercise their minds in spiritual understanding.

(56) The man is a captive servant of the sign, who needs or honors a thing that means something, but does not know what it means. But if one needs and honors a useful sign, which is instituted by God, and understands the power and the meaning of the same sign, he honors not that (says Augustine) which is seen and passed away; no, he honors that to which all things are to be pointed. Yes, if God has put it on, otherwise not. He who thus deals with the signs is spiritual and free, even in the time of bondage, in which it is not yet necessary for the carnal heart to discover the signs with which it must be paschalized 4) and to give them understanding, as all those who were forced among the people of Israel, through whom the Holy Spirit has given us the help and comfort of the Scriptures.

(57) Where do all things go together? They are drawn out there, so that we also know what we should think of our sacraments; for one may also speak of our sacraments in this way. So that no one would think that Augustine attracted these things in vain, he immediately says: "But at that time, after zero 5) the resurrection of our Lord has given us a very clear and bright indication of our freedom.

2) "nothing intended" - useless, not useful for anything.

3) d. i. such.

4) "paschgen" --- catch. Cf. § 9 of the second following sermon.

5) "now" put by us instead of: and.

has appeared, neither are we burdened with the heavy custom of these signs, which we already understand; for the Lord, even apostolic teaching, has given us few signs, which he has drawn from many. They are also only slight, and easy to do, and they have a high understanding, and they are of a clean merry custom; as then is the sacrament of baptism, and the righteous committal of the body and blood of the Lord. Now if one is so informed that he understands where the signs are directed, he will know that he honors these two signs not out of carnal service but rather out of spiritual freedom. So much Augustine. Oh that God would want [those] who so freely stab at us without cause, to measure above-mentioned things well and more diligently with themselves. Augustine counts the celebration, that is, the honest reception of the body and blood of Christ among the things that must be understood figuratively. 1) If the Latin word *celebratio* were understood correctly, it would partly explain the matter of the mystery, for we think well and truly of the body of Christ. Now when a man thinks well of a friend, he extols his virtue and praises the good deeds that his friend has done for him. The friend is not physically present, even though he 2) already thinks well and honestly of him.

58. Augustine thus speaks by name: "In the same way as it is a carnal bondage to follow the letter and to take or understand the meanings for the essential things which are indicated by the meanings, so it is also an evil, wicked, dizzy madness to interpret the signs uselessly. But if anyone does not understand the sign, what it means, and yet understands so much that he knows that it is only a sign, he will not be pressed into bondage. For it is much less likely, 3) that one is pressed with an unknown sign, but with a useful one, neither that he interprets it last 4) or uselessly, and thus his neck, which he has first drawn under the yoke of bondage to them 5), binds him anew in the ropes of error." Until here Augustine of the figurative speeches.

(59) You will have heard 6) that this above-mentioned saying of the supper, drawn from Matthew, is bad according to the literal one presented.

The reason of the soul (as Origen said before Augustine) is death. Now it cannot and may not be; cause, death arises from it to the soul (as Origen spoke before Augustine). You call our mind a mangler or a smasher 7) of sacred writings; but this is not so. For if we do not give just this sense, we will overload the people who learn from us with carnal bondage, which is only a miserable bondage.

(60) Go, you who are such fellows, and mock us, since you have long been mocked by good Christians, as if you were children, and children's teachers who do not know what they are saying, by the deed of the Spirit of God; and so you accuse 9) people of mocking you when you do not mend your ways.

(61) If we understood nothing else on our side, 10) except that we knew that they were signs, we would not be pressed with any bondage; but if we were to follow you, 11) we would interpret the signs badly and uselessly. Yes, we would be so completely bound to the outward word that we would accept no interpretation anywhere, and therefore we would have to wait for two bondages if we were of your opinion; God would grant that we interpret them or leave them uninterpreted. Dearly beloved, do you bring forth some benefit of the presence of the Body of Christ. If you want to say that the consolation of consciences is a benefit, I speak thus: if there is a consolation of consciences, it comes from the remembrance of the death and other good deeds of Christ, otherwise those who may never come to the Lord's table, but whom the Father of all consolation, 2 Cor. 1, often comforts more abundantly, neither just those who go to the sacrament, would have to receive such consolation]. 12) This same consolation should also be one of those gifts which do not serve to edify the Christian community, but it should be one of those gifts which secretly delight our minds in Himself, 13) to which minds the insensible body (if it were in the bread), and which should not be pondered (as you speak of it), brings just as much benefit if it is not present as if it were present. Did not Christ have to go bodily so that the disciples would be able to receive heavenly comfort? John 16: Yes, he [had to]. Dear, what is this

7) Zerschrenzern --- Tearing.

8) used - tested, experienced.

9) indebted ---- indebted.

10) "Page" set by us instead: Secken.

11) nachhetchten-----nachhmggen, succeeded.

12) Such an intercalation seems to us to be necessary in order to give meaning.

13) So put by us instead of: in einsgeheim.

1) Marginal gloss: Augustine is a gusher.

2) In the old edition: joch.

3) weger --- a better way.

4) letz verkehrt.

5) dennen--vr>n dannen.

6) Heaved - raised, proved.

Against Zwingli and His Followers re. W.xx, 83S W8.

671

Comfort, from which you draw your mind from hour to hour to the memory of other good deeds? So the fourteen Swabian brothers saw fit to answer me. If ever there is comfort in the bodily presence of Christ, that same comfort is only given to those who think and reflect on the bodily presence. 1) Why then do you so soon wean people from it? that is, why do you so quickly withdraw the minds of men from the contemplation of this presence? Christ also signified the like, that it was a sign of love toward him, when men would gladly see him go, saying, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I go unto the Father. Shall we call Christ down from heaven? What is this great, intemperate, selfish love, that we cannot spare a little time from its consolations? Some of them say: Yes, it comforts us, even though we do not know what benefit comes to us from the bodily presence; for we delight in his promise that he wants to be bodily in the sacrament. Yes, it is well directed, that would be just the thing to begin again; and that would not be a small obstacle to finding the truth, and would be a good fire to chaffing. For this is always our question: whether there is a promise in the words "this is my body"; but where has a promise (if there ever was one) ever lifted up someone's mind, from which he should have withdrawn his mind (as they say), so that he did not meditate on the promise, and since it was recognized that there was no 2) benefit in it.

62) I have to say the slug 3) freely, and thus say: We comfort ourselves with mere dreams, and follow after the idol of our own vanity. And if I then consider it with myself, I do not need to speak more forcibly of the Scriptures. 4)

Now let us take other things in hand, which will not be much obscure, where one understands more clearly the above-mentioned things. Yes, they will make the above interpretation clear and confirm it with their clarity. It is also evident from this that we do not allow any foreign foreign understanding.

64 And Matthew continues thus: "He took the drinking vessel, gave thanks, and took it.

given to them, saying, Of this drink ye all: for this is my blood of the new testament, which is poured out for many, for the remission of sins."

From the time after that until the time of the apostles, it was not proper to drink or eat blood, whether it was human or animal blood. The apostles themselves, even out of a pretense of love, enjoined that one should abstain from blood, Acts 15. 15) Whereby the weakness of the Jews was nevertheless somewhat abated, until the circumcised and the uncircumcised, that is, until the Jews and the Gentiles were joined together in one community of God. 6) Therefore the fathers, the Jews, were not commanded to drink the blood of the Lamb. Nevertheless, the blood was also given as a sign; and when the Passover or Easter was celebrated, they took of the blood of the lamb while it was being offered, and spread it on the upper thresholds or posts of the houses where they were going to eat the paschal lamb. "And the blood," saith the Lord, "shall be your mark upon the houses wherein ye are, that, when I see the blood thereon, I may pass over before you, and the destructive plague shall not befall you, when I smite the land of Egypt," Exodus 12. The Lord also commanded them to keep this custom forever. Therefore also in the night meal of the Lord, when they slaughtered the lamb, the sills and both posts were sprinkled with blood. There is no doubt in my mind that the apostles understood, which was not hidden from anyone, that this sign of blood, which they had taken from the lamb they had killed in Egypt, was a sign and a memorial. And so they were still more admonished of their foreknown good deeds. And so Christ, looking at this previous figure, skillfully discovers the secrets of his blood and says, "This is my blood. As if he said, "You have seen the sign, namely the blood of the Lamb, on the thresholds and posts of the house, which is an indication of the blood that was shed long ago. But now, dear disciples, turn your eyes here to the drinking vessel, for it is not a drinking vessel of the eternal old Lamb's blood. No, it is a memorial of my own blood. That old blood was shed in Egypt land, but my blood will be shed only at the cross. And because the blood cannot be drunk, I have appointed bread in the place of the Lamb; and now I sanctify a solemn 7) remembrance.

6) erwaken - to come together.

7) "trungenliche" perhaps: what you can drink.

1) Marginal gloss: I mean. Christ is an unworthy guest for them.

2) ninen---nowhere; otherwise also written: "nienen."

3) "Usefulness", the point that matters; except - out.

4) The meaning of the last sentence is obscure to us.

5) ächter - different.

Mine, in the form of the wine you may drink; and therefore this drink is my blood.

(66) Dear, what would move some to pick another and an unrhymed understanding from the words of Christ, who saw how things were handled and how the new was compared to the old, if Christ would have left it at the words "this is my blood. Indeed, the counter-attitude that Christ needs, as the good householder who brings forth new and old from his treasure, Matth. 13, will be just enough as an interpretation that is not to be despised. Yes, if one understands the speech of the blood of Christ in the same way as one understands it of the blood of the Lamb. It would have been easy for the well-versed in the law, as Eliezer and Phyneas 2) were, to recognize in the spirit precisely that through the lamb and blood which we recognize through the sacrament of bread and wine. Now, we consider the apostles, who nevertheless were more misunderstood, to have been able to take from the paschal lamb and from the blood what figure Christ's speech had. Even if the things now reported are not yet clear enough and do not make any difference, the certainty that Christ has attached to them forces us not to suspect anything crude. For Christ saith immediately after, "It is a blood of the new testament." To those who know what the new testament is, it is immediately evident from these words, just as the blood of the testament is in the drinking vessel, for the truth brings its light with it. Indeed *testamentum* is nothing else in the place, neither a *paotuw* nor a covenant between God and between men, which is established for this reason, so that we may be sure that our sin will be forgiven us; as one also reads in the prophet Jeremiah, Cap. 33, and there is nothing 3) that the consciences would like to have at hand, which would be more preferable and desirable to them. 4) The most merciful Father has deigned to seal this testament, that is, this covenant, with the seal of the death and blood of his only begotten Son, as he has purposed from eternity; and lest we falter, for that it should be strong, it is

also confirmed with the death of the Testator Jesus Christ. Therefore the church was born, and at the same time as Eve came forth from the side of the sleeping Adam, Genesis 3, so also the church was built from the blood-flowing side of Christ. Yes, I say, she (the church) is built from the side of Christ, not from the cup, from the cross, not from the table, although she testifies to this with the signs before men, which before all happiness before God has raised through faith; and this testimony could also be called edification, and yet would not be spoken unformally. But actually to speak of it in essence, the blood of the dying Christ makes pure, it delights and makes alive; for the church is in the blood of the testament, as Zacharias the prophet speaks of it with few words and merrily, saying: And you are a blood of your testament, Zach. 9, 11. So it is written in the Hebrew text, that the Hebrew word "athe", in German "du", is drawn to the church; that it has the meaning: that you are or remain my people; yes, I say, that you are such a delicious, peaceful, free, honorable people, and that there are so many of you, that you shall receive of the blood of your testament. Look, Zacharias calls it a blood of our testament, as Matthew badly calls it a blood of the testament. Zacharias does not speak, a testament in your blood; no, a blood of your testament, he speaks. The testament, that is, the covenant is ours, for GOD has agreed with us, and has confirmed it by His Son's blood. Although, stop 5) (I), the blood is also ours through faith, because it was shed for our love, but it is therefore the blood of the testament, because it confirms the testament, that is, the covenant. For this reason the Lord immediately says in Zechariah: "And I have let your prisoners out of the pool where there is no water," (since the Hebrew text says: "I have let out," we read in our Bibles: "You have let out"), and thus the Lord says: "Because the sacrifice and blood of my Son is so dear and pleasing to me, I will let out all the children of the church who were imprisoned in the wretched bondage of sins, according to the prayer, and I will set them free. But what does he mean when he says: "The blood of the testament"? Will the blood that is in the cup, and that can be drunk, confirm the testament? will it subside sin? will it comfort consciences? O woe! no, indeed not! For the Holy Spirit, that he might prevent such madness, hath added, saying, "Which for the after-

5) Set by us instead of: has.

1) "ja auch" put by us instead of: "jach".

2) Eleazar and Phinehas will be meant. 4Mos. 25, 7.

3) niemen - nowhere.

4) Marginal gloss: Where there is not the knowledge that God is our Father, all this serves nothing.

remission of sins is poured out." Now the blood is not poured out of one drinking vessel into the other, that sins may be remitted. No! Where then? On the cross and nowhere else. And so (as it is shed on the cross) the blood of the testament is in sealing, and makes us sure of the gracious will of our heavenly Father. Out of this must ever come to pass, if the blood, which ye say ye have in the cup, is for the confirmation of the testament, that it may confirm [the] testament, and assure our consciences. Yes, I say, it must follow that Christ's death on the cross will not be sufficient, and that from day to day the lack which Christ did not fulfill on the cross with his death must still be fulfilled; and that the prisoners are not yet let out of the puddle, since there is no water in it. But what would that be otherwise, neither especially to blot out all the merit of Christ together? For if his merit is not sufficient, it is not merit at all; but this would be offensive to a Christian to hear. What then do they mean when they say that the outward signs and seals are to strengthen consciences? For, in short, when they have rightly experienced themselves, they certainly realize that they are deceived and robbed, for they have received comfort beforehand from the infallible pledge of the Holy Spirit. 1) The sacraments do not comfort anyone for themselves, but because they are signs and preach Christ in the place of words, they bring comfort to the person by serving as an instrument.

67. Further, one would cry out against this, saying: Listen, was the blood of Christ, when he was still a young boy, not also a blood of the testament? Now it was just one blood after and before. Since the blood in the chalice and the blood that was poured out afterwards is one blood, will it not be in the chalice as the blood with which the testament is confirmed?

68 Answer: It is true that it was one blood when he was a boy, and when it was poured out; but because it was still boy's blood, it could not be considered testament blood. But when it began to be shed, it was considered testamentary blood, for the covenants are confirmed with blood, for which reason it cannot be called testamentary blood. About the nmnt's Lucas and Paul clear enough "a new testament in blood", Luc. 22. 1 Cor. 10. which here Matthew speaks, that it should be shed. Had it now another opinion with oem testaments, and with the shedding, further, neither that

1) Marginal gloss: The spirit alone is the pledge.

If we only have a memory of him, then we are again preparing for the papists their butchery and their sacrifices. But the handwriting of our sin is pinned to the cross, Col. 2, and the exalted Christ has drawn all things to Him, John 12. In this is the covenant.

69 Look now, my thief, the testament has not yet been fulfilled in the supper, so the blood has not yet been poured out; what else will we find of the blood, that it is present, neither just on the form, that one remembers it? and this is exceedingly good for thanksgiving. Yes, faithful and diligent remembrance is itself a true thanksgiving. We can truly grasp no other meaning, and especially since the honest accompaniment of the old custom takes place, which warns us as a teacher and leads us by the hand.

(70) Not enough has yet been done for your argument and counter-argument, which you pick up from the rules of the world's orators, and which you now and then steer out of there, because out of there, and ever suppose that you want to conquer with it that this preannounced interpretation, or the figure of speech, may not exist. And because Christ the Lord speaks of it, "which is shed," you assume from the beginning that if our opinion stands, then it must and will follow [that] the figurative (not the natural, true, right) blood is shed and is a blood of the New Testament; from which then it follows that we well deserve to be punished for Marcionite heresy; for the Marcionites also said: Christ did not truly suffer, and his blood was not truly shed. Answer: What does it matter to us that we are concerned about a danger when it is not necessary? What compels me, then, to make a reckoning, saying, This is a figure or memorial of the blood that is shed, and so the memorial is shed? Wouldn't that be a great opinion? Why do I not speak as more thus, as I should speak: The wine is a figure, or a memory of the blood, and therefore so the memory of the blood, in so far as it is shed, is signified by the wine? Or therefore: The wine is not only a memory of the blood, but it is a memory that the blood is shed? Well, if Christ had understood it with a few words, saying, this is an outpouring of blood [xxxxxxx]; would not both memories have been solved with it? Since no one is hurt because of the speech that has 2) been taken away, one should certainly be hurt even less because of the speech that has been cut into pieces. Yes, there is more strength in the speech that has been cut up, and a

2) out-of-print, i.e. in the word.

greater reputation, and remains the sense nevertheless completely neither so 1) he would have said: This is a figure, or a memory of my blood, and a memory of the shedding. I say also, it is not a baeurische speech, God gives, how one bequeaths to us a mist with much dizzy intrigues. And this we hear from the pagan poets' writings, and from common speeches, also from the custom of the church. The poet Virgilius 2) did not speak uncleanly when he tells how Venus brought her dear son Aeneas the shield that her husband Vulcanus had forged; and speaks among other things thus: How Vulcanus freely cut out on the shield woolen pointed hats and fine little shields that had fallen from heaven 2c. Do you mean to say that the painted shields that he had in his shield fell from the sky? No, because it was only a figure. So he also says in another place, 3) how Aeneas neißwa 4) had seen several times how Troilus, the unfortunate youth, was fleeing defenseless on one side, and was not in accordance that he should fight with Achilles, and how he was leading along there on the empty chariot, and was thus hanging with his feet still on the chariot 2c. This was the painting that Aeneas saw, nor does the poet speak of things as if Aeneas himself had apparently seen them. Did you therefore mean to say that the unfortunate painting had fought with Achilles? Another mean speech: If I showed thee a painted image of Paul, and said unto thee, This is Paul, who hath warred with the sword of the word against the whole river of Illyrici and of the Greek country, Rom. 15; or, if I saw the image of St. Peter, and said, This is Peter, who hath received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Now if you would interpret these sayings in such a way that you would say: This is the image of Paul, which image preached the word of God in Grecia? and this is the image which is full of the Holy Spirit, and which has determined heaven with his preaching? and would you rebuke me for my speech, as one who had sinned against the common bad habit of speaking? You would not do it.

(71) Even if the disciples had said of the lamb which they ate: This is the lamb whose blood, sprinkled on the threshold of the house, killed the Egyptians and finished us off: would anyone understand from this that just for the sake of speech the figure of the

blood was blown up on the doorposts of the house, and that the angel had seen them? How is it that in such an excellent matter you grate together such childish, powerless arguments (but that they are childish, powerless arguments, logic may admonish you, what power the pregnant propositions (as the Logici of it tanten⁵⁾) have, and the righteous, brave things and sayings, which we are wont to throw at you, are swallowed up 6)? Verily, verily, the things indicate that you are well with quarreling and with strife. If we were so well pleased with strife, would we not also say: Christ said that his blood would be shed, so that it should be understood that just as he said it, and just as they had the supper, it should be shed at the same hour, and the body broken? Yes, we would like to do it, because the text can be seen for it, but we do not want to do it. Because we fear that the Egyptian plague of frogs will come upon us. That is, we fear that, if one were to serve the quarrel in this way, as some do, a new sophistical frog talk would grow out of it. We do not want to know the things that do not serve anything.

(72) Therefore there is nothing to prevent us from accepting the figure of speech, which every child would understand if he had been at the supper, as the apostles were. And so what I have answered of the blood, let the same also be answered of the bread, of which Lucas and Paul speak. For since both Lucas and Paul say, "This is my body, which is given or broken for you," it is not their opinion that therefore only the figure of the body is given or broken, but thus: the bread, which signifies the body, the same designs and signifies also the giving or breaking of the body. That is so much said: the bread brings it again to our remembrance, how the body is given for us (the true right body). And here we are far enough from the nonsense of the heretic Marcioni, to whom the coarse mind you hold would not have given a little instruction that the fantastic assumed body of Christ is hidden in the bread. 7) Enough of this. There are still other things more, which also indicate and maintain not an ungodly, but a right natural mind.

1) quite neither so == quite as if.

2) Marginal gloss: VirZ. 8. lik. Aeneid. [v. 664.].

3) Marginal gloss: VirZ. 1. lib. Aeneid. [v. 474.].

4) i.e. something like.

5) "tanten" - to make trumpery. Compare § 104. Otherwise also written: "tandten".

6) pushed aside - pushed aside, disregarded.

7) Marginal gloss: In short, if the body is in the bread, then the same body has been crucified.

For it follows in the text Matthäi further thus:

I tell you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine from itzuud until the day I drink it anew in my Father's kingdom.

74. With this common saying Christ says badly that he will no longer be with us in the flesh (meaning that he will neither drink nor eat, as Lucas says), but that he will go away to the Father, which John also reports in the supper, John 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. For this reason the Holy Spirit diligently prevents us from understanding anything coarse in the things spoken of in marriage; in that he immediately says that he will go away, and so earnestly commands them that they may have remembrance of him, he shows sufficiently what the wine and the bread are. As he called the wine 1) blood before, so he calls it 2) wine after, yes, in clearer words, by a fine circumlocution, he calls it a fruit or a plant of the vine. Out of all this, what other understanding does Christ leave, neither that wine is wine, and not essentially nor actually blood, which should now be taken away? Indeed, he leaves no other understanding, but he 3) conceals the unknown meaning, that the body is in the bread and the blood in the wine, in such a way as 4) one speaks of it. 5) What would that be for an afterward 6) bad speech to such a man as Christ is, saying: I will drink no more wine? As if] our Master Jesus Christ had been a schoolmaster of the full Philoxenians and Epicureans, that he should speak of bodily need, which is in eating and drinking, if they should cease, as of great things? For we know that the kingdom of God is neither in food nor drink, 1 Cor. 4, and that there is no power in it. What does Christ mean by this? Nothing else, neither he is now near death, and henceforth one should no longer seek his bodily presence in the world. That is his opinion. Although he ate and drank with the disciples after his resurrection out of special freedom, Apost. 10, it was only for the reason that his resurrection, together with our faith, was truly a sign of the world.

For at that time he did not eat for hunger, nor did he seek pleasure in it, for he was full and satisfied with the highest bliss. He did not drink new wine, but the same wine that we drink, or else he would not have proved that he had a true body. To this he says: "Until the day, he understands the high desired day, when he will show himself a friendly table companion to all the gathered elect. He means the day when the hidden secrets will be opened, when the godly will be resurrected, when they will run to meet him, 1 Thess. 3, when he will hand over the kingdom to his Father, having overcome the last enemy, 1 Cor. 15. He will also give the dead their joy on that day, because of the strange and innumerable tribulations they now endure. And as Christ is already rejoicing in immortality, so on that day we immortals will be compared to his glorified body, and we will rejoice with him, and there we will live well with him in a new and holy way. Of course, the wine will be new at that time, and the heavens will be new, and the earth new, and even all things new, Revelation 21. For he will dwell with us again in the flesh, and this will be an unspeakable joy for us. For in this way he will satisfy our desires with the goods of his presence.

75 Does the opinion not immediately depart from itself? Is it not clear and obvious, and worthy of a Christian spirit? Yes, truly. But I am very worried that if I were to seek bodily presence with you now in this misery, before the day, it would be as it wanted, 8) if it were only really bodily, yes, I say: I am afraid that in the future, in the kingdom of God the Father, I would not be a comrade or a partaker of the delicious desired meal; 9) since I am so well acquainted with the pure interpretation of the words, and especially since even now, in this time, I realize how much the carelessness, not to say the childish imagination, of how Christ is in the bread, brings harm to true righteous vision. All those who are endowed with the gift of discerning the spirits and who actually pay attention to the inner man's training will testify to this.

My Diebolt, you have probably noticed how the truth can be achieved with little work even with the

1) commensal - appropriate.

2) hinnach- nachher; "hinnach" put by us instead of "him yet".

3) d. i. rejects.

4) i. e. approximately.

5) Randglosse: Niam von woão yuoäärn iusükdlli.

6) indulgent -- indifferent.

7) d. i. such.

8) Marginal gloss: Visible or invisible.

9) Marginal gloss: O Christ, seek Christ in heaven, nowhere else.

(1) He was considered to be fighting against us. The testimony of other evangelists would not be necessary. Nevertheless, let us also examine them to see if they say anything that proves to us that our mind is not at all Christian, and whether they admonish us from our understanding, and call us to depart; for this is the business of all together, on which I go, that we have not gone astray from the truth.

From the night meal from Marco.

77 Next, look at the next one on Matthaum, the Marcum, whether he says something further neither Matthew, although he uses almost the same words. But in it, Marcus writes more neither Matthew, how the supper was prepared, and how Christ did not present the host without miracles. Marcus also indicates that the disciples found him. Namely, when Christ commanded them to go to his house carrying a jar of water, and boldly demanded that he show them the large, paved, prepared room. 2) And by the majesty of the place, that in this supper they might be led to high things, and not to low things; that is, that they might learn heavenly things, and not earthly things; and that they might follow spiritual things, and not carnal things. 3) But some who use the signs for the essential things, and thus pretend that the flesh is united to the bread in the supper, these are quite carnal, as I reported above, and crawl along on the ground, so that they cannot come up into the room of the supper.

But lest it be thought that I am more jesting with the foreign and spiritually borrowed mind, nor that I am pondering the proper meaning of the Scriptures, let us leave it at that, and now have a look at how the evangelist Marcus describes all things with diligence. He does not do it in vain nor without cause that he indicates the word Passover, 4) which we call in German Osterlamm or transition, so many times before. For thus he speaks: "On the first day of the sweet bread, when they offered the Passover, or the passover lamb. After this the disciples inquired where they should prepare to offer the

Passover, or eating the paschal lamb." Finally he says, they have prepared the Passover, the Passover or the Paschal Lamb. Passover is a figurative word to the Hebrews, and reminds them of another, neither they saw before their eyes; as the kind of sacraments is. Marcus also needs such diligence (so that the memory of death is imagined), since Judas, the enemy of the house, is admonished with such brave, defiant threats; for it was not the smallest part of Christ's pain that he had his own traitor with him among his servants. Yes, the pain was so great that the Holy Spirit also reproved it through the psalmist, saying: "My benefactor, on whom I trusted and who ate with me, tramples me underfoot," Ps. 41.

79 So Marcus is talking about the drinking vessel:

And he took the cup. Gave thanks, and gave it to them, and they all drank of it; and he said unto them, This is my blood of a new testament, which is shed for many.

Those who have not yet drunk a foreign opinion, and read that the disciples drank before Christ spoke his words, will recognize from the beginning that nothing outside of wine is granted to be a holy remembrance of suffering; nor will they suspect anything inconsistent. But the others, who want to keep the pope's opinion, need the figure that is called prothysterion in Greek, that is, when the last is put forward and the first behind, and they cry out to other evangelists for help, since there is no need for it. Cause, the Holy Spirit (from which breath the evangelists wrote) has seen our great clumsiness and superstition, from which we lie exceedingly anxious for unfamiliar words, well before. And in order to rid us of this evil and to put an end to the unnecessary fantasizing about the body being in the bread and the blood in the wine, he does nothing but cry out.

81 Now see thou, seeing that the evangelists have described the time, the order, and the words of the supper in so excellent a matter, without any particular care: see thou be not too much wise, if thou puttest a burden of piety in things that ought not, lest thou fritter away love and the matter in itself. 5) For the remembrance and thanksgiving of the passion of Christ,

5) In the old edition: verzettest.

1) i. e. shines.

2) Delicious - preciousness. - In the old edition here and immediately following: "beyder" instead of "bei der".

3) Marginal gloss: Though a Christian must seek high things with earnestness.

4) Marginal gloss: Passover, in good German, Uebergang.

to which wine and bread with their matter serve, is the Here the Holy Spirit teaches us fortunately what to think whole sum of this trade. 1) Here is no scruple, here is no of the words of the supper. Above that, one should not do knof, 2) and nothing heavy. How is it, then, that the simple- anything else in the supper, neither the Lord has minded reader, who perhaps does not like to be commanded. Dear, what has the Lord commanded to be instructed, is presented with a scripture from which he done in the supper? He commanded that we should take cannot judge himself? Why do we darken the Scriptures the bread and eat it, as the other two evangelists speak without cause? Why do we accuse the Holy Spirit as not of it, in which we are commanded nothing more. I do not having taught publicly enough? Why do we not send read that they tell us to take the body and eat it. I do not ourselves to the Scriptures? Gelt, the Scripture should read that they say to us that the body will be in the bread. serve our slow? What does it matter to us that we prefer I do not read that Christ has given those, the priests, to walk in darkness rather than in light? If we seek authority to make his body out of the bread, so that it adornment in the Scriptures, why do we ponder such begins to be the essential body. 4) No, I do not read any confused opinions? of these. I do read here in Luke that we are to have a remembrance of his body, which is set forth for a gloss and interpretation, so that that which is obscure in other evangelists may be revealed here. And this is the third thing the Lord has commanded us to do. Therefore, the two words "take, eat" should be interpreted as referring to the bread, but "have remembrance" as referring to the body.

From the night feast from Luce.

82) There are other things, too, which Marcus precedes and Lucas follows in the supper. For as Marcus speaks of the wine, that Christ, after they had already drunk from the cup, had said that he would henceforth drink no more of the fruit of the vine until he drank anew in the kingdom of God; Lucas tells the same before the thanksgiving of the bread of the paschal lamb and of the drink. At which place not only the old custom ended, but also there (as I said before) the Lord's going is cheerfully indicated. If other evangelists had also described it in this way, we might suspect that Christ wanted to teach with these words alone that the burden of the law was to be lifted up and carried away. 3) But what he meant by this is not clear. But what he meant by this is no less clear from the brevity of other evangelists than from their length. Again, what the other two evangelists say about the betrayals of Judah before the supper, Lucas describes after the supper; and with this change, that one puts it before, the other after, the remembrance and the going of the Lord is taught in a fine, simple and quite beautiful way, and besides this, the ornament of the speech does not lose so much, but still remains a beautiful speech. Other things that go before or after the supper will be left for this time, because it is clear from other gospels how much goes into it. We will only consider the words spoken about wine and bread. For as Matthew and Marcus say, "this is my body"; Lucas adds, "which is given for you, this do in remembrance of me."

The fact that Lucas speaks here: *hoc facite*, that does; since *facere* does not mean to sacrifice, as a Hanseatic Guly 5) who wants to try it out of the pagan Virgilio, 6) since the poet needs *facere* for sacrifice. He may not bring the sacrifice here with the same verse. Therefore, we interpret this again just as we did above, [that] the bread is the body, that is, we say it is a memorial sign and a figure of the body. In what way is it a figure? Just in the way that it should be a memorial that the body is offered for us. I put it on before, so that the figurative speech does not force us to speak that the figurative body, and not the true body, is given for us. No, we are sufficiently warned against this by the very public statement: "It does you good to remember me. How shall we do it in remembrance of Christ? Thus: His body was given up for us. You might also interpret the little word *quod*, in German "der", after the Hebrew manner, for "sofern", so that it would have the meaning: this is my body, insofar as it is given up. However, we have also spoken of this before; it is not necessary to imagine it so often.

84. it is clear enough that this figurative speech

1) Marginal gloss: Summa of this trade: do not forget love.

2) Knof button, knot.

3) d. i. taken.

4) Marginal gloss: Yes, you read, Andreas Flamm, the learned man, wrote it.

5) Probably as much as "Hansnarr". - "sich gäuchen" - to imagine foolishness. Cf. § 98 of this paper.

6) Marginal gloss: Virgil, edos. 3 sv. 77.]: oum kaoiana vituw. (In the old edition: vineula)

Christ's "this is my body" holds more force, neither if he had spoken without figure: this is the figure of my body. Also this, when he says: "which is given for you," neither when it is interpreted without figure, that you would say: this is a figure of the body, which means that the body is to be given, or that it is given. When I hear that the body is to be given up or broken for us, as Paul speaks of it, I say, if the right natural mind does not approach, then that which is given up or broken for us is not bread, nor is it given up or broken for us in bread. But that it seems good to some that the two words "to give" and "to break" should be applied more to the bread than to the body is not appropriate. The reason is that the two little words "for you" attached to it do not make it good. For when you look at the distribution, as one distributes bread, we do not say: I give the bread for you; no, I say badly: I give you the bread. If something is given for the other, it indicates that something else should have been given, which is not given. Understand it thus: We should have been given to death, but that we might be free and live, Christ was given for us, in our stead, to the Jews from Judah, from the Jews to the governor, from the governor to the executioners. And all these things were done for us and for our sake. If someone gave me bread, and you said: He gives you bread; the speech does not rhyme, if you look at the common usage of speech; you must say, He gives you bread.

(85) Now, if ever I should interpret it according to your opinion, that the body is in the bread, what consolation is left me? What promise will refresh my heart? What change will this be, that the body of Jesus Christ, for that [that] he should be given into death for me, was hidden in the bread? Christ made me alive on the cross, not in the bread; so also the promise to make me alive is not on the bread. 1) O woe, no! by no means; otherwise what need would it have been that he had died? And for this reason it is evident who they are who teach another thing in the Scriptures, known neither to the biblical scribes, nor to the evangelists and apostles, together with the prophets. But that the two little words "to give" and "to break" also apply to bread pleases me well. Nonetheless, the other buried words force the reader to

1) Marginal gloss: Consider seriously what dishonor it is to have Christ in bread.

Words, namely, "which is given for you," that we first put them on the body, as far as it is given for us in death, and accordingly they may well be applied to the outward sign and sacrament, so that the sacrament may be understood the more fully, and taught the more intelligibly: That just as bread by its nature feeds, and is wrought from many grains together, and is broken and distributed in custom, so I also should learn and believe that faith, that is, the firm trust I have in the body given for me, feeds me, 2) and that love provides that I am united to the body of Christ, that is, to other believers in Christ, yes, also to the head, Christ himself. 3) Again, as I say by faith, Christ is broken for my love and for my use, killed, and divided in such a way that he is all ours, as much as we put our trust in him. Now look, the old custom of the lamb reminds us, why should not also the bread remind us?

(86) Nor is it necessary to stand in this way (4) over the word "break". We do not speak of the legs of Christ our Lamb being broken. Nay, we, seeing we also read in the Scriptures, that he was poured out like water; that he became dry as broken pieces; that he became soft as wax; that he was a worm, and not a man, Ps. 21 [22]: what then doth it grieve us, when we say that he is given up and broken, seeing that he hath given a sign, which is exceedingly fitting? That they ask me to indicate to them, when in other places the little word "body" is taken more for a figure of the body: that must grieve me lützel 5). Is it not enough that it is written here? An industrious man would find almost two hundred words (if he did not find eight), which are not written more than once in the Bible: how should one interpret them, because the Scriptures do not give them to be understood anywhere? For this reason, the evangelist Lucas takes great care not to be understood in a crude way. Even more apparently he teaches this also in the words of the drinking vessel, saying:

2) Marginal gloss: Do not be driven by it.

3) Marginal gloss: Love unites us to Christ and his members.

4) i.e. upside down.

5) lützel -less.

6) The text in the words of the parenthesis seems to be corrupted. The sense which is required here is: [So many hapaxlegomena he found, he paid any attention to it. - Perhaps it is to be read: [So many Wortes fände er, achtete er icht [i.e. any] drob.

The drinking vessel, a new testament in my blood, which will be made for you.

He who would not be at ease with quarreling would soon learn from the Luke here, for he would be more unlearned, neither the German Michel, what the blood of the testament would be in Matthew, yes, what the trade would be with each other. And therefore, that we may interpret it here in no other way, neither for a memorial of the testament, so the little word "blood" will also be a memorial in other places of the true blood, by which the testament is confirmed, and the little word "body" of the body, which was given for us. For if 1) this interpretation exists in one place, then those who can hold spiritual against spiritual, 1 Cor. 2, will well accept by a counter-attitude what the other's opinion is, because they know well what Christ has given them. All men know that the drinking vessel is not a testament, but that it is a sign of the testament is clear. Is it true? Yes. Dear man, what is it that we are pressed with such a narrow mind, that we do not allow the bread of the body to be called a sign, when it is called a body, since it is all in one text?

What the Hebrews call berith, the Greeks diathikin, the Latins testamentum, we call in German a pact or a covenant. Now, this is the covenant between God and between men, that God is their God, and that they are his people. But there can be no covenant either between two, namely between the one who makes the covenant and the one with whom he makes it. But that God is in fact a true God, that is, that he is regarded as a gracious protector and sustainer, it will be necessary for him to remit and forgive sin, and to communicate the delightful knowledge of his name. 2) But that we may be His people, it will be necessary that we obey His voice and believe Him to be merciful. As far as God is concerned, it will not need sealing that he may be sure that we trust in him and bear an inclined will toward him. Why is that? Because nothing is hidden from His eyes, and He has no need of our works. But we, who are very much afraid because of our sins, are not satisfied with the simple promises, because of our unbelief, that he will be gracious to us and inclined to us; therefore we are frightened and are not satisfied whether God swears to us yet. Dero-

1) i.e. to go; "lead" put by us instead of: foro.

2) Marginal gloss: Do not forget love, so you remain in the covenant.

Therefore, our weakness must also be strengthened with an external sign; and so that this may happen most perfectly, the wickedness of our most miserable, unwholesome pressing 3) receives a sign to which nothing can be compared. And so, because God the Father has nothing better nor more precious than His Word, which is His only begotten Son, He willed that He should take on Himself mortal flesh and blood, which He was to shed on the cross. Whoever does not trust in this sign, Christ Jesus crucified, will certainly not be in the testament, that is, in the covenant; he will also never recognize God as a father, that is, as a merciful God. He will never be able to comfort his conscience; he will not know that his sins have been forgiven him. 4) From what? Of not knowing the Son, John 7, through whom is the way to the Father, John 10; who is also the way, the truth and the life, John 14. And this testament, this covenant and pact is completed and confirmed with the death of Christ, so that we may henceforth trust in God and confess Him in truth as a Father, who did not spare His own Son for our sakes, but gave Him up for us, Romans 8. 8 Whereby we also, now made spiritual, allow the law of love to be written by His Spirit, no longer in stones but in fleshly tablets, that is, into our hearts, Jer. 31. How blessed indeed is he who understands it! Now the sealing of this covenant is such an excellent and precious sealing that it could not be greater. Nor is there greater love, neither that a man should lay down his life for his friends, nor, as much as is in him, for his enemies, nor for sinners, John 15. Nor shall such a sealing ever be reopened again, for it would indicate that this covenant had not been sufficiently strengthened by the bitter death of Christ. The fact that the Word was to become man was a sure seal of the covenant and the testament. But from the blood of the dying man all sufficiency, that we no longer lack anything, has been given to us. Therefore, for this reason, we actually call the blood a testament, that is, a seal of the covenant, insofar as it makes the covenant complete and perfect. If the blood had already been in the cup, it could not have made the covenant, for there it would also have been shed by the godless Jews. 5) How then is it possible,

3) Presten - infirmity.

4) Marginal gloss: Whether he already goes to the sacrament a thousand times.

5) Marginal gloss: If there is blood in the chalice, it is New Testament blood. O blasphemy!

that the drinking vessel there is actually a testament, that is, a seal of the testament, since the blood itself, even that which should be in the cup (as you speak of it), is not actually the testament? Why is it not a blood of the testament? Because it is not shed there in the chalice according to the perfection required by the seal of the testament. How would a heart sprinkled with this holy blood sweat accept such a sense and understanding? Would such a one 1) not profane and trample underfoot the precious blood of the testament, if he alienated it from its glory, which it has at the cross? I ever mean it. Perhaps you confess, yes, you should confess, that the testament on the cross is perfect, and next to it you would say that the blood was in the chalice, with which blood the testament is sealed afterwards; so it will also be nothing. 2) Because the same blood does not make the heart of the drinker drunk, it is too weak to help the pressing of unbelief.

It may be that one quarreled, speaking: The memory of the following suffering and bloodshed makes the hearts drunk, and the blood is nevertheless present in the cup. So I say: Thank God that you now know the new testament, so that it is useful to you, and here is a remembrance of the testament. Why is it that you, not just out of freedom, forget that the blood, in that place, 3) of the blood is a memorial? Since it is good for you and tastes good, you accept figurative speeches; since it does not taste good for you, you do not want to hear them at all, that is the deficiency of all. One more thing: The blood most of all gladdens and delights the soul for the reason that it is remembered, not drunk. It has pleased Christ to give me his blood by the way, so that I might be helped much; and not by the way, so that I might be helped little; as if he had given it to me to drink from the cup, for I derive almost little benefit from it. A Christian heart rejoices and comes to satisfaction from the joyful, faithful remembrance of the shed blood on the cross; but from this it does not come to satisfaction that the wine has become blood. 4) O woe, no! Dear, what is the sacrament? Is it not sealing to me?

90. So I am talking about [the] thing. If one speaks of it in the reason, as it belongs, the

The shed blood, the blood of Christ, is the right seal, and the body is the true sacrifice. Neither wine, nor bread, nor seal, nor sacrifice may actually be. But if you leave it out, that it is a figurative speech, and teach that they are a remembrance of the seal, then all the business is already done, and we are already one in the matter.

(91) We shall learn from the old testament that the things spoken of above are true. The old testament was carnal; therefore it was old, as the testament is a new testament, for it is spiritual. As the people are, so is the pact or testament. Now several of the same people were carnal, and yet were counted for and for among the people of God, because they kept only the laws and the given ceremonies. But God was their God and protector, they were also warmly his own people. The covenant was firm if they kept faith and did not turn to the idols honored by the pagans who knew nothing of God. For the one idolatry, or the one worship of idols and images, has been a cause of all their driving out, of all their bondage and dragging to and fro. 5) The other sins were otherwise punished in the land of Israel, so that the covenant remained untouched. Although the old law was also spiritual, because it gave a free spirit; but because it does not accomplish that which it requires, it is not worthy to be called a new law, but is legally called the old law, because it is carnal.

92) Furthermore, the fleshly covenant, and that which was only temporal, was also instituted with blood, namely with calf's blood, when it is described in Exodus 24, how Moses sprinkled the people together with the book with blood, he said: "This is the blood of the testament", or of the covenant, "which the Lord has made with you, over all these his words"; from which the Israelites were assured that they were of the people of God. The greater Jewish people also had other sacrifices, and although they did not clearly realize that they would be the perfect sacrifice (Christ) in the future, they were reminded by these sacrifices of how they were inscribed at Mount Sinai according to the given law for a people of God. The ashes of the red heifer, which they sacrificed when they worshipped the calf at Dan, served for this remembrance, Book 4, Mos 19, and they kept the same ashes in the water of desecration. Christ, however, reminds us of a greater good deed and covenant with a spiritual blood, with which blood not the blood of the Lord is sacrificed.

5) Marginal gloss: idolatry of great tribulation a well.

1) "not" is erased here by us because it is too much.

2) d. i. serve.

3) i.e. in the chalice.

4) Marginal gloss: Constantly remembering God does the trick.

The only thing that is cleansed is that which is inside. Yes, actually the will, and the wine would be blood? No, it even the external, because he came into the world to reminds me well of the testament, and it is not itself the make the whole man whole. Now in the same way as the testament.

old covenant, which was once 1) established with the people and promised to Abraham, was not renewed. No, "this is my body" to be an essential speech and forbid it was and always remained a covenant; for God was figurative speech. For this reason, I would be carrying an always God of the people, and always considered the entirely human, that is, a false interpretation, where I people to be His people, until He eradicated the old with bring forth a different interpretation, neither of which I the new and a spiritual testament came in place of the old have reported.

carnal testament. Nevertheless, they always showed their Now it would be enough with what Lucas writes, if not good deeds with carnal sacrifices and outward worship. first of all a clever one would have assumed that "shed"

Therefore, the new covenant, which is called the New Testament, which is much, much higher, more and better, does not need to be renewed, as long as we do not forget it with diligent and spiritual sacrifices, that is, with thanksgiving, whether in praising God and proclaiming and magnifying His good deeds, or in serving our neighbor through works of love. 2) This covenant of ours is an everlasting covenant; it is and will be of use to all those from the beginning to the end of the world. Who then are instructed, how may you then consider them to be rippers of the Scriptures?

94 Some will perhaps interject and say with even more words: The New Testament was ever completed at the cross, yet it began to be ours in the supper, in that we accepted the word and the sign, which is just as much as the word, in faith.

95 Answer: If they are then renewed, and their cause becomes better, I may well grant them that, but the blood is ours; and at that time the testament began to be ours, as soon as we believed in Christ our piety, and his blood was shed for us, even outside the supper; as we clearly learn from the 6th chapter of John. It is, in short, faith and the inward hearing of the Word, which hearing comes from the Father who seals our hearts with the Holy Spirit; the same faith makes us a people of God, yes, a willing people who have a desire to be obedient. I leave it at that, that we then become more certain (in the night meal) of the testament through the Spirit, 3) by the help of the sacramental instrument; but should I therefore just speak, that the sacrament would be

From the night meal from Paulo.

As Lucas was a companion of Paul, so he writes almost like Paul. At the beginning, Paul gives him credit for having taught the things he received from the Lord, namely, the custom of the evening meal, as it was kept by Christ and the apostles. At the outset, I warn against this on account of some who boast and boast in this way, as if Paul had indicated with these words that the priests had been given power to transform the body of Christ into bread with certain five words (with leave), whereas Paul only takes care that he prescribes the history of the supper, which rhymes well with his presumption; For he himself was not with Christ in the supper, but after he became a disciple, he received his teaching from the Lord, so that he might learn that Christ had left a memory behind him with the signs of his death, believing that he was extending a true love among his own. This mystery was explained by Paul before, 1 Cor. 10,

- 4) dennen - from then, out.
- 5) In the old edition: joch.
- 6) gäuchen - to fool.

1) einfart - simple. Compare § 130 of this paper, at the end.
2) Marginal gloss: The works must follow shortly.
3) Marginal gloss: Through the Spirit we become certain.

saying, "For we many are One Bread and One Body, all partaking of One Bread." How so? Notice, Paul also indicates, "The bread," he says, "which we break, is it not a fellowship of the body of Christ?" As if he were saying, "Why do we break and eat the bread? Do we not do it to testify to the fellowship and love which the death of the body of Christ, which is commonly in our hearts, makes us?" which love is so great that it unites us all as members of one body. 1)

This secret of the night meal Paul learned from the Lord, which he also taught the Corinthians before; now he tells it to them again, so that he might give a strong tryak 2) to the remnants in which they were ill, and he tells it in this way:

The Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed, took bread, and when he gave thanks, he broke it and said: Take, eat, this is the body of me which is broken for you, do this in remembrance of me. In the same way, after the supper, he took the drinking vessel, saying: "The drinking vessel, a new testament in My blood, do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.

(100) That Paul remembers the night here with few words is because he reminded the Corinthians of the custom of the paschal lamb, and of the discourse of Christ, which he spoke before the supper, as he was betrayed, as Lucas says: "This is my body, which is given for you"; so Paul says: "This is my body, which is broken for you"; and they both say "for you," and not badly above: which is given to you. Which they would have done, if they had only wanted to indicate the giving of the bread, and not rather the remembrance of death - for the breaking of the bread is also a sign of death, just as the slaughter of the lamb was also a sign. Cause, how would we eat the bread if it were broken? But if the bread is broken, and thus divided in the breaking to eat, we learn from it that we are made alive. It is true that the bread is broken for us, but the body of Christ is broken for us and to us. Now if the body of Christ is in the bread, it would not have been broken for us, but only badly for us. Do not be offended by the word "broken", if there is not already a leg broken.

1) Marginal gloss: Liebe thut allesammen.

2) "Tryaks" - theriac, remedy.

For there are many forms of breaking, as when the soul is separated from the body, it is called and is a breaking; as Christ said other things more before the supper of his death, namely, "the grain would not bear fruit, it would die"; from which it need not follow that the body of Christ, like the grain, is rotten.

(101) Paul is very diligent to understand these things when he says, "Do these things in remembrance of Christ," for this is the commandment of Christ. In the same way he says of the drinking vessel, "Do this as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." And lest anyone should take something inconsistent from the word "do this," he interprets it again, saying:

As often as you eat of the bread and drink of the drink, proclaim the death of the Lord.

We have enough glosses and comments 3) in these words of Paul. What does the Lord command us to do? Does he command us to eat his body in bread? No, he does not. Does he command us to drink blood in wine? No, he does not say so. What then? He commands us to eat of the bread and drink of the drink. What more? He calls us to have remembrance of his death. Nor do the two words "that is" have such force that we would understand that the essential body is in the bread and the essential blood in the wine. No. What did he mean by this? Nothing else, neither that we should not regard them as other bad food, which is not so well commanded to us by the Lord. They have some power, I confess, but it is not so great as to make wine and bread more honorable than all creatures. 4) No, they do not have the power. But is it not honor enough for them that they are assigned to the most sacred custom?

What should one do in Estonia? One should be mindful of the Lord, and this should not be done badly with a cold mind. For Paul interprets it this way: "Proclaim" he says, that is, often remember with sincerity, and proclaim that the body of the Lord has died and been broken for you. 5) Yes, proclaim

3) Comments - explanations. In the old edition: Comments.

4) Marginal gloss: If Christ's body and blood were there, bread and wine would be the highest creature.

5) Marginal gloss: O Christ, until earnest in the business of God.

but not in a dark corner, 1) that the pious brethren are who eats unworthily of our Lord Jesus Christ will be guilty excluded, that the rich are present, and the poor must be of the Lord's death. Paul says: "The bread is the bread of excluded. No, it is to be done publicly, for the Lord's the Lord"; 6) as he also calls the drinking vessel of the supper does not separate the poor from the rich, the priest Lord the drinking vessel. How is it that he says it is the from the layman, the learned from the unlearned, the man Lord's cup or drinking vessel? It is because the Lord from the woman; death is proclaimed to all men, and all Himself has appointed it as a memorial of His death. Dear, believers become partakers of the righteousness and merit of Jesus Christ. This custom shall not only last for a what is the cause of Paul's incurring such a heavy public penalty, namely, that he is guilty of the body, when the body is not in the bread? Do you ask? Yes. Oh, there is because the world will also remain until the future of the already a prepared answer, which is now well suited to Lord. Therefore Paul says: "Until he comes"; and with your question. Remember, if anyone desecrates or defiles these short words he indicates what other evangelists the king's image, he is punished as if he had defiled the have presented with many and different words, namely, majesty, as if he had offended the king himself. 7) The that Christ will no longer eat of the lamb, nor drink of the king's image is not to be desecrated. As one betrays fruit of the vine, until he drinks it anew in the kingdom of himself, that he does not pay much attention to God, if he the Father. Other evangelists describe the history of the takes the name of God lightly in his mouth, without need; supper when Christ was still present; Paul, however, 8) and if one desecrates a holy place, 9) he sins against looks at the proper custom of the supper that began to be the Lord of the place itself; so it is here also. If someone celebrated and kept among Christians at that time. is so unmoved by the memory of the Lord that he despises Nevertheless, they all deny, Paul and the evangelists his sign, he is undoubtedly called a reprover of the absent alike, that he will not be bodily present or that he will not body; here I mean the true natural body. By the truth, if be present. one is such an ungrateful man that he persists in

I cannot be surprised enough by those who say that grudgery, malice and ingratitude, he is guilty of death; yet the body is there in a new way, but has not yet come; that here he is given such a good opportunity of remembrance would be strange with the unpleasant angels; it would and gratitude. If the memory of death neither moves nor also be unbelievable that they would be in a place, and softens one, did Christ not die in vain? I hold it ever. If one and one would say, "In that place they are," and yet they would does not consider that he has been redeemed with such not be there, as they speak of the body, that it begins to an inestimable price, 1 Peter 2, and does not repent of his be present, but has not yet come. He is in the bread (so sins, what could make him more pious? Has our God had they say), but neither glorious nor humble. 3) I cannot anything more delicious than His Son? Has the Son been believe that the journeymen know what they are doing. 4) able to do something greater, neither to take on sinful

105 Paul further drinks and lets the bread remain a flesh like us, without sin, and to be killed innocently, like a bread for and for, saying: a sinner, for our sake? No, indeed. Since it is so, why would

And so whoever eats the bread and drinks of the cup of the Lord unworthily will be guilty of the body and the blood.

(106) Now if Paul were of your opinion, he should not the memory of such a high and precious thing?

be so stingy about words, nor so utterly indifferent 5) Now, how is it that he is guilty of this? Does it come about things. He should have said freely: He who has the from the fact that he does not believe that body

1) Marginal gloss: Publicly our praise shall be from God. 2) i.e. approximately.
3) Marginal gloss: This is the punishment of our art, so talk, and not know what.
4) aunts - talk trumpety.
5) i.e. indifferent.

6) Marginal gloss: Des HErrn Brod, nicht Bäckerbrod.
7) d. i. Violence.
8) Marginal gloss: By the song [one knows] the bird.
9) vermaßget verletzt, verunreimgt.
10) "niener" occurs only here. Maybe "nienen" - nowhere.

the body in the bread and the blood in the wine? No, Paul does not say it. This is what he says: "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. In what shall he prove himself, that he may not be guilty of the body, nor of the blood? In seeing that Christ did not die for him in vain. Who are they? They are all those who do not believe that they are justified by the righteousness of Christ, and that his death is our life, and his blood has washed away our sins. That is one thing.

The other thing is that he should also test himself in this, so that he may actually know whether Christ is feeding him. Why is this? Therefore, if Christ did not feed him, he falsely testified to being fed with the sign of the bread. Another indication is that the bread is not the body of Christ, because all those who are not fed with the heavenly bread and do not eat the flesh of Christ in faith, eat the external sacramental bread unworthily. So then, what does the sacramental meal add that faith did not give beforehand? Well, we will talk about it later.

A man must prove himself, then, whether faith "begins to work in him through love; 1) for if the greatness of such a high good deed clothes you with the new man, that is, that you love the brethren on account of Christ and everything that belongs to Christ, and are hostile to everything in which Christ is displeased, such as dishonesty, anger, pride, unfaithfulness, committing dishonest acts, and the like. For the Corinthians are punished because 2) they proclaimed the death of Christ, but just then, like the rest of them, they still did not improve on their old splendor, nor did they let it go, and they have not yet been converted to the new life, nor to brotherly love. What kind of a wrongly conceived contemplation of death is this? What hypocrisy is this, now in the rising blossom 3) of the Church? If the body that died for us does not come closer to our hearts, neither that we do not weep, nor that we are not moved to godliness, then we do not esteem it higher than a dead dog; and this is not to distinguish the body of the Lord. There are also some who interpret this saying "to discern the body of the Lord" in such a way that this little word "body" is much more than a sign of the body, because they do not discern it, and make no distinction between the holy and the common food.

1) Marginal gloss: The works must now follow.

2) Marginal gloss: Paul, a rough Moses.

3) "Blust" == Blüthe.

set. This interpretation of theirs is not the best, just as this one does not rhyme very well, that they point to the spiritual body, that [those] do not distinguish the body of the Lord, who do not fear God's community. However, our interpretation is the clearer one.

110 Now notice how often Paul says in his speech "to eat bread" and "to drink from the cup", so that no one will easily fall into another sense, because he is only miserably overtaken with insanities. For if there had been more, neither wine nor bread, the majesty of the matter would have required a more powerful and courageous speech.

Finally, he also points out the punishments of those who use the signs unworthily; a severe judgment, which also begins in this life through several severe bodily diseases, as can be seen. And so they understood the words of Paul:

For this cause many of you are weak and sick, and many sleep: for verily, if we had judged ourselves, we should not have been judged: but if we be judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.

(112) I do not object to some being punished for disregarding the sacramental custom, which is most notable in that the body of the Lord is not distinguished. From this it follows that diseases first of all affect the heart, that they are truly weak when it comes to confessing the truth, and unfit for it; they become unskilled in overcoming the desires of the mind; they become discontented when it comes to helping the brethren; 4) they are children in understanding, women in strength, and please themselves, despising all other people; they are false. But where the memory of the death of Christ JEsu truly possesses the hearts, there nothing is hindered that can serve to improve the nature. Therefore it is no wonder that while the mind is sick, the body is also afflicted with God's judgments. 5) So then, I think, it also happened to the gout-ridden man, as we have it from the words of the Lord, who says to him, "Go, and sin no more," Luc. 5. But I am much more astonished at the damage to faith and good virtues than at the above-mentioned corporal punishment, which is always connected with it.

4) Marginal gloss: Abominable to the hypocrites.

5) Marginal gloss: Becoming powerless in faith and love is certain death.

1) where one goes unworthily to the table of the Lord. And therefore it is no wonder that no people are more wicked, more venal, 2) impure, proud and merciless, neither priests nor monks. Why? Precisely because they themselves so sacrilegiously undertake the sacramental rites and holy business. For this reason we want and should judge for ourselves whether we are truly fed with the bread of heaven. For if we lived our lives without hypocrisy, we would go less astray in darkness, and we would be more manly in freely confessing the truth. Yes, I say, we would lift up our heads not only in fears, but also in the future of the Lord with a free and joyful mind. For we would know that everything we suffer here will be shot for our good.

Vom wahren rechten geistlichen Esten, from the 6th chapter of John.

Long enough we have hemmed ourselves in the words (for you have willed it so) of the supper; consequently you will not unwillingly allow us that we also step to the sixth chapter of John, and there set him as a probationer of our coin.

Paul was led by opportunity to speak of the signs. John, however, does not think of external signs at all, indeed, he only does not touch them. If it had been such a counsel of God to honor the bread so highly, it would have been even more of a miracle that such an excellent man as John, who only had a desire for high heavenly things, should pass by the matter with such profound silence. Yes, truly! The faithful evangelist John has sufficiently admonished us of all this that serves our salvation. There are some scholars who become deaf from the moment they hear some things from John about the sacraments, because he wrote nothing in particular about the sacraments. How justly they do this, they see. Who would despise the school physicians, who write only about medicine, if they do not practice medicine themselves, and yet prescribe common rules on how to maintain health, how to attain it, and how to make medicine? Yes, who would not love them more, and diligently indulge in them, 3) since they are not the only ones.

It is uncertain what illness would possibly trigger him, so that he would not need a running medicine, if it took the way that he would become ill? No one should shy away from Johannem, because he does not want to be taught; his writings are a good eye ointment for me, which are now very necessary for the supporting people, and serve well for the cause. Yes, if they are properly applied. Hardly may we recognize more cheerfully elsewhere who holds more rightly to the Sacrament. How so? So John teaches what the bread of the soul is; from whom it is served; how it is obtained and eaten. Do things not seem right to us? Do you think that it is taught in vain to teach how and in what form the flesh of Christ may or may not be eaten? Is it not good to know how far the flesh is useful or useless? The things look to me for it, one may well dissolve from the things the greatest heavy part. Cause, as soon as I understand that the meat is of no use, and that it cannot be eaten for itself.

(115) If I know that the heavenly Father alone gives me this bread, I can immediately judge what I should expect from men and from the supper. Therefore, let us also consider the things John says in chapter 6, to see if they might rhyme with our intentions. For indeed, we find in these two places, from which we may prove ourselves, whether we went to the sacrament worthily or unworthily.

In the sixth chapter we are instructed how faith or trust must be, so that we may go to the supper without danger. Other things like this are not omitted when he writes of the supper, but John does not speak of the outward signs, wine and bread. How is it? Thus it comes to pass that one should not be angry because of outward signs, for they are nowhere so great as they are made.

(117) As to the first, we are taught from the sixth chapter of John, which is the bread of souls. For indeed, a badly common bread would not do for those who suffer insatiable hunger and have sorely troubled consciences of sin. It must be only a delicious bread. Dear, what kind of bread is it? It is Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God Himself, through whom all things are created and remain in their essence. Without a doubt, it is he who can make us alive and feed us. For he says, "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall not hunger." Again: "I am the living bread that comes from heaven."

1) So put by us instead of: "der dann abweg damit hetscht."
"heischen"==follow. Cf. § 61. The meaning is: This harm always follows when one goes to the sacrament unworthily.

2) "more reasonable" probably as much as: forbidden.

3) to allow == to listen.

he that eateth of the bread shall live for ever.

The other thing we learn for the nourishment of our souls from this sixth chapter of John is this: Whence hath Christ, or whence cometh he, that he is the bread of life? Did he get it from being a son of man? No, "from that he hath it, that the Father hath sealed him. Or is it because he has a flesh, as we have? No; but hence he hath it, that he came down from heaven. Would the flesh he received from Mary the virgin, his mother, have been useful? Alas, no; but therefore it was profitable that the living Father sent him, and that he should live for the Father's sake; "for the Spirit is he that quickeneth; the flesh is not profitable."

(119) We learn, thirdly, in what manner or form his flesh becomes to us, that we may eat it, and thus proceedeth: When he was like unto God, he esteemed it not robbery to be like unto God, but poured himself out, and took upon him the form of a servant, and became like unto men, and was found in manner and form like unto men. He humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the gallows; because of this God exalted him and gave him a name above all names, Phil. 2. Christ indicates Paul's words above with the words: "For I am," he says, "come from heaven, not to do what I will, but what the Father wills who sent me, that I should lose nothing of all that he has given me, but that I should be raised up at the last day.

120 Seeing then that he, being like God, poured himself out, that is, descended from heaven. Item, he did not do his will, but the will of the Father; and that is to be obedient unto death, wherein he hath given us life. And that he might make us alive with his death, he teaches thus: "Every one that seeth the Son (that is, every one that knoweth that the Son of God hath thus humbled himself unto death, and wrought divine power on earth), and believeth in him, the same shall have eternal life."

Immediately after this he says more clearly, "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. This is just as much: my flesh will be bread for you, because I will voluntarily give it to death out of great love, so that I may make you alive.

122. so someone now reported sayings on the

sacramental bread, the same brings us a foreign sense of Scripture, as my Theophylactus also does, the Doctor Urban Rieger, 1) a distinguished man, who is learned and quite eloquent, has sought 2) to attract. But in the matter of the Sacrament, the same Urban (with leave before him) is of a lesser mind than is proper. For even though the teacher Theophylactus in other places happily directed his teaching according to Chrysostom, in that place he was sorely lacking; for these are also Chrysostom's words, which he speaks of John's saying reported before, saying: "Christ calls Himself a bread of life from causes, that He may strengthen our present and future life." It is true, Chrysostom confesses, that Christ's speech refers to the Sacrament, but in a different way; for in the next 47th homily, after Nothdurft, he indicates what his opinion is, how one should understand his words when he speaks of the Sacrament, saying: "What is to be understood carnally? This is when one understands a thing simply as one speaks of it, and considers nothing else; one should not judge visible things in this way either. No, one should view the mysteries with the inward eyes, that is, spiritually." So much Chrysostom.

In other places Chrysostom admonishes this even more clearly, saying: "As soon as the inward eyes see the bread, they fly over the creatures, and do not think of the bread that the baker has baked, but they think of him who has made for himself a bread of life, who is then signified by the sacramental, or by the spiritual bread. I am also sorry, on account of the same Urbani, that he does not note it better, that it is not Athanasius whom he cites for this, but just the previous Theophylactus; although he is not to be despised, he is nevertheless in the business of the sacrament nothing careful, not at all. However, his words may not receive anything, because 4) they are of the kind that Chrysostom has in him, who likes to talk about signs rather than about the essential things that are signified by the signs.

You will also find that all the old teachers call the body and the blood the sacrament of the body and the blood; enough has been said about this in my previous booklet, so there is no need to repeat it here.

1) Urbanus Rhegius.

2) "jerked" perhaps: taken out.

3) "his revenge of the words" perhaps: his questions about the words.

4) "for" put by us instead of: the.

The book of the Lord's Supper, which went out under the name of Cyprian, has deceived many people, and all who know Cyprian a little better will give evidence of it. That it is a false and secretly patched up book is easy to assume: for the dissolute man who wrote the book says in the preface that he wants to keep his name secret; which Cyprianus would by no means have done; and therefore it appears that it was never 1) a monk. But the things that he accuses, along with other evidence gathered here and there in heaps, I myself have long since considered, and in the past accused some of them of the same. But now we are sure what the old teachers' opinion is. Well, this is therefore poorly resolved in passing. Let us return to the things that John says:

126. "The bread that I will give is my flesh." From this it is seen what is the use of Christ's flesh, and what is the unusefulness of it, and how far it is useful or not useful. But because it is the flesh of Christ, and is given for the life of the world, if it be believed, it truly feedeth; but if it be put into the mouth, or into the stomach, it profiteth the soul nothing at all.

The flesh of Peter, or the flesh of Moses, would have been of no use, God grant, if it had been eaten or sacrificed. But the flesh of Christ may (as Cyril rightly speaks of it) make alive; for the flesh is agreed to the word of God. Still so the presence of the flesh serves no purpose. The disciples who learned it did not like to understand such a flesh's worthiness, and therefore they were annoyed. For how would carnal men see glory in the cross, wisdom in foolishness, and life in death? The trouble became very great when the flesh was taken from the earth, when Christ received a name above all names for the great deep humility.

In that John saith, This offendeth you? how then, if ye see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? For the Spirit gives life, the flesh is of no use," thus he will speak: Then, forsooth, all vexation will cease from the true disciples, when they shall see divine power, from which Christ rose again, and ascended into the heavens, and so the flesh will no longer be present; for the fleshly presence was a hindrance to the disciples in the sending of the Holy Spirit, John 16. Yes, even then, forsooth, the truth will not be any the less present in all the world.

1) i. e. approximately.

Then it will undoubtedly be that Christ is a son of God, and those who believe the words that I speak into their hearts, they will be a spirit and a life. That is so much, the same my words will be a good tax for them to a spiritual life, that they are henceforth no longer minded after the flesh, and so in this way my flesh will be food for them (the believers), and my blood a drink. Not for the sake of any other food, but just for the sake of faith, which faith is not false or hypocritical, but a brave faith, so that the heart is born anew through it, and thus begins to fear and love God. After that, when it is so well fattened with faithful, diligent remembrance, that it also breaks forth into works and thanksgiving; and this is the eating of Christ's flesh only, for in the supper he did not give his flesh, but only bread to eat.

But if one said: One must or should eat the body, then it will be necessary that he put a figurative speech from the word "eat". But since, in short, there is no other food, neither reported above, it should not have been recognized that bread is the essential body. Note also this, that just as it is not a violent figurative speech to say, "My flesh is indeed meat," so it is not a forced figure to say, "This is my body. The reason is that in the two sayings the little word "is" is used only very subtly. [Those people who eat the flesh in faith, the essential thing, the true body and blood of Jesus, is not only shown to them by the outward sign, but it is shown to them by faith. How? That the body is essentially present? No. How then? So that it becomes ours, just as it was ours before. I will gladly confess that the body is present, yes, especially when the enjoyment it produces is given and present, namely, the knowledge of the Father's mercy, which knowledge is the only food of conscience. 3)

The fourth thing we learn from the sixth chapter of John is what enjoyment or use this spiritual food has. Yes, what is its use? The spiritual food remains and makes us remain until eternal life. That he may have it, saith Christ, Whosoever cometh to me shall never hunger; and whosoever believeth in me shall never thirst. He further says, "Him that cometh to me, I will not

2) d. i. such.

3) Marginal gloss: Hear, O Christ! Hear.

throw out." Item: "He that eateth of the bread shall live for ever." And, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day: he that eateth me shall live because of me." Further, "[Those] who ate the manna died, but whoever eats this bread [will] live forever." These first told tidings are also a cause that we do not let it happen just so above, that one makes the body into the bread, or out of the bread. For, by the truth, the words can be taken for revealed words, and promise without proverb 1) life to all who eat and drink in this way. 2) And if any man but eat or drink of it, 3) he shall have in himself the fountain of life; and he shall have no more need of it, neither to eat, nor to drink.

Item 131: If your opinion existed, there must be two ways to salvation. One way would be to believe that the body that should make us alive is in the bread. The other way would be this: that faith, that is, the good firm trust in Jesus Christ crucified, made us blessed. From this it follows that one who wanted to be saved would have to derive as much benefit from the supper as he derives from the cross. Now, how can or how should a man prove himself, if he hopes for remission of his sins from the supper, since he has not obtained such remission beforehand by faith in the death of Christ? If the body of Christ can be eaten and the blood drunk in the way you speak of, there is a worry that malediction will come upon all those who do not drink wine or who are ill, and that their consciences will suffer evil. For as soon as they hear, when the sacraments are administered, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you." Who now would be well pleased with the fencing, if he ever had clear words here. However, one should be glad that these words of John do not serve for the supper, although, if the opinion of the dead body existed, I could not see it, as this whole 6th chapter does not belong to the sacrament. For that is ever so, Christ will not work such excellent miraculous signs without a particularly great cause, understand that his body is in the bread, and one body in many places, and as many altars as many bodies. No, indeed!

132. fifth. Who gives this bread, and

1) "Pronoun" probably as much as "circumlocution".

2) Marginal gloss: May all devils not overthrow this. 3) i.e. serious.

From whom shall it be desired? From the Father who is in heaven. For thus saith the Lord, I have told you, ye have seen me, and have not believed. All that my Father gives me comes to me." Item: "Moses did not give this bread from heaven, but my Father gives you the true bread from heaven, and no one may come to me, but the Father draws him. It is written in the Prophets: They are all taught by God. Therefore every one that hath heard and learned of the Father, let him come unto me." Christ pollinates his speech, saying: "No one may come to me unless it is given him by the Father."

Will all people have this bread? No, no. Who then? Only those who have longed for it, and those who are drawn by the Father. Therefore, no one will have this bread with his own strength, nor with the experience of many scriptures.

134) Sixth, we learn how and when we received this bread. For thus we receive the bread, if we work a meat that fadeth not away, and if we follow neither the world, nor the things that are in the world, but custom, 4) honor, riches, yea, I say, even ceremonies, and all that is under and less than Christ. Yea, then first of all we receive this bread, and work an incorruptible meat, if we seek JEsu(m) Christum, the Son of Gattes, who showeth divine deeds, with great desires, and if we esteem all things as filth, as Paul did, that we may win Christum.

(135) And when they asked, What is to be done? "This," said Christ, "is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath sent: and verily I say unto you, He that believeth in me hath everlasting life. Well then, if we seek the flesh of Christ in bread, do we not receive it from the hands of man, whose only gift we should expect from the hands of the one Father? Moreover, if Christ will be in a wheat loaf, he will start to be ours in another way, neither in eating by faith. But this is not so. For Christ is not eaten in any other way, nor can he be eaten in faith alone.

136. seventh, we learn from examples who have eaten the flesh of Christ or not. Peter has eaten the flesh of Christ and drunk his blood, therefore he says, "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life, and we believe and confess that you are the Son of the living God." How well the flesh of Christ tasted to Petro, and how useful it was to him.

4) Maybe: "Belly"?

No one can know how much it pleased him, since he himself was enlightened by the Father. But Judas, who is a model of all hypocrites, was the one who did not eat the flesh among the disciples, but he was the devil, and remained so; and he was also, without doubt, an instrument of wrath, and one who would betray his Master, whom, after so many great deeds of miracles, he thought only bad for a man, like another. We see it even today in the descendants of Judea, how far they depart from Christ, in whom there is only one great faith. So much from the sixth chapter of John, from which we are told who they are that eat the flesh of Christ, and in what manner and ways it may be eaten. Therefore, there is more than one thing that denies 1) that the Lord Christ used and spoke a figurative speech in the supper.

137 I also added the things that Christ, as John writes, said in the supper about his departure and about the desolation of Judea. Item, how many obstacles his bodily presence brought to the future of the comforting spirit. Item, of the one commandment of Christians, that is, of love. Of humility, of the patience we should have in adversity, as Christ our Master did before. But these things do not do much to explain who they are that have brought the true natural sense into the Scriptures, above that which is now reported. Therefore I leave it.

138) But this I must still answer some who say: If then the true believers find salvation through the one faith and eat Christ in the one faith, never thirst, and live forever, even if they then 2) never come to the evening meal; what need is there of the custom? I would have said to them that this custom should be ordered for this very reason, because the blessed have a desire to proclaim their blessedness to other people, and to thank the Benefactor, and to draw all people, as much as they can, to the glory of God, which is done in any case in the proclamation of the Word and in the exhortations. Nevertheless, human frailty is also somewhat diminished, in that Christ has instituted outward signs, with which such would be spread and praised, as with a sincere 3) welcome, so also otherwise with

writings and words. One would also be poorly united without external signs in one and the same service of God. One should also keep such external signs instituted by Christ with all honor in all purity, truth and love. If we love Jesus, who died for us, we should also love our brothers, who are members of the body, and help them as appropriate. For this purpose the supper custom serves not only a little, but also Jesus Christ will dwell in us much more blessedly, neither in bread. Who JEsus Christ is for eternity given. Amen.

Now, my Billican, as you have heard, so my heart understands the words of the supper. I trust God, it understands them Christianly and blamelessly. But after you let the light come to you, you will see that all things are much clearer and smoother than you would have thought. That you want to excuse my Tertullianum, he was of a short memory, I say so:

Tertullianus does not accept this excuse of Heine, because it is obvious that he was not such a forgetful man that he forgot the highly famous words of the supper; he also does not speak in the person of Marcioni, because the whole text there screams against it. And therefore it seems good that you had more to do, neither that you consider all things. However, I would like you not to consider his words, which he introduces against the Marcionian heretics, as a small, unremarkable argument, since he says: "The truth of the body is signified by the signs"; for you will find the same in Chrysostom and Jerome. His speech is also suitable for the same time, in which not a few Manichaeans were present.

141) What hinders you, so Tertullianus writes to the housewives at the second book, saying: "The man should not know what you eat secretly before the food, and if he would know it, he does not believe that bread is that one speaks that it is. What is it that penetrates you here? How would a pagan pig distinguish between the holy and the unholy? How would a pig judge from the stones of the earth? How would he call the bread a holy corpse, who bravely denies that Christ rose from the dead? Do you think he would believe that the bath of regeneration is what it is called? Tit. 3. I do not mean it."

How often do teachers, when they speak of the sacraments, exhort the consecrated, that is, the faithful, to know what is being said? You should

1) disputes == disputes.

2) Perhaps it should be read: "dannethin" i.e. fernerhin.

3) i.e. about one, any one.

For this is not Tertullian's opinion, that he understood the figure of the supper in such a way that he thereby raised the truth, that is, the true body. No. Beyond that, the name figure also does not enforce such. For if the name figure enforced such a thing, you would also have to say that Christ was only a ghost; for we read of Christ in Phil. 3 that he was invented in figure or form, like a man. Everything that shows the likeness of a thing, we call a figure, which one might also call a sign or a sacrament.

143) The rest of the things we have just said before; therefore, even if Tertullianus insists on his opinion, Christ will no less be our brother, who has put on our true flesh to make us alive.

Further, that you like my Swabian booklet, I truly do not know whether you have read it with open and alert eyes or not. Truly, lest I be a superior judge, methinks they have badly failed in that they want to be seen as having forgotten neither discipline nor love in their writing; cause, which write for unity's sake, they arrange their writings differently, neither they have done.

I ask God to forgive them and to do them good. Oh that God would want it to be my business alone, how I would gladly swallow even more evil words, and not say a little word about it. But it is the business of truth, which it is not proper to neglect. I have answered them as much as the Lord has given me. Those who read and examine your writing and my answer against each other will perhaps find out whether you or I have dealt with these matters more honestly.

Finally, by entrusting me to the prayers of good friends, you are doing me a special service; you cannot serve me any better. My request to you is that you also pray to God for me always, so that I will not forget you. May Christ grant that we may long help one another with prayer and exhortation, for the benefit of the Christian community and for the glory of His name. Farewell.

Here are two sermons, containing that one should not separate brotherly love because of the Lord's Supper. Also on the worthiness of the sacrament, with brief rejections of many objections of the opponents, preached by John Ecolampadium of Basel, pastor of St. Martin's there.

O God, save the prisoners!

18. Johann Oecolampad's two sermons on the worthiness of the Lord's Supper. *)

Held on 21 and 24 December 1525.

The first sermon

Of the Worthiness of the Sacrament, done by John Ecolampadium from St. Thomas Day [21 Dec. 1525] on the Gospel, read according to the time, John 20.

But in the evening of the same Sabbath re.

1 Watch wonders, one hears also a quarrel among the disciples of the Lord, because of a thing that is not to be despised in any way, and just in the Easter. The ten disciples told Thomas that Christ had risen from the dead, but Thomas opposed it. But so the quarrel is well tolerated, for he was fearful. Christ has

The ten disciples who had received mercy were friendly toward Thomas, although he was a little more deliberate. Those ten disciples, having obtained mercy, were friendly toward Thomas, although he was a little more superior. 2) Thomas, on the other hand, also took care that no harm would come to love out of this³⁾ span, even though he did not believe their words that Christ had been resurrected, and nevertheless remained with them.

1) i.e., on neither side.

2) "superior" - too much, not to suffer, peevish. Cf. Col. 629, § 89.

3) d. i. Discord.

*) These two sermons appeared in 1526 together with the previous "Responsibility" and the "Antisyngramma" without indication of the place under the title: *Apologetica Jo. Oecolarapadii*. The separate title of the sermons is: *Vs äiMitats kuoärlstiaak serraouk" äuo*. They are translated into German by Ludwig Hetzer. We give the text according to the old edition of Walch.

But how should Christ, who is a prince of peace, Isa. 9, and a God of love, Joh. 4, hold himself in the chip? Should he despise Thomam, who did not have a bad temper at all, whether he was well-headed? or should he let the erring sheep go? Oh woe, no. What is he doing? He brings the erring sheep to him, now that he has risen, which he redeemed only before on the cross. He also lets him go free of this error and makes him a confessor of his glory.

Now God would have us even to this day live with and among one another in such gentleness, and not be so carnal, but truly spiritual. Since all things, in our time, are full of quarrels, I have no doubt that the gentle Christ would also settle our quarrels in a short time. Yes, we have no reason to complain about him, for he is today the same Christ that he was before, Heb. 13. Therefore we should not despise anyone, if we are taught by others about God. Out with strutting! Out with selfish, self-seeking love! One should kindly instruct the rude. But if we are of a slow mind, and even now and then dwell in darkness, even if we are not all of the same mind in all articles, all this does no great harm; so far, only let our heart be taught, and keep strong peace. Yes, everything, one only sins nowhere against love. Let us have an unquenchable desire for the truth, and the truth, which is Christ, will not be far from us. O it is evil that Herod and Pilate became one for Christ's sake, and yet the disciples of Christ, and those who confess and preach one God, are divided among them, Luc. 23. The lamb and the wolf will be one, and cannot the sheep remain one among themselves? Isa. 11 Certainly, as soon as we indulge our sensualities, we will never see an end to the strife, nor the growth of truth.

(3) Well, though our adversaries are not almost humble, let us give them a soothing account of the faith, and especially of the things which they accuse us of concerning the sacrament. For I fear that some of the fainthearted might run away because of their sacrilegious cries, 1) or become even more despondent. Moreover, Christmas Day is approaching, on which (as I hope) your many will testify with the holy sacramental sign of brotherly love. Therefore, I will speak about it a little more clearly, not only from the cause,

1) "lausen" put by us instead of: zausen.

That you may learn from it how others wrongly judge us; but whether there be any who have not hitherto noted the opinion of sacramental mysteries to the very best, that he, now and more fully reported, order his life in such a way that he give no occasion to the adversaries to persuade.

(4) Let us begin with the things which those throw at us from the text of the Gospel now read, to whom it is not sufficient for the glory of Christ, which we confess in the articles of our faith founded in holy Scripture. Namely, they are not content that the most holy body of Christ is seated in heaven at the right hand of the Father, but they also say that it is essentially in the bread. For as soon as the simple-minded meet them with their vile reproaches, that their opinion is contrary to common sense, yea, that they also test in the mouth another thing, neither do they teach, of which also the eyes, the ears, and other senses bear witness; well then, from this hour they wipe out the saying of the Lord out of this gospel, and say, "Blessed are they which have not seen, and believe," from which then they make such a reckoning. Well then, though the senses mean another, and the things we speak feel none, for we know that our sensuality is deceived: so let not the words deceive. Concerning "such is the faith of those things which are not seen," Heb. 11. This is the adversary's speech. But let us diligently consider where the meaning of the words is directed. It is undeniable that there is no mention of the sacrament in today's Gospel, but that only the faith of the resurrection is strengthened. But if it were proper to argue that one must believe everything that one does not see, we would also want to prove that an ox is stuck in a pea, and a mosquito is an elephant; indeed, it would not be a lie so hideously large that one would have to believe it, because one does not see it. From this, however, the actual meaning of this saying may be written. Christ, our Lord, has it in custom that he praises the faith of Abraham and the archfathers, saying: that all the trusted ones 2) in him are true children and true successors of Abraham, Luc. 19, as the Zachaeum, together with those who come from the going out and the going down of the sun, and will rest with Abraham in the kingdom of heaven, Matth. 8. 8. On the other hand, he also said that the Jews were not children of Abraham, but of Bastarte, and were even of the kind of Abraham, John 8. So Christ also looks in this place upon the fathers, that they believed

2) Familiar == those who trust.

They had been admonished only by word, without any 4) and so much more, the more hidden it is; for Christ sign, and so Thomas was unequal to his 1) brothers in that says, "Unless I go, the Comforter will not come. Now case, in that he did not believe even after the deed. saving faith comes neither from the flesh, nor from the Therefore he says to him: O Thomas, the sign does not blood, but from the Holy Spirit, who draws us away from make you blessed, yes, it punishes you, the true believers the flesh; for in order that we may be saved, we must, for believe the word without sign.

the sake of necessity, leave all that is not highest and (5) Furthermore, if the adversaries would deny that this best, and pass quickly by. All who cling to the flesh are sentence was said in the church and rhymed with their easily repelled. But the few who cling to the word have assumption of the sacrament, we will find that it is closer already conquered these things; nothing can harm them. to our opinion than to theirs, and that they fall by their own The faith that the Lord requires of us is presented at the sword. Why? For this very reason, one should first have end of this Gospel (as in many other places) in few words. publicly stated with an undeniably clear word of God that For all these things which are written are written, that we the bread is the body of Christ, and therefore one should may believe that Jesus is the anointed Son of God, and not waver in this, because it would be just and precisely that believing we may have life. This is the faith that is so. God granting that human or angelic reason would be commanded us in the Scriptures, and not the delusion against it, would be equally valid. Yes, that is the defect, that the bread is the body of Christ. Many other things that that one offers it with cheerful words. But if they cry out, Christ did are of no concern to us, therefore they are "This is my body," there are many other causes that do conveniently omitted; but what is necessary is here not allow one to take all 2). from these words, that the opened in one sum. If, however, taste and sight deceive bread is the essential body of Christ, or that the body in and hinder us in this place, we legally understand by sight the bread is also in heaven. This is a freer thing: it is found all preconception of bodily presence, for preconception or in the writings of the papists themselves, 3) that this sense postconception hinders no less than sight itself. It also [understanding], that the body is in the bread (or that the happens that the things one sees before one's eyes do bread is the true body), cannot be obtained or grasped not draw the mind away from contemplation; but this from the clear words of the evangelists, but comes only never happens if someone models something for him, so from the fact that the church has thus recognized it. The that his mind is not prevented from resting. If I were to say others, too, will never conquer together that the essential that the body was in the bread and that I was convinced body is in the bread, or that the bread is the true body, of it, it would happen suddenly and in a miraculous way, even if they use their art and all their speed, because God human stupidity would not be able to refrain from such an wanted to punish us for our sins, so that we step away innovation of higher things. From which it follows that the from His light. Now, since the bodily presence is not Christ, because he wanted to take the flesh from our proved by divine words, no one should urge us not to eyes, Apost. 1, he also willed that we should be believe our sensitive senses, so that we eat bread for withdrawn from the imagination of his bodily presence; meat, gall for sugar. Yes, it would be foolish to urge and in order that we may be saved, we must fly above anyone to believe without a displayed word, for "how will everything that is not the highest. In order that I may they believe if they do not hear?" Rom. 10.

discover the trade even more cheerfully, I will indicate it (6) If it is a matter that the helpful control of the face and with an example, and set it thus: I have imagined myself the sensuality are detrimental to the saving faith, then also talking to God in the dark of midnight and contemplating the bodily presence of human afflictions will be a blessing. something high, when it happens that my dearest benefactor sits down bodily next to me, whom I neither

see nor hear, nor grasp, I alone know,

1) "his" put by us instead of: his.

2) d. i. such.

3) Marginal gloss: The bishop *Ravensis* has written it.

4) Marginal gloss: If the small harms, the larger also harms.

5) i. e. approximately.

that he is with me; how is it, then, that his nimble, unforeseen presence did not confuse me, and did not separate my mind from the higher thoughts I had resolved to think? How is it possible that the presence of the body of Christ, which is so full of miracles, and in which contemplation strives, no longer deters the mind, neither that it may properly use and exercise itself in the memory of the suffering of Christ? There we show ourselves our hypocrisy by saying: Yes, we believe it, if only we do not believe it.

(7) It is true that the fathers who believed in the word did not need to be present in the flesh, yet they were saved. Therefore, it is unnecessary for our adversaries to apply this saying, "Blessed are those who have not seen and believe," to their opinion, for it will be on our side that this is the meaning: Blessed are those who have believed without bodily presence; this is the faith God wants us to have in what He wants to be believed.

8 Further, as one easily answers their childish reproaches, so also one soon answers their abusive words with which they sprinkle us. First, they cry out that we defile and destroy divine sacraments. Secondly, they complain that Christ, the spouse, who is the most beautiful among men, is being removed from the Church 1). Thirdly, the spiritual food of souls, together with its precious treasure, is taken away by us. Fourth, they cry out that the very body and blood of Christ, above which there is nothing more divine in all this world, is stolen by us. They do not take pleasure in this, they go at us more boldly, saying: "We have nothing in our commonwealth but wine and bread; we have neither God nor Christ. They and their swine (so the opponents say) live at home just as deliciously as we do; although we already have much, they esteem the sanctity of bread just as highly as a loaf of bread given in the honor of Saint Ulrich, or Saint Hupertus, or another saint. Above all these disgraceful speeches they attribute to us the disbelief of the Jews, which Jews are always repugnant to the sacrament of the Christians. They say that the ancient Jews were higher in worship because of their ceremonies and sacrifices than we are. I would have liked to do all these things for my own sake, just as I heard and realized it.

not. But I must not do it from the unused 2) and weak, because the truth must be discovered aloud. I ask you to resolve patiently, I will not say anything ungodly. Things are not so bad yet, they can still be helped.

(9) First of all, that we deny the sacraments their honor and take it away is a lie. Yes, it is true, we deny their honor, and we desire that their honor remain unharmed. 3. But this true honor does not stand in the adorning of garments; it does not stand in adorned and gilded vessels; it does not stand in great, delicious torches, and the like. No, God has never desired any of these things, nor praised them, nor loved them. What does God desire? He desires purity of faith; He desires truth without falsehood and hypocrisy; He desires innocence, love and the like. All these things we desire to build. Now, if Christ had first considered external things, indeed, he would have considered them first. But he is the one who dispensed with us from external things and taught us not to cling to the elements of this world. Dear, consider our cause and the cause of the adversaries against each other; they will be disgraced if only one makes a cross too small. [But those who first run from the harlots over the altar or to the sacrament, spiritual usurers, death-beaters, people-shamers, blasphemers of the word of God, the greatest blasphemers are good companions and patrons to them, keep them honest, if they have only the papal way, that is, ungodly, messt. Which one do you think defiles the sacraments, us or them? Which one should not be suffered? Which one is detrimental to God's community and the sacraments? You know it well yourselves, and you see it before you. And so much for now.

You also see that they are more guilty than we are in other cases. We find ourselves quite innocent, God grant how they bark and rave against it; cause, that with which they subject themselves to make us hateful to all, is only worth nothing, nothing at all. For who are we to take away the church's sponsor, of whom it is said that he will cling to his wives, and they two will be one flesh, Genesis 3? they will never learn this from our words.

(11) Just as we do not take away the spouse of Christ from the church, so we do not take away the spiritual food of the souls, but we bring it forth.

1) i.e. taken away.

2) i.e. untried, inexperienced.

3) "Aufmen" probably as much as: raise.

(12) But it is fitting that they should remind us here of the marriage. For as Christ is the spouse of the church, so he also feeds her with flesh and waters her with blood, for both (the marriage and the feeding) take place in faith alone; it is also unnecessary that neither in the marriage nor in the supper there should be bodily presence. If our adversaries dream of a carnal supper, they undoubtedly also dream of a carnal marriage. But nothing, far be it from the congregation of God with such blasphemy! God has married us to him in faith, in mercy and in pardons, as Hosea says Cap. 2, we also cleave to him in faith. So also (by faith) what Christ has becomes ours, and our things become Chrisü. He endured words of shame that he might make us honorable; he was poor that he might make us rich; he died that he might make us alive. His glory, his righteousness, his inheritance, in sum, all that he has is our own; 1) but we have no need of his bodily presence for it. Christ, our spouse, remains with his own and is helpful to them, even if he is not already present in the flesh. Yes, I say, whether he is already not bodily present. Yes, I say, even if he is not present in body, he has promised to be present with his power, with his help and with his blessing, and he is. Still we are not the people who make him absent. No. He (Christ), when it was convenient for him, departed to his Father. Of this his bodily absence he foretold, Matt. chap. 9, saying, "The bridegroom's children may not grieve, because the bridegroom is with them; but the time cometh, that he shall be taken from them." When Paul said, Phil. 1: "I desire to be redeemed and to be with Christ," Christ was never with him. Do you mean whether Paul ran to the sacrament house or box? No, of course not. Where then? He went to heaven, where he also told us to go. "If ye be risen," saith Paul, Col. 3, "seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of the Father: for this is our citizenship, our headship, and our treasure. 2) True believers in faith know well that Christ cannot be taken away from them, because their faith remains firm and sound.

13) Now see who is more careful, the one who is the most careful.

1) Randglosse: Ein Mümpfeli [- mouthful d. i. a small consolation] für ein betrübtes Herz.

2) Marginal gloss: For faith keeps him.

To teach faith, whether it be those who teach spiritual adultery by their own works, or whether it be those who will not hear that we live and are saved by faith. Do not they abolish faith who give it so little, and so the bridegroom himself? I think so, they accept the bridegroom. There is also another holy marriage, in which the Word of God, John 1, thus made flesh, has taken our nature, and has accepted it in such a way that he will not leave it henceforth. And who is this who assumes that Christ is not our spouse in this way? Yes, I also firmly believe that the Word did not leave the flesh even in death; and therefore, since he bears our flesh, we also bear his flesh, for his divinity is so powerful that, just as his flesh was resurrected, so we also will be resurrected. As he in his flesh, yea, hold [!], in our flesh, ascended up to heaven, so shall we also ascend. That every godly man may swear to him with five words 3) that he may enter into bread: o we do not desire this, and yet we do not fear that in that case anything will be detrimental either to Christ or to us. They should tell us 4) where the holy scripture speaks differently of the marriage of Christ.

(14) This is also the answer we give to the spiritual food of souls. How and what kind of food it is is sufficiently evident from its marriage. For in like manner as we are espoused to Christ in faith, so also we are fed with the flesh of Christ through faith. This is clear from the 6th chapter of John, which cannot be interpreted in any other way. Here we again conquer that blasphemy is legally attributed to those who praise faith exactly and little, and ascribe blessedness to works. They say, however, except what is the food of souls! Indeed, the food of souls and the food of angels is one food. The angels are guided by the wisdom and knowledge of God, and remain in their nature from God's Word. So also our souls are not led in any other way, neither with the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ: for "this is life eternal (says Christ), that they may know thee, that thou only art the true God, and that thou hast sent Jesus. This knowledge, if it is true and without falsity, makes alive; it feeds, it delights, it satisfies and fattenes the soul. This is the difference between the angels and us, that we see by faith and by hope, that they see by faith and by hope.

3) In the old edition: complain.

4) i.e., to speak out.

In short, there is nothing that feeds the soul, 1) but only the highest wisdom, and everything that is contrary to this is pure poison. Now we teach and preach this doctrine publicly, and this one thing grieves us, that they receive so little, and that the several part speak another and do another. The unbelievers deprive themselves; or if the blame is ever to be ascribed to anyone, then those will be guilty who take it amiss that faith is so highly emphasized in the sermons, and worry that something might be taken away from the works. But nothing is taken away from the believer, because he keeps his treasure. What is the treasure? It is not the bodily presence, but it is the Word by which all things were created, which also dwells in the hearts of believers. Nevertheless, this treasure is also in our hearts, because our heart is with him in heaven. Example: If a man had a field far away in a foreign land, and yet needed and enjoyed the fruit that grew on it, and it remained his own, so that all the income served him home, who would say that the field was taken from him? Rather, what harm does it receive? None. See, it is the same here with the body of Christ. Christ is your gift, the Father has given it to you; Christ was born for your benefit; Christ suffered for your benefit; all that he has is yours; his glory is yours, his inheritance is also yours; yes, all the fruits that may come to you from him you already possess in hope. Therefore, dear Christian, do not be frightened by the adversary's taunts, 3) indeed, by their shameful persuasions, for their words of shame go out from their own heads. So we have our bridegroom, we enjoy spiritual food, and are also rich from our treasure; give as they swarm.

(15) Now let us go from the first disgraceful speech to the other, with which they mockingly blast among the common people: in our churches there is nothing else but wine and bread. I wonder why they are allowed to speak like this; do they say this because they hear the words wine and bread, supper, table and meal called? O the cause is too bad for them to speak of us in this way; for we do not sin, even though we call the sacraments by the words wine and bread, since the Holy Spirit also is the Holy Spirit of God.

thus by Paulum 1 Cor. 10. and 11. and by the Evangelists spoke. Now we will not be more learned than he is. Cause it is bread, and will remain bread, because there is some bread left. Nevertheless we do not speak that it is only a badly common bread. Although it is, as far as matter is concerned, no different from the bread we eat at home, it is still not bad bread. But that it is bread, the mice and the worms give evidence, whether it already denies the pope's heap. Yes, indeed, it is nothing but bread before and after the use, and therefore it is not necessary to keep it in the boxes with such great idolatry, for it is only bread; nor did Christ appoint it to be used for idolatry.

(16) Lest anyone think us sacrament abusers, let us freely declare how highly we hold the sacrament. If the twelve shewbreads in the law were not common bread, and yet had no difference in matter from other common bread, Leviticus 25, 1 Kings 21, how much more will there be nothing common or bad in this sacrament, even though the true body is not in the bread, provided that only the due thanksgiving does not remain undone!

17. at the beginning: Everything that Christ has commanded us is exceedingly dear to us, be it, stop [!], however indifferent 4) it may be. Even if he had commanded us a small pebble, he would have given us a thing that was dearer to us, neither a precious stone. Isn't it so, that the bad simple-minded people feel a special charm, if one brings stones or water out of the holy land of Jerusalem? How much more then will they take heed to a thing that Christ commanded us? For he never commanded to be astonished at the things brought out of Jerusalem, no doubt because they did not serve superstition. All that Christ Himself ever personally tried (though bitterly) is almost dear and pleasant to us. Christ starved; therefore hunger is also a blessed thing to us. Christ died; therefore death is also sweet to us. Christ was blasphemed and reviled with the shame of the cross; therefore we also have the cross honestly. How much more, then, should we be commanded by the sacred custom of the Supper! For Christ himself has used it, he has commanded it to us; therefore the thing is well commanded to us. Because now the

4) i.e. indifferent.

1) Marginal gloss: Meat is also not a food.

2) sth - anyone; "sth" put by us instead of: sthan.

3) i. e. chatter.

The gifts of other friends of ours, which we nevertheless possess at times contrary to their will, are so much valued by us: how then shall we mock the custom commanded us by Christ himself in the last supper? If you measure the worthiness of him who commanded you, who he is, and who you are, and how excellent is that which he commanded you, then it will not seem bad to you. 1) Thou art a sinner worthy of many hells, and otherwise unworthy of all good. [But he that commandeth is the Son of God, the firstborn of all creation, by whom and from whom all things were created, who is dear to the Father, and without measure; yea, he and no other hath commanded it. So because of Christ, the instigator, the sacraments are holy and venerable.

18 Secondly, the things by which Christians are told and enlightened of more divine business are held more sacred by them than other things. For this reason, we have the evangelical and biblical Scriptures, from which we have received salvific teaching, in all fairness, but in honor. That is why people swear by the Gospel and gild the Bible. No Christian would tolerate that they were spurned or burned. Now the sacraments are also in the place of books, for according to their interpretation they are sacred signs and belong to divine things, and teach just as the Scriptures do. And so we say not only that bread is bread, but that it is a sacrament, that is, a holy sign, yes, a sacrament; but not of every bad thing, but, we say, that it is a holy sacrament of the most holy body of Christ. It also reminds us of the holy body, how it was given and died for us, making us alive, and thus being our spiritual bread, which is skillfully signified by the material bread. Nothing holier can be taught in all books than this bread teaches, as now heard. But lest a coarse man should understand the signs to be 2) lollipop, the words have also been added which indicate 3) clear. Others use mockery, as Paul testifies in 1 Cor. 14, who speak with unknown tongues. But we speak good German, which is understood by the most common children, and has the greater power to move the hearts of men.

19) This also refers to the fact that the believers in Christ in all the world have nothing more sacred, neither the memory of the Lord's death, which is the only thing they have.

This is the night feast, which is celebrated so brightly as Christ commanded, saying, "Do this in remembrance of me," Luc. 22, 1 Cor. 11; indeed, it happens so brightly that nothing makes a person more joyful to remember the passion of Christ. How can anyone say that there is nothing but wine and bread when the remembrance of our Lord's suffering is held in high esteem?

There are people who kill those who turn back idols and images; who also, perhaps moved by divine zeal to shun idolatry, have done it wrongly. How angry they would be with those who do not honor the memory of death! They say that we teach in the right, if only we confess that the body is present. To whom we reply: The memory of the body that suffered for us is more than its presence. Understand me right, I am not saying that the memory is more, neither the body itself. Well, I say that the memory is more neither the presence of the body. Of what? Of the fact that the memory of suffering is useful, so that the presence of the body is useful to a few, since the body has already been seen. How much greater is the faith of the centurion, 5) Matth. 3, neither of the royal, who desires to have Christ, the physician, present in the house! Joh. 4. They say: what benefit is there for us, that Christ is in the bread, if he is not in the heart? They also say: What harm do we receive if we have him in our hearts, if we do not have him in our bread? O dear Christians, it is much, much better to strengthen the heart with the necessary remembrance of Jesus' suffering, Heb. 13, nor else in some fleshly food. Now you see, if we have Christ in our bread and not in our hearts, how can we go to the sacrament and give thanks? Why do we not remain more than with those who pray and abstain from the Sacrament? This is our probation, which Paul requires of us, 1 Cor. 10. Here we see who they are that take away Christ their sponsor from the congregation of God, even, I say, from themselves; for by their own speeches they betray themselves, that they are not yet married to Christ, nor incorporated, but are to be incorporated only at the hour when the sacraments are administered. They cannot reproach us that Christ is not with us, since we come together to give thanks to him for the good things we have received. The faithful eat his flesh and drink his blood in faith, so that they may be the first to receive him.

4) d. i. away.

5) i.e. Centurion, the captain.

1) Marginal gloss: There practice you.

2) d. i. little.

3) d. i. such.

They are not sure whether they are such, as they show to whom all our goods come; to whom all glory belongs. themselves with the sign afterwards. They are well And now our Lord God would that all things in heaven and satisfied with themselves. But if they have not yet tasted on earth would raise their voices with us in praise of our the bread of life, how can they claim to be Christians? Or Lord Jesus Christ! And since we have nothing to give how do they give thanks if there is no Christ in their hearts back, let us take the drinking vessel of salvation and call and they do not yet believe? on the name of the Lord. This common thanksgiving,

(21) There is another thing in the supper which is no which is known to God more than to men, commands us less wonderful, neither the presence of the most holy love, and exhorts us to holy correction of our lives, so that flesh of Christ; namely, the covenant of love, 1) on which the holy name of God may not be blasphemed by us, as Christ would have us take such great care that, if by unworthy members of Christ. We profess to be brothers necessity required, he would have his body crucified and sisters, and are prepared, as soon as the church again, yea, a thousand times more, that we might not be admonishes us, to improve our lives in such a way that deprived of such a gift of love. Let another boast of such God may be pleased with them.

faith, with which he moves mountains. Boast of such (23) Since there is so much unity of hearts, so much tongues as give nothing before even angelic tongues, 1 peace, so much heavenly thanksgiving, would anyone say Cor. 14. Boast of such great contempt of riches that he that it is not good? Who would be so sacrilegious as to say also distributes all his possessions among the poor; or that God is not among us? Who would take away the giver boast of such deep contempt of his flesh, which also of love from us? The adversaries speak out for once and dares to burn itself: nevertheless, we still have a better say, are they different Christian people, what they have in good, namely, chosen holy love, of which God is the their churches, with which they invite the people to his author. [Those who thus offend us should look at what (badly tasted) meal, of which we are lacking? Do they they are doing, because they do not value such a high boast of the proclamation of the death of Christ? so do we good, love, by a hair's breadth, and because they rage boast of it. Do they, with their public testimonies, boast of more fiercely against us solely for the sake of their faith and love? We do the same. If their hearts are madness, neither do the hunted angry tigers rage at those spiritually gladdened, we are also spiritually gladdened. who take away their young. Yes, there is one thing in which they think they are richer than we are, and that is the presence of the body and

22. These are our mysteries, that we are all one bread than we are, and that is the presence of the body and and one body; that we are all one wine and one blood; blood of Christ. Nevertheless we are not deprived of these that we are all partakers of one bread and of one drink, 1 benefits, for we believe that the body and blood of Jesus Cor. 10. We are admonished beforehand that no one are seated in heaven with greater honor than they have. should be angry with another; that no one should keep in Although it is an abomination and a horror to us that his heart the injustice done to him by another; that no one anyone should think that the flesh and blood of Christ should seek vengeance. We desire to become servants should be present, as they speak of it, for the sake of any of our neighbors, and so desire to grow in faith and love, minister's words. Nevertheless, we have Christ also under that we may, after the example of Christ, die for our the sacrament; yes, if one only knows what *sacramentum* neighbor. I will not say that we are prepared to help our is; and I have no doubt that we have him more truly, neighbor in his need from the rest of our goods. We do neither [those] who hold opinions that do not serve the not come together as Rotters and. Enthusiasts. No, glory of Christ. The flesh of Christ keeps us incorruptible; because we banish them and exclude them from others, the blood of Christ is also profitable unto us, that the where they, eight [me], are denounced. We do not Father remember us no more of our former sins, and lay carouse as the gluttons who begin to indulge in gluttony not unbearable punishment upon us. We are also assured early in the morning, Isa. 7. Worldly pleasure does not of the inheritance and the covenant, confirmed with the make us one. What then do we do? Nothing else, neither blood of Christ. In sum, there is nothing that we lack, that that we desire to give thanks to our Lord Jesus Christ, is due to Christ, or that brings any benefit. from

1) Marginal gloss: Love, the highest everywhere.

And therefore, do not listen to the evil tongues that diminish our glory, but live all your lives with such humility, love and respectability that the vanity of the talkers and our godliness may shine before God and men, through the help of Jesus Christ our Lord. God help us to do this.

The other sermon of protection,

by Johann Oecolampadium preached on Christmas Eve [Dec. 24, 1525] at Basel.

(1) In this sermon I shall also answer the adversaries, who are so bold that they are allowed to speak in order to make us hateful to men: we stink after the Jewish manner, and in our congregations or churches there is much less spirituality and worship, neither just among the Jews themselves. Now it is fitting to answer them, since 1) we have just explained the text of today's Gospel, from which a just judge will see how far we and the common Jews are from each other, all of whom commonly deny the Virginity of Mary.

(2) Hear therefore first of all what Matthew saith, after which I will not forget my office to answer them.

First, we are to take an example from the virgin Mary and from St. Joseph, Matthew 1, that all those who follow God's words will never be abandoned by His mercy, even though they may suffer danger and fear at times. For there is no doubt that as soon as Mary the Virgin consented and surrendered to divine will, saying: "Behold, a servant of the Lord, let it be done to me as you have spoken of it," she became pregnant by the Holy Spirit from that moment on. Although she enjoyed this gift and grace of God the Lord, she still did not escape all dangers, because she did not open this secret (that she was pregnant) in front of virginal discipline; only to Elizabeth did she reveal it. Now that 2) she had already been revealed due to incentives 3) of the Holy Spirit, and the fruit could not remain hidden any longer, there was still a danger for her, because of the unbelieving, merciless Jews, who are not ashamed to tell even pious people, since there is already no indication of suspicion.

1) "now" put by us instead of "and".

2) "now" put by us instead of "and".

3) "Incentives" set by us instead: Arrivals.

Would they have spared the virgin first? Even if the Jews did not dare to stone Mariam, they would have directed her 4) least of all against all people. Therefore, God did it in time, and provided for her through her parents (before 5) she became pregnant, and heard the angel's bargain), that she was married to a pious God-fearing man, who would take care of her. We do not read that she was a lustful virgin or that she desired a man. No, but that was the right of the parents who decreed her marriage. Now, God wanted that the parents also in these times would have righteous care to marry their children; and it would be good that the marriages, which are carried out without the consent of the parents, would be cut up with public city bylaws and would be refused. But we will preach about this at another time.

4. well! Joseph, who had also chosen a godly housewife for himself, also began to be almost afraid, because he learned that she was pregnant: at the same time he also saw that she was of such a pious life that he would not want anything dishonest to happen to her, and he was not allowed to live with her, because he was pious. In addition, he would have been a cause of death for her. The holy scripture prevents it everywhere, so that you do not suspect the last 6). It is also written that Joseph learned that she was pregnant by the Holy Spirit; but how he came to know this, we do not wish to know, for the Scriptures have not revealed it; unless he was told by a prophecy, or because of her pious life, or that Elizabeth had made this known to him, or that he had only recently seen that she was not pregnant, and immediately afterwards appeared pregnant, the Scriptures say nothing about it. However, the scripture testifies that he was pious. Now if he had had an evil suspicion of her, and yet had kept her with him, he would not have been pious. Therefore, because Joseph's mind was wavering and he had actually resolved to leave her secretly, so that the virgin would not have a bad cry and no harm would come to him because he was staying with her. When all human counsel failed him, divine counsel came to his aid. How? Well, the angel appeared to him in his sleep and told him all about it.

4) "they" put by us instead of: themselves. - "aligned"--- publicly reviled.

5) "for" put by us instead of: and.

6) i.e. wrong.

He spoke to him in such a way that he made him certain and strengthened him in every word. In that the angel calls the child a son of David, he reminds Joseph of the promise made to David by God, 1 Kings 7 and 23. And in that he tells him of the fear, he frees Joseph from worry, in that he discovers the secret thing to him. The angel said that the fruit was conceived by the Holy Spirit, confirming their godly opinion that they were not deceived. In that she would give birth to a son, he indicates that it would be a deed or work of God, and says that he should be called JEsu(m) (that is, a beatific), while Joseph learned him to be a God, for no one can make blessed, but the one God, who makes blessed, and absolves from sins, no one else. In the last, the angel confirms all this also by the prophecy of Isaiah, who foretold in chapter 7: "Let a virgin give birth to God, who will help people". For even though Christ is called Jesus, God is with us through Him, which is why He is called "Immanuel" in Hebrew, and "God is with us" in German. How would Joseph have been able to sit down with him in the presence of all the world, since he who is the child's protector is also God? Therefore Joseph, strengthened by the angel, did as he was supposed to do.

5. besides, watch out that you do not perhaps take offense at the little word *donec*, until, as if she had not remained a virgin after that. For the manner of the language gives such that one might suspect it, as also those consider it, who from the saying, Matth. at the 5th chapter written, read: "There he does not come out, until he pays the last quadrant"; yes, from the little word "until" they believe, one must pay the last quadrant in purgatory. In the same way, beware that you do not err in the little word "the firstborn. Christ is called the firstborn in Scripture because Mary did not bear a child before him, not because Mary had more children after him. In addition, the firstborn sons had an exceedingly beautiful advantage over other children.

(6) And so, just as we and the Jews have nothing in common with each other in this Gospel, so also we are not one in the matter of the reverend Sacrament. Dear, what is it to us that they are hostile to our sacraments, which we desire to keep in the form and measure in which Christ instituted and instituted them, and we also want them to be pure and pure.

be kept without confusion? It may be that a Jew understands the simplicity of some Christians, and bears an abhorrence for idolatry; item, that he is hostile to the avarice of our priests, to whom nothing is finer, neither the sacrament; and thus in that case with us, 1) should we also judge of it, if we are hostile to the unreasonable, to which the Jew is also hostile? No, we know well that the Jews are an obdurate, blind and faithless people; nevertheless, so are abominable vices, which the Jews are also forced to reproach ours for. For example, the Jews reproach death, they reproach theft, they reproach adultery, and such major vices: should all those also be Jews, who do not reproach all the wicked 2)? I do not consider them to be Jews. Now if idolatry arises in the sacraments (as it does), the idols are not excused on that account, even though the Jews are very harsh 3) and vehemently reproachful; our zeal is still undiminished on that account, otherwise we are sufficiently distinguished.

(7) Just as the Jews dislike our baptism and the use of the evening meal, so we also dislike their circumcision and synagogues. But let us see which party among us stinks according to the Jewish customs, and they must be finely judged which are least favorable to Christ. This is the one thing that separates the Jews from the Christians, and the further one departs from the knowledge of Christ, that is, the more he resents Christ, the closer he is to the Jews. Otherwise, in other points that do not concern Christ, the learned Jews would soon become one with our scholars. The one Christ, who is our cornerstone, rejected by the Jews, Isa. 28, Eph. 2, will give those who confess him evidence of their innocence, 1 Petr. 2.

There are three things about which the Jews were most vehemently angry. The first, they were very annoyed that Christ did not make the rites of their forefathers high and great. The second, they resented that he did not allow the Sabbath and ceremonies 4). The third, they might have become nonsensical, yes, they were more furious than dogs, because Christ called himself a son of God. In the three points now reported, one can freely see who is the one who now, in our times, has been at the Jews' and at the-

1) hull - voice.

2) all the ungodly - such ungodliness.

3) d. i. hard.

4) d. i. little.

Pharisee's side. It is true that our doctrine and sacrament he was no longer able to go to the sacrament on the same is now very far from their opinion; you will all give day. There the sacraments were given only in gold or evidence of this, where you, mind [I], will deign to notice silver vessels. The priest had to dress himself with the me?

9. we read in Matthew 15 that the Jews were offended flag, 6) and with the measuring spike. If he had not had a at the rude 1) or impoliteness of the disciples, who ate the plate, he would have been unfit for it; and this offering, bread with unwashed hands, contrary to the ordinances along with many others, all flowed only from human of the fathers. The disciples were also excused by Christ, essays, and not at all from the word of God, with which who said to the Jews, "What goes into the mouth does not some people's consciences are bound. Now look who are defile a man, but what comes out of the mouth does"; and the ones who are fighting at this time of the ceremonies, he rebuked them with the saying of Isaiah 26, saying, "O stirring up stone and bone and everything they can think hypocrites! Isaiah prophesied the truth of you, saying, of, so that they do not leave. Are they not the monks and This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and the pope's crowd? and the greatest virtue seems to them honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; to be the greatest piety.

yet in vain do they honor me, when they teach the (11) Those who first come from the harlots, the commandments of men." So Christ, who is a doctor or spiritual usurers, and who are full of envy and greed, now teacher of the truth, has delivered us from all human offer the sacraments, and give themselves for Christ; yet teachings. Who judges now? Counsel, [those] who cling no one interferes with them. But if a simple man, without to the words of men, judging the same (here we are not all pomp, according to the word of God, proclaims the talking about the fact that one need not or should not be death of the Lord and serves the brethren, behold, he is obedient to worldly rulers in matters of common use, no, beheaded, he must be hanged and burned; yes, he is we are talking here about the freedom of souls). Those considered more vile and mischievous than the greatest are Christians, 2) who know that they are free; for which evildoers. Nevertheless, those cry out against it: Love will reason Paul writes to the Galatians, Cap. 5, 1. thus: "You be hurt, one should take care of the weak 2c. 7) Answer: shall stand firm in the liberty with which Christ has set you Yes, the wolf also gave the sheep such an answer, it free, and shall henceforth no longer be paschalized with would have clouded the brook for him, although it drank the yoke of bondage 3)." He also writes this opinion to the below at the brook, the wolf above at it. For the very ones Colossians, Cap. 2, saying: "If you have died with Christ 8) break the bond of Christian love, so persecute those to the outward elements of this world, why then do you who live according to God's word. Again, those who live allow yourselves to be treated with statutes, 4) as if you by the word of God have no regard for them (for which were living in the world, as if it were said to you, "Do not the gospel is sufficiently preached), of whom Christ said, touch this, do not try this, do not attack this." Truly, Paul Matt. 10: "Let them go, for they are blind guides of the was not allowed to set anything for the Corinthians to eat blind." Yes, they need their freedom, they are in bondage at night, but he teaches them the same things he received to the word, and they draw on it. The weak and the from the Lord. We also follow him, so that we may be free untrained do not fight against it. It is only the Pharisees from the Jewish ceremonies. who do so, and they will always be weary of the trouble,

Some time ago, women were scolded severely if they yet their messages, which they introduce to us, are not did not come along in the smartest way 5). At that time it comfortable.

12 Secondly, the Jews ever thought that they had a just cause to be angry with Christ, because they regarded him as wanting to do away with the law, as Marcus Cap. 2. of this

1) Bäursche - coarse creature.

2) Side note: Who is a Christian?

3) Paschgen - sang. Cf. Col. 667, § 56.

4) "behamen" - to hang, to bring into the Hamen (fish net).

5) consternated - veiled (?)

6) Main cloth - humeral; hand flag - maniple. Compare about the vestments Col. 390, § 59.

7) Marginal gloss: So it must go to.

8) i.e. to tear.

writes: As the disciples went through the seed on the Sabbath, and on the way they 1) plowed the ears, the Pharisees said, Lying, why do they do that which is not proper to do on the Sabbath? Jesus answered them: The Sabbath was made for man, and man was not made for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath. From this we learn that all those who judge someone on account of the holidays are judging them. Why? Because the Jewish celebration is over, the temple is destroyed. Where are the sacrifices of the Jews? All ceremonies of the old law are gone, the circumcision together with the purifications and anointings have come to an end. In sum, the law contains imperfection, Heb. 7. The shadow and the meanings are to give place to light and truth, for thus they are redeemed; just as Christ did not come to abolish the law, but to redeem it, Matt. 5. For this reason, the people who reintroduce legal ceremonies to us obscure Christ and introduce darkness into the community of God. What then grieves our adversaries? Behold," they say, "Aaron wore the majesty of the divine name in front of him on his forehead, beautifully adorned with precious stones, yellow with gold, adorned with purple and silk wool, 2) he smelled 3) of delicious balsam, and created with the sound of the cymbals, which banged at the bottom of the garment, that everyone marveled at him. Yes, they say, we are worse clothed than the common Levites, and yet the Jews had something to offer; so we have nothing at all; shall we then be impious, that we have no sacrifice? I answer, O wretches, how long will you remain under the disciplinarian? When will you grow up to be a perfect man of God? Behold, the apostles do not forbear women to wear garments embroidered with gold; they exhort them to the adornment of souls; and will the shepherds and bishops only esteem it? for otherwise they are highly commanded not to esteem such things, 1 Pet. 2. Now if it be so excellent a thing to fight for, why did not Christ also array himself with such garments, and set others an example? But Christ did not want to know anything about these things, and he covered them up. 4) He also did not want to be born of the family of Levi, but of the family of Judah, so that he could be a

the true priest would be recognized, according to the order of Melchizedek. Yes, he is the right Melchizedek (that is, a king of righteousness). Now how much more and higher is Melchizedek than Aaron? For Aaron gave tithes to Melchizedek, in that Abraham, of whom Aaron was born, gave tithes to Melchizedek. So he who takes the tithe is more, neither he who gives it. How then does Aaron stand so splendidly in his adornment? Since Christ is not a priest after the order of Aaron, why do they urge us to this order? The king of larvae, the pope, he should thus arm himself according to the preached gospel. The faithful servants want to follow the footpath of their master; for they know well what darkness this finery brings to men who are otherwise inclined to superstition. Those who walk in the light are beautifully and deliciously enough adorned. See that you do not despise evangelical simplicity, which Naam 5) also spurned in the Old Testament, when he learned from the servant that even the waters of the Jordan were not to be spurned.

(13) That we have no sacrifice is not true. That is, we do not sacrifice calves or sheep; but Christ once before offered the most holy sacrifice of his body for our sins; there is no need to offer that again. He has once done enough, and the sacrifice is an everlasting sacrifice in the eyes of the Lord God. We do not want to sacrifice it again. But if it has not been enough for someone, let them do well; we, the redeemed, therefore give thanks to him. And in remembrance we have that which was lost of old; the benefit of the sacrifice is ours. Those in the city 6) who do not keep the light anywhere, the same squat in the shade, and confess to be the disciples of the Pharisees. [Those who undertake to introduce sacrifices anew betray themselves quite freely, that they taste after the Jewish way. Let us eat in the footstool of sincerity and truth, 1 Cor. 13, that is, let us be diligent to keep our faith, which we have in Christ, unspotted 7) from all hypocrisy.

14 About this we can also catch our adversaries' remnants 8) from other statements. Namely, when the priesthood is put down, the law is also put down. Another law the rude Jews have, another law we have, Heb. 7. as how? Understand it thus: The Jews will be

5) Naam - Raeman, 2 Kings 5.

6) Kadt - Koch.

7) Unmeasured, uninjured. Compare Col. 695.

8) Bresten - infirmity.

1) prättschen - to scrape out.

2) i. Secdenzeug.

3) smacked - smelled.

4) i.e. shunned, disdained.

The Christian community, however, is governed by the law of the spirit and love. To the Jews the law was given with thunder, with lightning and with great fright of all the people, Exodus 19; but the law which the Spirit writes in our hearts gives birth to joy and peace. From this it is evident that all people who are diligent in piety or go to the sacrament only out of fear of punishment or for their own sake are undoubtedly judging, Jer. 31. But those whom the Father begets with the lovely curls 1) and who become pious out of the prompting of the Spirit of God and receive the sacrament, these give thanks to God the Lord; they are truly noble children of God, and how much higher to be esteemed than the people of the Jews! Well then, if it lusts thee, compare also this doctrine of ours and the doctrine of the adversaries. Dear, how much do you think that you will find priests who only light a traffic light in vain? A great multitude of them serve the belly, Malachi 3. Many are inspired by glitter. Few are those who are not urged by commandment. You also know how much effort it took for everyone to go to the sacrament on Easter. Yes, of course, you are also well aware of how little fruit has come from it. Now there is no need for words. All those who go by law, ordinance or commandment are not worthy of Him, for one would not bring them to it without a commandment; such as these do not give glory to God. Who gives him the honor? The one who freely does undeserved work. Do you see the Jews now? We remind the people that, regardless of selfishness and pain, they should look to God alone, and that they should do all things of good will out of the indication of the Spirit. All who find themselves trusting in the Word of Christ, by which they are being prepared for a new life, should come in good cheer. But if anyone should find himself lacking in faith, or not having the heart to amend, let him take heed that he be not subdued, let him be put to the sword, that he go to the dreadful mysteries. From what cause? For this reason: Christ wants and requires a new, good, willing and spiritual people.

(15) Neither shall we despise this mark, which may be felt by the Jews. What can so nearly cut the hearts of the Jews than that the Son of God became a curse on the cross? Nothing more; and because he said he was a son of God, they want to kill him. JESus

1) So put by us instead of: with the bodily curls.

He said to them that he was the bread of life that came from heaven, and that the same bread was such necessary bread that whoever did not eat it would not have life in him. The Jews do not understand anything high or divine about Christ; they always cling to fleshly food. But Peter, who was taught by the heavenly Father, understood; he ate the bread of heaven and had life, for he ever said, "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have words of eternal life, and we believe and confess that you are the Christ, the Son of the living God. From the confession it is sufficiently evident that Peter was led with the flesh of Christ; therefore, he undoubtedly did not receive the sacrament unworthily afterwards. To the Jews it was a hard speech, and when they heard that this was the work of God, believing in him whom the Father had sent, they said, "What sign are you doing? For though he had always done many miraculous signs, yet they thought nothing of him, but that he was the son of Joseph.

(16) From this it is evident that we are further from the opinion of the Jews, neither are all our adversaries. Why is that? Therefore they all wait for a carnal supper, and for another meal, neither of which is cheerfully presented in the 6th chapter of John. We eat as Peter ate, and confess that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and then we testify to this faith of ours with the holy sign. Now if anyone eats the flesh of Christ in any other way than Christ taught, he is not yet capable of the word of God, and there is still something Jschariothic or Jewish in him, who is always prepared (interpret the words correctly) to tear the body apart. In sum, the flesh is of no use to them. Yes, the incarnation of Christ is of no use to them either. We think much of those who are led by the divine word. Which words the Father wanted to be so sure that he sealed it with the death of his only begotten Son.

(17) And so, dear friends, you see how it is so soon done and so easy to clean out each one with mockery 2) and malicious words, of which our adversaries are well used 3). Nevertheless, the truth remains unchanged, and for the sake of its gushing and stumbling 4) it may not be measured 5): whether one can

2) i.e. vituperation.

3) need == practice.

4) "Stumpiren" probably as much as: Stamping - useless talk.

5) d. i. injured.

Even though it seems to darken at times, it returns to its old color from time to time. You have now understood how much we honor the sacraments. Therefore, for God's sake, I ask you to make every effort so that the mouths of our adversaries may be more filled with innocence and with the bravery of our lives, and neither with insolence nor with insolence.

be stuffed. Yes, we want to need ourselves, if we want to rhyme them 1) to acquire such from Christ with unceasing supplications; who is of one glory with the Father and with the Holy Spirit. God grant us this.

1) rhyme -----.

19. D. Martin Luther's Sermon on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ against the Fanatical Spirits . *)

1526.

In this sacrament there are two things to know and to preach. First, what one should believe, which in Latin is called *objectum fidei*, that is, the work or thing that one believes or to which one should be attached. Secondly, the faith itself, or the custom of using what one believes in the right way. The first is outside the heart, held outwardly before our eyes, namely, the sacrament in itself, of which we believe that in the bread and wine is truly Christ's body and blood. The other is inwardly in the heart, cannot come out, and stands in it, how the heart is to hold itself against the outward sacrament. Now up to now I have not preached much about the first part, but have dealt only with the other, which is also the best. However, since this is now being contested by many, and the preachers, who are also considered to be the best, are dividing and blushing over it, so that already in foreign countries a large number are falling for and holding that Christ's body and blood are not in the bread and wine, the time demands that something be said about it as well.

2 To begin with, however, I say that if anyone is of the opinion that he is caught in such error, I would faithfully advise him to stay away from the sacrament until he hears the word of God.

and become strong in faith. For we have for ourselves the bright, dry text and word of Christ: "Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you; drink ye all of it, this is my blood, which is poured out for you for remission of sins; this do in remembrance of me." These are the words we insist upon; they are so plainly and clearly spoken that even they, the adversaries, must confess that it takes effort to draw them elsewhere, and yet they leave such bright words, and go after their thoughts, making darkness for themselves in the bright light.

(3) But if any man will ride aright, and not tarnish, let him beware of the sharp thoughts which the devil stirreth up in the world, that he may drink up the egg, and leave us the husks; that is, take the body and blood of Christ out of the bread and wine, that it be no more than bad bread, as the baker bakes. And mocked us, as they longed to do, that we were carnivores and blood-drinkers, and worshipped a chopped-up God, just as the apostate desperate wretch Averrois, who had also been a Christian, mocked the believers and blasphemed: "There is no worse people on earth than Christians, because they worship their own God.

*This text was published in 1526 in Wittenberg by Hans Lust under the title we have given, and also in another edition, without place and printer. In the collections: in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 109 b; in the Eisleben, vol. I, p. 234; in the Altenburg, vol. III, p. 340; in the Leipzig, vol. XIX, p. 374 and in the Erlange, vol. 29, p. 328. A Latin translation of this sermon is found in the Wittenberg edition, Ior. VII. fol. 334b. The title of the scripture is repeated again before the beginning of the sermon, but instead of "Schwärmgeister" it is written: "Schwärmer. We reproduce the text according to the Erlangen edition, which has the text of the first original edition mentioned above, with comparison of the Wittenberg.

which no other people had ever done. Wasn't that a believes thus: God gives, Christ crawls into the bread or delicious, pointed word? This is what the devil is doing cup, or into what he wants; if I have the 5) words, I will against us everywhere in the world. neither see nor think further; what he says, that I will keep.

Now God is such a man, who delights in doing what is Thus he wraps himself in the word, does not let himself foolish and unprofitable in the sight of the world, as Paul be turned away from it, is also preserved by it.

says in 1 Cor. 1:23: "We preach Christ crucified, an 6. for we are ever not so great 6) fools that we do not offense to the Jews and foolishness to the Gentiles"; item understand the words. If such words are not clear, I do not v. 21: "Because the world through its wisdom did not know how to speak German. Shall I not hear what it would recognize God in His wisdom, it pleased God to make be if someone put a roll in front of me and said: Take, eat, blessed through foolish preaching all those who believe in this is a white bread? Item: Take and drink, this is a glass it 1). Well then, whoever does not believe, let him believe of wine? So when Christ says, Take, eat, this is my body, that it is only bread or a bowl of water. He that lacketh faith, even a child understands that he is speaking of what he let him believe what he will; the same is true. As he that is is offering.

drowned, if he drown in a brook, or in the midst of a river, It is a natural speech when one points to something, he is as well drowned. So I say of these spirits, if they drop that one knows what one says. If I were to make such a the word, let them always believe and divide as long as word even more obscure to myself, and think up they want; as has already happened, that six or seven something pointed about it, I would be making a mistake. sects have risen above the Sacrament, but all in the They are all clear and plain words: to take bread, to give delusion that Christ's flesh and blood is not there. thanks, to break, to give, 7) to eat, to drink, this is my

(5) This makes, I say, first of all, that they have not body, this is my blood. They break themselves with great abode by 2) the words of 3) Christ; then that they have difficulty over it, come with their conceit before; according followed and seen with their 4) thoughts: Should Christ be to it the words must interpret, what each one has in the bread and wine, and be spread so far in the world, conceived. Therefore we stick to the words and close our and every man eat the Christ? that would be an unskilful eyes and senses, because everyone knows what it thing. This is the first thing they have conceived, and they means: "This is my body", and especially that he adds: have a painted glass before their eyes, and the words "Which is given for you. We know what Christ's body is, must be called what they think. This is what all the spirits namely, born of Mary, who suffered, died, and rose again. of the mob do; they make up their own minds beforehand, (8) Now they have two principal things which they and when they like them, they are obliged to force the bring against us. First, they say that it is not fitting that Scriptures on them as well. But he who draws the right Christ's body and blood should be in the bread and wine. faith from the words, the Secondly, that it is not necessary. These are almost their best reasons on which they build, and we will see them.

1) So the Bible and the Wittenbergers. Erlanger: to him.

2) Erlanger: in.

3) Wittenberger: Christi.

4) [Variant of the Wittenberg edition:] fall into their reason threefold, and think about the matter, thus: If Christ's body and blood should be in the sacrament, and should be distributed throughout Christendom as edition; it is missing in the Erlangen edition. The Wittenberg edition has often as the year, and everyone, as often as he goes, should eat Christ's body and drink his blood; what would that be for an awkward, inconsistent thing?

5) Wittenberger: his word.

6) "large" is missing in the Erlanger.

7) "geben" ("give"), which is also in Latin, is taken from Walch's old instead of this sentence: "There are always clear and distinct words: Take and eat, this is my body"; item: "Drink from it, all of you, this is my blood".

First fanatical reason. 1)

(9) In the first place, I would just as soon say: It does not rhyme that God should descend from heaven and give Himself in the womb of a mother, that He who feeds, sustains, and gives breath to all the world, lets Himself be fed and given breath by the virgin. Item, that Christ, a king of honor, to whom all angels must fall at His feet, Ps. 97, 7. Hebr. 1, 6. Phil. 2, 10. and all creatures tremble before Him, throws Himself down among all men, and is to be hanged on the cross for a most heinous transgressor, in addition by the most desperate of men. So I also wanted to conclude that God had not become man; or that the crucified Christ was not God. So they say that it is not fitting that God should do so many miraculous works in the sacrament as He does nowhere else. For that we believe that the one body of Christ is in a hundred thousand places, as much bread as is broken, and 2) that the great legs are to be hidden there, so that no one sees them or feels them, they consider this to be an unskillful thing, and they make great miracles of it; but they do not see that they are vain thoughts. For if one would measure it this way, one would not have to let any creature remain.

(10) For if I should and could measure the creatures and mark them out with words, you should see as great, even greater wonders in them than in this sacrament. Take before you the soul, which is a single creature, and yet is in the whole body at the same time, even in the smallest toe; so that if I prick the smallest member of the body with a needle, I strike the whole soul, so that the whole man wriggles. Can a soul be in all the members at the same time, which I do not know how it happens: should Christ not be able to be in all places in the sacrament at the same time?

Item 11: My soul can think, speak, see in speech, hear, feel, 2c. at the same time, and also digest food in blood, flesh,

1) This caption is taken from Walch's old edition.

2) Wittenbergers: and that with the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ is truly and essentially present, presented and received, they consider this to be an incredible thing.

Leg, urine and dung: no one thinks this is a miracle, because we see it every day and are used to it. People lack nothing, except that they have never really looked at any creature, as we shall hear further.

012 Behold a grain of corn in the field, and tell me how it is that the stalk grows out of the ground from a single grain, and bears so many grains in the ear, and gives form to each one.

(13) There are many, many wonders in one grain, which they neither perceive nor respect. Item: How does this happen? I have only two eyes, and yet I take all the heads in my eyes at once; indeed, I can do it as well with one eye as with both. Thus one eye can aim at a thousand grains, and again at one grain a thousand [eyes] 3) can aim.

14 Further, take an example of the very word that I speak; it is a poor miserable voice, and so to reckon the least creature, nothing more than a wind; as soon as the mouth ceases, it is over and nothing more, that no weaker, more perishable thing can be: nor is it so mighty that with the voice I could rule a whole country. Now where does it come from that I capture so many hearts with words? I have a small voice, so there are hundreds or thousands of ears; nor does each ear catch the whole and perfect voice; I do not divide it so that one ear has a piece of it, but each has it completely. They see this and think it is no miracle; indeed, if we had never seen it, it would be the greatest miracle.

15) Now if my voice can fill all ears, and each takes as much of it as the other, and the word spreads so far, should not Christ be able to do it much more with his body? 4) How much more enlightened is the transfigured body than the bodily voice? 5) You will find many more such things.

3) "eyes" in the Wittenberg, also in Latin.

4) Wittenberger: Wie viel ein leichter Ding ist's 2c. Latin: *illuminator*.

5) Wittenberger: If you cannot understand this, how it happens, which you experience daily: Dear, give Christ the glory that it is true that he says here: "This is my body" 2c., even if you do not understand how it is possible.

Miracles in the creatures, that, who looks at a creature rightly, this article will let nothing err.

Item 16: I preach the gospel of Christ, and with the bodily voice I bring Christ into your heart, that you may form him in you. If then thou thinkest rightly that thy heart receiveth the word, and the voice dwelleth therein, say unto me, What hast thou in thine heart? Then you must say that you have the true Christ, not that he sits in it as one sits on a chair, but as he is at the right hand of the Father. How this is, thou canst not know; but thine heart feeleth it well, that it is surely there, through the experience of faith. But if I can tell you in one word that the one Christ comes by voice into so many hearts, and everyone who hears and accepts the sermon grasps him completely in the heart, for he cannot be divided into pieces, and yet he is spread out completely in all believers, so that one heart receives no less, and a thousand hearts no more, than the one Christ: we must ever confess, and is a daily miracle, yea, as great as here in the Sacrament; why then should it not rhyme, that [we received his body and blood, according to his words, in the Lord's Supper?1) He also distributes Himself in the bread?

(17) Now if I bring Christ into the heart, what will happen? Is it so, as they think, that he comes down on a ladder and climbs up? Christ is still seated at the right hand of the Father, and also in your heart, the one Christ who fills heaven and earth. I preach that he sits at the right hand of God, ruling over all creatures, sin, death, life, the world, devils and angels: if you believe this, you already have him in your heart. So your heart is in heaven, not in a semblance or dream, but truly. For where he is, there you are also: so he dwells and sits in your heart, John 17:23, nor does he fall from the right hand of God.

18 The Christians experience this and feel it publicly. But those who see things

1) The bracketed words are from the Wittenberg edition. The following words "he - austheile" are missing there.

not how great it is that Christ thus dwells in the heart, and divides himself completely in every heart, and is spread out through the word. Therefore, whoever can believe this, it is not difficult for him to believe that his body and blood are in the sacrament. For if you were to measure the miraculous sign 2) with reason and thought, you would eventually come to the point where you would also have to say that Christ does not dwell in the hearts of believers.

19 Now, behold (as I said), the weak bodily voice is able to do all these things, that it first brings the whole of Christ into the ears, and then into the heart of all who hear and believe: should it be so strange that he brings himself into the bread and wine? Is not the heart much more subtle than the bread? That you now want to measure such things, how it happens, you will probably leave. Just as you cannot say how it is that Christ is in so many thousands of hearts, and dwells in them, as he died and rose again, and yet no man knows how he gets himself into them, so here also it is incomprehensible how it is. But this I know, that the word is there, "Take, eat; this is my body, given for you; this do in remembrance of me." When we speak the words 3) about the bread, 4) he is truly there, 5) and yet is a bad word and voice to be heard. Now as he cometh into the heart, and breaketh not a hole in it, but is taken by word and hearing only; so also he cometh into the bread, that he may make no hole in it. [Just as he came to the disciples after the resurrection through a closed door, and yet made no hole through the door]. 6)

20. Take another example: How did his mother, Mary, become pregnant? Although it is such a great miracle that a woman becomes pregnant by a man, God has reserved for him that he should be born of a virgin.

21 Now how does the mother come to this? She

2) In the Wittenberg instead of: "the miraculous sign" - "the miraculous works so done in the Sacrament." In Latin: Vo6 miraeulum.

3) "Words" is missing in the Erlanger.

4) Wittenberg: and wine.

5) Wittenberger: his body and blood are truly there.

6) The bracketed words are switched on from the Wittenberg edition; they are missing in the Latin.

knows of no man, and her whole body is decided; nor does she conceive a natural child, with flesh and blood, in her womb. Is there not more wonder than in bread and wine? Where does it come from? Gabriel the angel brings the word: "Behold, you shall conceive in the womb and bear a son" 2c. With these words Christ comes not only into her heart, but also into her womb, when she hears it, grasps it and believes. No one can ever say otherwise than that the power comes through the word. Just as it cannot be denied that she becomes pregnant through the word, and no one knows how it happens, so it is here. For as soon as Christ says, "This is my body," his body is there through the word and power of the Holy Spirit, Psalm 33:9. If the word is not there, it is bad bread; but if the words come, they bring that with them, of which they are called.

22. item: We believe that Jesus Christ is set over all creatures according to mankind, Eph. 1, 20. f., and fills all things, as Paul says in Ephesians 4, 7. ff. Is not only according to the Godhead, but also according to mankind a Lord of all things, has everything in his hand, and is present everywhere. If then I am to follow the spirits that say it is not fitting, I must deny Christ. We read from Stephano Apost. 7:55 that he said, "I see the heavens open, and Jesus standing at the right hand of the Father." How does he see Christ? Must not cast his eyes high up. He is around us and in us, in all places. They do not understand this and say that he sits at the right hand of God, but they do not know what it is to see Christ ascend to heaven and sit at the right hand of the Father. 1) They do not know what it is to see Christ ascend to heaven and sit at the right hand of the Father. It is not as you go up a ladder into the house, but that he is above all creatures, and in all creatures, and apart from all creatures. But that he was taken up bodily was done for a sign. Therefore he now has all things before his eyes, more than I have you, is nearer to us than any creature.

the other. So they speculate that he must go up and down from heaven through the air, and be drawn down into bread when we eat his body. Such thoughts come from nowhere but from foolish reason and flesh. 2) Our words, when we speak, must not draw him down, but are given us as a safeguard, that we may know to find him assuredly.

For though he is everywhere in all creatures, and I would find him in the stone, in the fire, in the water, or even in the rope, as he certainly is there, yet he does not want me to seek him there without the word, and throw myself into the fire or water, or hang myself on the rope. He is everywhere, but he does not want you to grope after him everywhere, but, where the word is, grope after it, and you will seize him rightly, otherwise you will tempt God and cause idolatry. Therefore, he has given us a certain way how and where to seek and find him, namely the word.

(24) The wretched people do not know or see this, who say that it is not true that Christ should be in the bread and wine, because they do not understand what Christ's kingdom is, sitting at the right hand of God. If Christ were not with me in prison, torture and death, where would I stay? He is present with the Word, although not in the same way as here in the Sacrament, where he binds his body and blood with the Word in the bread and wine, to be received also bodily. If we believe this, it is easy to grasp and believe. Heaven and earth are his sack: as the grain fills the sack, so he fills all things. And as a grain bears such a stalk, ears, and many grains; item, as a few cherry stones, thrown into the earth, bring forth such a tree, bearing so many flowers, leaves, shells, bast, cherries; item, my voice is given in so many ears: much more can Christ divide into so many little pieces, whole and undivided.

25) Because those 3) do not see this, they start with their human arrogance, what it is that God is doing with it such 4) illusion. Well, let them only confidently fool;

2) Wittenberger: carnal thoughts.

3) Wittenberger: the Rottengeister.

4) Wittenberger: Wunderwerk. Latin: delirium.

1) These bracketed words, which are also in the Latin, are from the Wittenberg edition. Because such additions are often repeated in this writing, we will no longer indicate them by notes, but only by square brackets.

But let it be said that Christ does all these things by the word, as he has said; and as there are innumerable wonders which he works daily by it, shall he not know how to do them by the same power? He has taken hold of the word, and by the word he also takes hold of the bread. If he can travel into the heart and spirit, 1) and dwell in the soul, then the bodily thing can be much less 2) open to him, since the heart is much more subtle. But he keeps the small miracles, so that he reminds us of the greater ones. For it is much greater that he comes into the heart through faith than that he is in the bread; yes, 3) he needs the very bread or sacrament for the sake of faith.

(26) If we saw this, we would not speak so highly of miracles. But if one wants to think about it with reason, 4) then we must also say of faith that no man could believe; for it surpasses all reason too far. Summa Summarum, therefore, that those 5) who say that it does not rhyme, therefore it is not so, let us turn around and say the contradiction: God's word is true, therefore your conceit must be false. Should it therefore not rhyme, that you think it does not rhyme, and think that the word must not be right, and your conceit should be valid?

Second fanatical reason. 6)

The other reason they give is that it is not necessary. Then Christ must be led to the school and mastered: the Holy Spirit has not done it right. For so they say: If I believe in Jesus Christ, who died for me, what need is there that I should believe in the baked God? Well, he will also bake them once, so that the bark will burn. Who says this? God or a man? A man says it. Why? Because Satan has possessed them; have not learned more than the

- 1) Wittenberger: come.
- 2) i.e. lighter. Latin: kaoliors. "
- 3) "yes" is missing in the Erlanger.
- 4) ömen - to make assumptions, to make up one's mind.
- 5) the gushers.
- 6) This caption is taken from Walch's old edition.

Words speak and preach that Christ died for us [rose from the dead, and the like] 2c., but in the heart they feel nothing of it. Do you now want to master God, what is necessary and what is not necessary, and let him conclude according to your conceit? It is much cheaper to turn it around and say: God wants it that way, therefore your conceit is wrong. What God considers necessary, who are you to speak against it? You are a liar, so he is true.

28) Tell me also, because faith alone justifies that Christ is not necessary, let us say to God: You had sin, death, the devil and everything in your power, what was the use or need that you sent down your Son, let him act so abominably and die? If you could have let him stay up there, if you had not cost you more than a word, sin and death would have been wiped out with the devil, because you are ever omnipotent?

29 Let us conclude, then, that Christ was not born of a virgin, and say, "Why was it necessary? Could not God just as well have caused him to be born of a man, and yet have created him in such a way that he was conceived without sin and remained innocent? Yes, further we want to say: it is not necessary that Christ is God, because he could just as well have resurrected from death by God's power and redeemed us, if he had been a real man. Thus, the devil blinds people so that they cannot see God's work properly.

(30) Secondly, that they also regard not the word, but will search out all things with their head. If you search out a grain in the field, you should be surprised that you stumble. God's works are not like our works.

31 Therefore you say, "What is it to me whether it is necessary or not? God knows well how or why it should and must be so. If he says that it is necessary, then all creatures are silent. Because Christ says here with clear words: "Take, eat, this is my body" 2c., it is mine to believe the words, as firmly as I must believe all the words of Christ. If he has only one straw

- 7) Thus the Wittenbergers. Erlanger: kunnten.

If a man were to reach out and speak such words, 1) I would believe it. Therefore one must restrain mouth, eyes and all senses and say: Lord, you know better than I do. It is the same with baptism: the water is baptism, and in baptism is the Holy Spirit. You might also say, "Why is it necessary to baptize with water? But the Spirit says: "Listen, here is God's will and word, stay with it and let go of your arrogance.

(32) These are the two reasons why they say that it is not to be believed that Christ's body and blood are in the sacrament; which are also the best, and especially the other they leave out by far. Now these are such reasons, which nevertheless would move pious hearts, and have also moved them in the past. I myself have also been concerned about what is needed, and how in such a small piece of bread 2) there is such a large body, undivided and whole in each piece. But if they look at a grain or a cherry stone, it can teach them 3) morals. For why does God feed us by bread or under bread, when he could just as well do it by the mere word, without bread?

(33) Why does he not make man, as he made Adam and Eve, in a moment, so slowly that man and woman must be together, and bring up the child so long with toil and labor? But he says thus, "What is it to thee?" Joh. 21. I have done so from the first 4) Adam and Eve, now I will do so. Once I let a son be born of a virgin, I will not do it again. So people want to bind God with their laws, which is just as much as if I said, "Why did you give this one a large body and me a small one? Why did you give this one black hair, and the other yellow; this one brown eyes, and that one gray?

1) Thus the Wittenbergers. In the old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: sollts ichs.

2) Wittenberger: the truly essential body of Christ.

3) Wittenbergers: to lead to school, and to remember that they could not wonder enough about it.

4) Instead of: "from first" the Wittenberg edition has: "in the beginning".

34. Therefore this is the summa: See that you pay attention to God's word and abide in it like a child in the cradle. If you let this go for a moment, you will fall from it. And this alone is the devil's way of pulling people out and making them measure God's will and work with reason.

35 These, I say, are still sensible hearts, which grieve over the two things touched; such are still to be advised. But the others are vain enthusiasts, who go on, and break and stretch the words of Christ 5); yes, they are real arch-enthusiasts, and have not one reason for themselves; they have a standing before reason. But as these tear and force the words, reason can still well see that they are fools. There are only three words: "This is my body. Someone gives the little word "this" a nose, and tears it from the bread, so that it should be interpreted this way: Take, eat. This is my body; just as if I said: Take and eat. Here sits Hans with the red jope. 6) The other takes the little word "is," which is supposed to mean as much to him as the word "means. The third says, "this is my body" means as much as, this is a figure of my body; set such own dreams without all reason of the scripture.

(36) These enthusiasts do not challenge me, nor are they worth fighting with; they are crude grammatical enthusiasts; the others are subtle philosophical enthusiasts. Therefore let them depart, and let us stick to the words as they are, that in the bread is the body of Christ, and in the wine truly his blood. Not that he is not elsewhere also with his body and blood; for he is wholly with flesh and blood in the hearts of the faithful; but that he will make us sure where and how thou shalt fast him. There is the word that says: when you eat the bread, you eat his body, given for you. If this were not there, I would not look at the bread either. That is enough of the first part.

5) Wittenberger: to interpret and stretch differently than Christ spoke them.

6) Jope - jacket. - The first interpretation is Carlstadt's, the second Zwingli's, the third Oecolampad's.

The other part.

37 Since we have now received the treasure, lest we should take the kernels out of the husk, and keep the chaff for the grain, it is now necessary to preach of the other part, how the sacrament is to be used and enjoyed. For it is not enough that we know what the sacrament is, namely, that Christ's body and blood are truly there; but it is also necessary to know why it is there, and why or for what purpose it is given to us to receive.

38. But they have the heartache to inflict; the devil cannot leave it, he must defile what God makes and speaks; if he cannot even tear it away, he makes a hollow nut out of it. The pope has taken one form from us; but these leave us both forms, but make a hole in the nut, so that we shall lose the body and blood of Christ; for this they leave the right custom standing on both sides.

39 So we say: In the past, we have labored and worried over how to go worthily to this sacrament. We now call this "worthy going" the custom of the Sacrament. There we were taught to purify ourselves with many hard works, fasting, confession, and to prepare ourselves in such a way that we needed it only for one work. So far the papists have done it, and yet it has remained constant, and still a grace that evangelion, scripture, baptism, sacrament, and the thing has remained, 1) as it is in itself. But the custom they have torn and taken away from us, we must bring it up again and preserve it, as we have done before. For when I preached against the abuse, I did not take care of the heresy that is now rampant, and only struck with those above the right custom.

40 I have now taught that one should not use the sacrament as a work; as they have said, whoever has confessed and knows no mortal sin on him, and thus goes to the sacrament, does a deliciously holy work, so that he deserves heaven. Whoever wants to use his right, does not have to receive in this way,

1) Wittenberg instead of: "and the thing remained" - "remained in the custom".

That he should say, I have done this, as though thou hadst fasted or watched; but thou shalt believe, not only that Christ is there in body and blood, but also that he is there given unto thee, and always rest upon the words, "Receive, eat, this is my body which is given for you; drink, this is my blood which is shed for you; this do in remembrance of me." In these words His body and blood are given to us. So that there are two things to believe: that it is truly there, which the papists also believe; and that it is given to us, which they do not believe, and we should use it as a gift.

(41) Then you hear that it is spoken clearly and in German; he commands you to take his body 2) and blood, for what or why? That the body may be given for thee, and the blood shed for thee. Our new preachers have such misery to inflict on us, that they also take it away from us; they deal with it in such an abominable way that I think the devil is trying his utmost, and that the last day is not far off, that I would rather be dead than hear Christ reviled and blasphemed by them.

They say that it is only a sign to recognize and judge Christians, that we should have nothing but the husks. Then they come together, eating and drinking, because they are considering his death. In the remembrance shall be the power, that bread and wine shall be no more than a sign and a paint, that we may know that we are Christians. Why do they do this? Because they throw the words to the wind: "This is my body, which is given for you. The words mean nothing to them, they rumble on above. Nothing shall be valid anymore, but to proclaim and preach death. Yes, of course, one should proclaim his death; we have also preached it, more gloriously than they always do, and if they had not heard it from us, they would probably know nothing about it; the papists have never spoken anything about it. Therefore they must not teach it to us and boast about it as if they had invented something new.

2) Wittenberger: to eat and drink his blood, and to do this in his memory. For what or why? That thou mayest be saved, and believe, and be comforted, that his body is given for thee 2c.

(43) Therefore we also preach the death of Christ, according to the words, "This do in remembrance of me. But there is a difference: when I preach his death, that is a public sermon in the congregation, in which I give to no one in particular, whoever grasps it grasps it; but when I offer the sacrament, I give it in particular to him who takes it, giving him Christ's body and blood, that he may have forgiveness of sins, obtained through his death, and preached in the congregation. This is something more than the common sermon.

44 For although in the sermon there is just that which is in the sacrament, and again, the advantage is that here it points to a certain person. There one does not point to and paint a person; but here it is given to you and me in particular, that the sermon comes to us as our own. For when I say, This is the body which is given for you; this is the blood which is shed for you for the remission of sins: then do I remember him, and declare and speak of his death, not that it is done publicly in general, but that it is drawn to you alone.

45 Christ has decreed that when we come together, each one should take of the bread and cup, and then preach about 1) him. Why? Because this is not to be given to anyone except Christians who have heard Christ preach before. But the preaching or proclamation applies generally to everyone, even to those who are not yet Christians. The Christians alone should enjoy it, but still remember that you will become more.

46 For this reason it should be proclaimed publicly and such a public commemoration should be held, so that those who do not yet know it will also come. But that they make such remembrance alone in the corner is of no value; it is to be done publicly before the congregation, and to be preached at mass at all times. Therefore the word "do this in remembrance of me" means as much as this: As often as you do it, preach about me; as Paul interprets it in the first [epistle] to the Corinthians on the 11th, v. 26, when he calls it "proclaiming the death of Christ. He uses the word "proclaim" to indicate that [there is]

not in a corner among Christians alone, who know it beforehand, and are not allowed to preach, but only to exhort, but publicly in crowds for those who do not know; so that both, remembrance and proclamation, mean nothing else than doing the public preaching of him; as is done in all preaching.

(47) This, I say, is to be done always when we receive the sacrament. But those who go to the sacrament should believe and be sure, not only that they receive Christ's true body and blood in it, but also that it 2) is given to them and is their own. For what purpose? Not for the sake of money or merit, as a work, as the monks and priests keep Mass; but "for us for the forgiveness of sins". Now we know well what forgiveness of sin means. When he forgives, he forgives everything completely, leaving nothing unforgiven. If then I am free from sin, I am also free from death, the devil and hell, and I am a son of God, a Lord of heaven and earth.

48. So let every man know how to answer, especially when he is challenged and persecuted, that he may say, I understand the words, that his body and blood are given me for the remission of sins; therefore every Christian must know these words from letter to letter [that he may say from the heart]: Then hath my Lord given me his body and blood in bread and wine, that I should eat and drink, and be mine, that 3) I may be sure that my sins are forgiven me, and that I may be loosed from death and hell, and have everlasting life, and be the child of God, and an heir of heaven. Therefore, I go to the Sacrament to seek such things.

49) I am a poor sinner, I have death before me, I have to go through it, the devil challenges me, and I am in all kinds of trouble and danger. Because I am now in sin, a prisoner of the devil and death; 4) I feel,

2) Wittenberger: this treasure.

3) "damit" taken by us from the old edition of Walch. Erlanger: "so that I may be sure." Wittenberger: "shall be sure of it." Latin: ut seeurus siru.

4) So in the Wittenberg edition. In the old edition of Walch and the Erlangen edition: caught. Latin: eaptivus.

that I am weak in faith, cold in love, whimsical, impatient, envious, sin clings to me behind and in front; therefore I come, finding and hearing Christ's word, that forgiveness of sin [through his blood and death] should be given to me. Therefore, when we have received the gift, let us proclaim it, that we may bring other people also to it. Behold, so should the children and the simple be instructed of the Sacrament, that they may know what they should seek.

(50) This is what we call the right custom, not that it is only done and obedience to the church is performed. For in this way a sow might well go. It is not to be done for the sake of the work, but that your heart 1) may be strengthened, as the words are, "Which is given for you, which is poured out for you." And even if the words are not there, as Paul leaves them, you still have the body that died for your sin and the blood that was shed for it. But if Christ is given to you, forgiveness of sin is also given to you, and all things 2) acquired through the treasure. If you have grasped this with your heart, as it cannot be grasped anywhere else, and believe, you must say: No work, no deed helps me from sins, but I have another treasure, my Lord's body and blood, given to me for the forgiveness of sins. This is the only treasure and forgiveness, and no other in heaven or on earth. Apost. 4, 12.

(51) For this reason he has given himself to us, and will be with us and remain until the last day, Matt. 28:20, not only because he is as the papists have him, and carries about [against the command of Christ] without fruit; or as others say, *ut siZnum*, that is, as only a slogan, which would bring us neither improvement nor fruit. Should Christ use such a great thing in vain, without benefit and piety? But this shall be the fruit, that thou mayest strengthen thy faith, and make it sure, that thou mayest preach thereunto.

52 They say it is a useless concern that is of no use to you or anyone else.

1) Wittenberger: Trost empfahe and.

2) Wittenberger: what Chrstus has and is.

be. Therefore, God still protects us, as before. The devil 3) has nowhere to go, except to come and smite where the gospel has begun. Therefore we must base ourselves on the words and insist on them, so we can answer the heretics well, for they are clear and German enough, and the summa is in them: First, that we receive forgiveness of sins as a gift. Secondly, to preach and proclaim the same afterwards.

(53) Thus you have the distinction of what memory is, and how it is to be used and enjoyed; namely, not otherwise than that we amend our infirmities and defects. With other people we have common infirmities; for ourselves each has peculiar ones; for their sake one comes to seek strength here. For this reason, this sacrament is called the food of hungry and poor souls who feel their sorrow and want to be helped from death and all misfortune.

(54) Then the papists taught, Beware, go not thou, but be pure, and have no evil conscience; that Christ might have a pure place. With this they made the poor souls so stupid and frightened that they fled from the sacrament, and yet had to take it out of compulsion, with such trembling that one would have liked to go into a furnace of fire.

(55) So let us be pure, that we may be sorry for our sins, and be glad to be rid of them; and (5) let us be grieved that we are so poor, so far from being in earnest, without fencing. But that we should be free from sin, no one will bring it about. Even if we were, you would not be allowed to go there. It is just for the sake of the weak. This is the custom of the sacrament, to strengthen the conscience against all adversity and temptation.

56 Now there is left the piece of the fruit of the sacrament, of which I have otherwise given much.

3) Wittenberger: strives with great diligence to get him there, and to throw the doctrine of the gospel, since it has begun.

4) Wittenberg: thirsty. Latin: *egentiuna*.

5) Wittenberger: should be sorry for us from the bottom of our hearts.

6) Thus the Wittenbergers. In the old edition of Walch and Erlangen: *dürfest*. Latin: *nulla ts urZrst 6NU8N*.

and which is nothing other than love, which the old fathers also practiced highly and most of all, and therefore called the sacrament communion, that is, a community. Now this is also held up to us in two ways or teachings. First, with an example; then with a likeness or sign of the bread and wine, so that every Christian, however coarse he may be, may grasp in the sacrament all the Christian doctrine, what he should believe, and 1) what he should do by faith. For this is necessary for every man to know, that Christ gave his body, flesh, and blood, on the cross, that it might be a treasure to us, and help us to forgive sin, that is, that we might be saved, redeemed from death and hell.

This is the first main part of Christian doctrine, which is presented to us in words and given to us as a sign and safeguard of his body and blood, which we receive in the flesh. He had indeed done it once, arranged it and acquired it on the cross, but every day he has it recited to us, distributed and poured out with sermons; he commands that we always remember it and not forget it. The other part is love, first of all indicated by the fact that he gives us an example; just as he gave himself for us with his body and blood to redeem us from all distress, so we should also give ourselves, as much as we can and can, for our neighbor. He who knows this and lives in this way is holy, must not learn much more, and will find nothing more in the whole Bible, for the two pieces are painted here in a heap, as on a tablet, so that they should always be before our eyes and in daily use. 2)

(58) Secondly, about the example there is also the figure or model, which the teachers have diligently shown, that he has given his body and blood under the form of things, which have such a nature that they are made of many things into a house. As, a loaf is made up of many grains, out of which one makes a dough, or

1) Wittenberger: and according to what fruit is to follow faith.

2) Thus the Wittenberg. Erlanger: is. Latin: strnsus xsxruntur.

A loaf of bread is nothing else than many grains baked into one another: "So we also are many (says Paul 1 Cor. 10:17), but all are one loaf and one body. So that as every grain loses its shape, and becomes one with the others, so that you cannot see or separate one from the other, all are the same, and yet all are distinct in themselves: so also Christianity should be one without sects, that all may be one, as faith, gospel, baptism, one heart, mind and will, Eph. 4:5.

(59) Thus does a Christian, and knows no other way, but that the good that is his is given to his neighbor; makes no distinction, helps everyone with life and limb, good and honor, as he can. Such a picture is also painted in the wine; there are many berries pressed together, from which one juice becomes, and each loses its shape. All the berries are in the wine, but there is no difference, so that one can know one for the other, has flowed all too often and become a juice and drink.

Thus Christ has beautifully 3) painted and carved 4) the whole Christian essence, so that no more books may be written without it being further outlined, so that it may ever be well understood and grasped. There we have a lesson, on which we have enough to study all our lives; you must not worry about something that others do not know, as our new sects always think up something new. There you have it all: learn as long as you want, but it will always remain flesh and blood that you are not perfect in faith, love and patience. So that this sacrament is a disciplinarian, by which we judge ourselves and learn as long as we live.

(61) What is it, then, that you want to know a particular thing before others, if you do not know that, in which it all lies? And he who knows this knows all that he ought to know, without which all other things, as much as can be known, are nothing. 1 Cor. 13:2: "If I could prophesy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge, 2c. and have not love, I am nothing."

3) Wittenberg: bodily. Latin: amablliaüumlrrations.

4) Wittenberger: Fürgebildet.

(62) Thus the devil leads men by the nose, so that they do not look at the main thing, want to go above, and bring forth something special, and thereby lose the highest and only treasure. Behold, it is most plainly spoken of, that the simple may well know how to use it, and also the fruit, that they may see whether they have used it aright. Let every man see what he lacks, and let others speak and talk as they will.

The third part. 1)

From confession.

63. about this also confession is to be preached, to teach the simple again, because one knows how we have let ourselves be tortured and disgraced with confession up to now, with such trouble that there has been no severe commandment, because the world has confessed. First, I think the word "confess" comes from the little word jehen, from which is made confess, besähet, that is, confessed; hence we have made it into one syllable, and call it confession, that is, a confession. As some saints were also called in Latin: Confessores, in German: Beichtiger; as Beichter, that is, Bekenner.

But, as I have said before, there are three kinds of confession. One before God. For first of all, it is necessary that I recognize myself as a sinner before God, as the Gospel reveals, Rom. 3, 23; and Joh. 3, 5: "Unless one is born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God. He who confesses that he is born of woman must give glory to God and say, "I am nothing but a sinner," as David sings in Psalm 51:7: "Behold, I was brought forth in sins, and in sins did my mother conceive me." As if to say, I must be a sinner, it is inborn in me; as soon as I was made in my mother's womb, I was a sinner, for flesh and blood, of which I was made, was sin; as it is said, Where skin and hair are evil, there is no good fur. So is

The clay of which we are made is not good; what mother and father do and bring to it is already sin.

Whoever does not want to confess this, nor be a sinner, but still have a free will that something good should still be in him, blasphemes and punishes God with lies, and must be eternally damned; how just. For he wants to be right and not suffer God's judgment. Therefore the prophet says again, Ps. 51:6: "Against you alone have I sinned, and done evil in your sight; therefore you will remain right in your words, and be found pure when you are judged." As if to say, "I will not quarrel with you, but let your word be right, and confess me wrong, that you are true; but those who punish you want to have a reasonable light, and something by which they may obtain mercy; before them you will be found pure.

Now this confession we must make forever, 2) as long as we live, that we may always say, Lord, before thee I am a knave in skin. But there is a difference. For even a knave and an unchristian can say this, but he certainly denies it. No one speaks it from the heart but a true Christian, as the 32nd Psalm v. 5 says: "I said, I will confess my transgression against me unto the Lord; and thou forgavest me the iniquity of my sin: for this shall all the saints pray before thee in due time." All the saints, as much as they are, have the virtue in them that they confess their sin to God and ask for it. Therefore, no one makes such a confession except the Christians, who are holy.

Now it is a strange thing that he who is pious before God and has the Holy Spirit should say that he is a sinner. But it is right; he confesses what he has been, and what he still is. He has the Holy Spirit, but is still a sinner because of the flesh; therefore all the saints cry out against the flesh. Nor is the devil far from it, who stirs up that he may bring the flesh into sin; therefore it is a high and great confession.

68. others also say they are sinners; but when other people say it of them, 2) "immerdar thun" put by us instead of: immer darthun. Latin: eitra Lutsrnüssionsua taeisnäs. est.

1) This third part is missing in the Wittenberg edition; however, it is in the Latin.

they do not want to hear it. But the saints, when it is said to them, or when God punishes them for sin, they say: Yes, it is right. Those hypocrites can well deceive themselves, but stop when they want to: but from other people they want to be unpunished and unlearned 1); as now clergymen and monks do, they also say they are sinners, but do not want to hear that we say it. Therefore God does not ask for such confession. This confession is now commanded and necessary, and the whole world is obliged to do it; but no one does it except the Christians.

69 The other confession is that which is made not to God but to one's neighbor, of which Christ speaks in Matthew 5 and 6; Jacob also writes of it in the epistle, chapter 5, 16: "One confesses his sin to another," that is, keep yourselves thus, that each one may humble himself before the other, and confess his guilt where he has offended someone. Offense, however, is of various kinds, common and special.

We are all in the community (I am concerned), and the Lord's Prayer interjects into us. This is that we do not help our neighbor as much as we owe to help him, with words, preaching, advice, comfort, money, goods, honor, life and limb; this is so high that no one is so holy, he remains in debt; therefore we must all say among ourselves: I am indebted to you, you are indebted to me, but especially to whom God has given much, he is also indebted much. I also owe more than perhaps twenty or even a hundred; he will also demand it of me, nothing else will come of it, it will count to the last penny, as I have invested it and advertised it. This debt now passes through in general, that it affects no one in particular: I am indebted to everyone; so everyone is indebted to me again for comfort and assistance where I suffer hardship and need help. But we are not diligent enough to seek out the people who need us; and offering service is also too much for us.

71. now when we look at the register how much we owe, we have to fidget

1) So taken over by us from the old edition of Walch; Erlanger: "and honored". Latin: nolunt oulpari st rexrekendi.

And we are afraid, and we find no counsel, because we say, One is indebted to me again, I have to reckon with others also, I want to give them all that; therefore I ask, Lord, that you also forgive me; so I make a line through it, and erase it. If we did not have this advice, we would be in a bad way; therefore it remains with this. Our Father, it is also necessary that we forgive our debtors, so that our guilt may be forgiven us; as Christ teaches in the Gospel Matth. 18, 22. ff. This is the one confession, that one must confess publicly before the people and confess the guilt; before God I am not pious, before the world, also after the common guilt, there each one has to promise the other, no one does enough. Therefore, one must ask the other to forgive him.

Now no other man than a Christian makes this confession. For the unbelievers do not suffer this, that they reckon such things to be sin; they lead the spiritual law, which says: To each his own is due; they think that they have the goods they have for their own sake, therefore they also need all kinds of goods only for their honor and pleasure, as Solomon says in Proverbs: "The wicked has food only for sin, but the righteous is mild. The wicked needs his goods, wisdom, art, honor, that he may have pleasure and use thereof; all this is sin, and so sin that he still thinks it is not sin, but right.

God created us for this reason, that we should be our neighbor's caretakers; but we are all guilty of this. But this we have before, that we recognize it and are sorry for it, striving to do more and more every day, fearing God, doing as much as we can and Adam allows; what we do not do about it, God puts a stop to it, as I said; not daring to pay it, it is too much, so we say: Forgive me, I will forgive again.

(74) Over and above this common guilt there is also a special guilt, as Christ speaks of it in Matt. 5:25. If a special person is insulted, lied to, damaged, scolded, or defiled by rumor, one should also confess and say that one has done wrong, and apologize to one's neighbor. Oh, that also hurts, the

To break Adam in this way, and to lower oneself against a poor man whom one despises, and to give him justice and the highest honor, and himself the greatest disgrace. This was also the custom in monasteries in former times, that the monks were forced to do this; but it was evil.

A wicked man does not humble himself so deeply that he disgraces himself, does not see that he would be greatly honored before God and before pious people. Christians can protect themselves from this guilt to some extent, both for themselves and for others, by covering it up and punishing it when one hears and sees it from others. But no one can defend against the common guilt. But we do not speak here of the two confessions; for these go on all the year round, and not only when you want to go to the sacrament.

(76) But here we speak of secret confession, which I consider to have come from public confession, which happened in this way: that the Christians made the previous two confessions together, so that each one confessed publicly before he went to the sacrament, before God and man. When the Christians were few, each one told it to the other. After this, it was decided that sins should be counted and numbered, but they will remain uncounted; you will never count how much you should do that you neglect.

Of this we now say thus: If these two are done publicly, one is not guilty of doing them. God knows your sin well; if you confess it to Him and then to your neighbor, your sins are forgiven. But it is by no means to be rejected for the sake of those who want to use it gladly; for in secret confession there is much that is useful and delicious. First of all, absolution, that your neighbor absolves you in God's stead, which is as much as God Himself would say; that should be comforting to us. If I knew that God was in one place, and wanted to absolve myself, I would not go there once, nor in one place, but as often as I could. This is what he has put into the mouth of man, so it is very comforting, especially to the afflicted spirit.

know to get such" there. Secondly, it serves for the simple-minded children. For because the common people are industrious, they always listen to sermons and learn nothing, and even in houses they do not stop anyone from doing it; therefore, even if it is not good for anything, it is good for instructing people and hearing them believe, pray, learn, etc.; otherwise they go like cattle. That is why I said that the sacrament should not be given to anyone, so that he knows what he is getting and why he is going. This can be done most easily in confession.

78 Thirdly, there is comfort in the fact that anyone who has an evil conscience or any other concern or need would like to have counsel, so that he can ask for it. Therefore, we cannot despise confession, for it is God's word that comforts and strengthens us in faith, teaches us what we lack, and gives us counsel in our needs. That is why no one does this confession properly except devout Christians. For it must be such people who feel that they would like to get advice and comfort. But this is the mistake, that one did not pay attention to the absolution, but to our work, how well and purely one confessed; in addition, one wanted to count the sin, which one cannot do, is also too much and great work with listening.

Therefore, this would be the best way to get away with it briefly: Dear brother, I come to lament my sin, that I am a sinner before God and man, especially I care about this and that piece 2c. Will you say it or not, is up to you. Then decided: Therefore I pray, give me good comfort, and strengthen my soul 2c. So it would have no trouble and work, without it being delicious work, which no one does, but a devout Christian.

80. From all this you see that the devil's commandment is that he presses everyone into obedience and mortal sin, and that those who do not do it give it to the devil, since it is not in our power either to take or to give, but it is a gift from heaven, Jac. 1. If I drive all to it, how many are they who gladly confess that they are driven to it?

without all distress? Not one in twenty thousand. With the others they do no more than mock God and blaspheme abominably. For the priest pronounces a judgment in God's stead, which is lacking and does not come true. For he does not like to confess and to hear absolution, nor does he believe in it. The fault is not in the priest, but in the one who confesses, who confesses and does not desire absolution from the heart.

Now God is not pleased that one should keep His word in vain, Exodus 20:7. If you do not desire it, let it stand, even all three confessions. It belongs only to pious people; otherwise it is better to leave it pending; it is not righteous, but

damnable. So far we have only confessed to the pope for his service, not to our souls, and that is rightly called the pope's or the church's obedience; he has had benefit and honor from it, but the others have had their souls condemned.

So you have a short and clear instruction of the two, sacrament and confession, so that it all happens willingly and out of desire, so that you come from yourself, and present your sin, get comfort and strength, so it is useful and blessed. And it is necessary that the children and the simple people be taught and instructed in this way, not by force, but with good words. For it is especially, as has been said, also for this purpose, and for this reason it should be done in pregnancy. Amen.

20 D. Martin Luther's writing: That these words of Christ: "this is my body" 2c., still stand firm against the swarming spirits. *)

About April 1527.

(1) How true the proverb is that it is said: The devil is a thousandfold. Which he proves mightily in all other things, so that he rules his world, as in bodily outward lusts, deceits, sins, mischievousness, murders, destruction, etc., but he proves it especially and beyond measure in spiritual, inward things, which concern God's honor and the conscience. How can he turn, drag, steer and turn on all sides, and at all ends block himself and put himself in the way, so that no one should be saved and remain with the Christian truth!

Let us take the history of the Christians (the old fathers and the Jews will remain silent) as an example. In the beginning of the

Since the first Gospel, when the Word of God was preached by the apostles in a pure and clear way, and no commandments of men were presented, but only holy Scripture, it was as if there should never be any need, because the holy Scripture would be the empress among Christians. But what could the devil not do? In the end he allowed only the Scriptures to be valid, 1) and no Pharisaic, Jewish commandment or value law should be valid any longer, and he also had some of his own in the Christian schools,' through which he secretly crept and crawled into the fierce Scriptures.

003 And when he was come in, and was sure of the things, he brake out, and went forth unto

1) In the old editions: gölte.

*) This writing appeared in 1527 (first probably in April, because on March 21 Luther wrote to Clemens Ursinus: "Auch ich mache jetzt ein deutsches Buch wider sie (Zwingli und Oecolampads fertig ssksolvos) in several individual editions (the Erlangen edition lists their five), of which two with Melchior Lottber in Wittenberg, one with Friedrich Peipus in Nuremberg, one at Wittenberg without indication of the printer and one with Gabriel Kantz without indication of the place. In the collections: in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 119k; in the Jena (1556), vol. III, p. 375; in the Altenburg, vol. III, p. 691; in the Leipzig, vol. XIX, p. 388 and in the Erlangen, vol. 30, p. 14. Matthäus Judex, professor in Jena, translated this script into Latin. This translation first appeared at Nuremberg in 1556 and was incorporated into the Latin Wittenberg edition, Dona. VII (1558), fol. 379k. We reproduce the text according to the Erlangen edition, which printed the text of the first-mentioned original edition, comparing the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

He made such a mess of the Scriptures, and created many sects, heresies and sects among the Christians. And because every sect took the Scriptures for itself and interpreted them according to its meaning, the Scriptures began to be worthless and were finally called a book of heresy, because all heresies make use of the Scriptures. Thus the devil was able to drain the Christians of their weapons, their defenses, and their fortress (that is, the Scriptures), so that they not only became weak and ineffective against him, but also had to fight against the Christians themselves, and made them so suspicious of the Christians as if they were poison against which they should defend themselves. Tell me, was this not a trick of the devil?

When the Scriptures had become such a torn net that no one could be held with it, but every man bored a hole in it where his snout was, and followed his own mind, interpreting and turning it as he pleased, the Christians knew how to do things no differently than to make many concilia, in which they made many outward commandments and orders beside the Scriptures, to keep the multitude together, against such divisions. From this presumption (even though they meant well) flowed that it was said that the Scriptures were not enough, that one should also have the Conciliation and the Fathers' commandment and interpretation, that the Holy Spirit had not revealed everything to the apostles, but had saved some things for the Fathers, until in the end the papacy came out of it, in which nothing is valid but the commandment and glosses of men according to the shrine of the Holy Father's heart.

When the devil saw this, he sneered and thought: Now won! the writing lies, the castle is destroyed, the weapons are down, for this they now weave stout walls, and make weapons of hay, that is, they now want to set themselves against me with human commandments; there, there it is serious! What shall I do? I will not fight against them, but I will help them to build with confidence, so that they may be fine, and gather straw and hay enough. It serves me well that they do not quarrel in the Scriptures, and walk idly on the word, but are content with the same piece.

stand, and believe what Concilia and Fathers say.

(6) In such peace and unity, I will cause other disputes and quarrels, so that popes will strive against emperors and kings, bishops against princes and lords, scholars against scholars, clergy against clergy, and always one against the other, for the sake of temporal honor, good and pleasure, but the unity of faith in the holy fathers will remain intact. The fools, what do they want to do with bickering in the Scriptures and God's things, which they do not understand? It is better that they quarrel about honor, kingdoms, principedoms, goods, pleasures and the thirst of the flesh, which they understand, yet remain devout Christians in unity in the faith of the Fathers, 1) that is, in loose faith.

(7) Thus was the counsel of the fathers: when they thought to have the Scriptures without strife and discord, they were caused thereby, that they came wholly from the Scriptures into pure man's hand. There had to stop discord and strife in the Scriptures, which is a divine strife, that is, since God is at odds with the devil, as St. Paul says Eph. 6, 12: "We do not have to fight with flesh and blood, but with the spiritual wickedness in the air" 2c. But for this, human discord for honor and good on earth has broken down, and yet united blindness and ignorance of the Scriptures remained, with loss of the right Christian faith, that is, unanimous obedience of the Fathers and the Holy See at Rome. Is this not also a piece of devilish art? How one starts it, he is a master and squire in the game.

(8) Now in our day, when we saw that the Scriptures were under the bank, and that the devil held us captive and deceived us with the straw and hay of human commandments, we also, by the grace of God, sought counsel in the matter, and indeed with great sour labor brought forth the Scriptures again, and gave leave to the commandments of men, and set ourselves free, and escaped from the devil, though he honestly resisted and still resists; but

1) In the old editions a play on words: "glosen Glauben" - "loose faith".

But because he has to let us go, he still does not forget his art, has also secretly mixed his seed among us, who should grasp our doctrine and words, not that they should assist us and help to drive the Scriptures, but because we fight against humanity in front, they invaded our army behind us, caused turmoil and raged against us, so that we perished the easier between two enemies. That is (I mean) mercury thrown into the pond.

(9) But he will not leave it at that, but begins with the least, with the sacraments; although in the same piece he has already torn the Scripture into ten holes and evasions, that I have never read more shameful heresy, which in the beginning has among itself so many heads, so many factions and disagreements, although they are united in the main matter of persecuting Christ. But he will continue and attack more articles, as he already sparkles with the eyes that baptism, original sin, Christ is nothing 1). Then again there will be a jumble in the Scriptures and such discord, so many groups, that we may well say with St. Paul: "The mystery of wickedness is already stirring", just as he also saw that after him many more groups would come. And where the world should stand longer, one will again, as the ancients have done, for the sake of such 2) discord, also seek human suggestions, and again make laws and commandments, which will unite people in the faith. This will then also succeed, as it succeeded before.

(10) In sum, the devil is too clever and too powerful for us; he blocks and hinders everywhere. If we want to enter the Scriptures, he creates so much discord and strife in them that we grow weary of the Scriptures and stupid to trust them, and must lie at loggerheads with him and wrestle with him. If we want to rely on human concilia and advice, we lose the Scriptures altogether and remain the devil's own with our skin on.

and hair. He is Satan and is called Satan, that is, an adversary; he must resist and cause misfortune, otherwise he cannot do it. For this he is a prince and god of the world, that he has power enough and can do it. Because he can and will do it, it is not to be thought that we may have peace before him; he neither feasts nor sleeps. So choose whether you would rather fight with the devil or be his own. If thou wilt be his own, then thou shalt have his company, that he may leave thee well satisfied with the scripture. If you do not want to be his own, fight him, grab his hair, he will not miss you; he will cause discord and riots in the Scriptures so that you will not know where Scripture, faith, Christ and yourself remain.

11. Alas, alas, alas to all our teachers and scribes, who are so sure of themselves and spit out everything that falls into their mouths, and do not first look at a thought ten times to see if it is right before God; who think that the devil is now in Babylon, or sleeps next to them like a dog on a cushion, and do not think that he is around them with poisonous fiery arrows that he shoots, which are the most beautiful thoughts, adorned with scripture, so that they cannot notice it. But no admonition, no warning, no warning helps here, the devil is a thousand artists; where God does not defend and help, our actions and advice are nothing; turn it back and forth, and he is the ruler of the world. He who does not know, let him try; I have learned something of it, but no one will believe me until he also learns it.

(12) It is the same devil who now attacks us through the devils with blasphemy of the holy and reverend Sacrament of our Lord Jesus Christ, from which they want to make vain bread and wine the sign or emblem of the Christians, as they dream and like; and the body and blood of the Lord shall not be there, as yet the thin and bright words stand there and say: "Effet, das ist mein Leib" ("Effet, this is my body"), which words still stand there, firm and un[b]iffened by them. I have indeed against the Carlstadt the things with diligence acted, and so that who would not have desire to err, should

1) Thus the Wittenberg and the Jena editions. The old edition of Walch and the Erlangen edition: "not". Also Zwingli (in the writing No. 83 in this volume, § 10) has read "nothing".

2) In the Wittenberg and Jena: "such". In the old edition of Walch and Erlangen: "such".

I think I can make do with it against such a devilish specter. But my dear enthusiasts despise me so magnificently that they do not consider me worthy to answer with diligence; it is enough for them that they look at the book and turn up their noses at it, and say: There is no spirit there. What does it help that I write a lot? They despise it, and if they only chatter a little on it and don't really touch an argument, then they call it answered, and only put their things on a lot of book writing and paper clicking.

13 And this is also one of the causes that I have hitherto refrained from writing further against them, because I have sensed such arrogance and contempt under their highly famous humility. The other, that their rapture is a loud loose talk, that I wonder how such fine learned people might be caught with it. And they also act with such a stupid, despondent conscience that I think they want the beer to be back in the barrel. And if they hadn't started it, I think they should leave it in the queue.

I see nothing else in the matter, but God's wrath, which leaves the devil the bridle to cause such gross foolishness and tangible darkness, to punish our shameful ingratitude, which we have so miserably despised and worthless the holy gospel, so that, as St. Paul says, we believe the wrong, because we have not accepted the love of the truth. There is also nothing lacking in this enthusiasm, except that it is new; for we Germans are such fellows: what is new, we fall on it and hang on to it like fools, and whoever resists us only makes us madder about it; but if no one resists, we soon get tired of it ourselves and gape at it for another new thing. Thus the devil has the advantage that no doctrine nor dream can arise so clumsily; he finds disciples for it, and the more clumsy, the sooner.

15 But God's word alone endures forever; error always rises and falls beside it. For this reason, I am not worried that this fanaticism will stand for long; it is too coarse and insolent, and does not fight against arrogance or uncertain Scripture, but

against the light and dry Scriptures, as we shall hear. But now I will set myself against the devil and his enthusiasts, not for their sake, but for the sake of the weak and simple. For I have no hope that the teachers of a heresy or a fancy will be converted; indeed, where that would be possible, so much has already been written that they would be converted. It has never been heard that he who has invented false doctrine has been converted; for such sin is too great, because it blasphemes God's word and sins against the Holy Spirit; therefore God makes them obdurate, so that it goes according to the saying of Isaiah 6:10: 1) "With seeing eyes you shall not see, and with hearing ears you shall not hear. For this people's heart is hardened."

16 Christ did not convert a high priest, but their disciples were converted, as Nicodemus, Joseph, Paul and the like. The prophets of old did not convert a false prophet. Paul also could not convert a false apostle, but gave the teaching: "if one is admonished two or three times, he should be shunned and let go, as a perverse one". Thus the holy doctors have never converted any heretics; not because all of them had not sufficiently denied and convinced all of that error with the truth, but because their hearts were possessed with their own conceit, and they were as 2) he who sees through a painted glass: You put before it what color you want, and it sees no other color than its glass has. But it is not lacking that one does not put the right color before him; it is lacking that his glass is colored differently, as the same saying of Isaiah Cap. 6, 9. f. also gives 3): "You will see it (he says), and yet you will not see it." What else is this said, but: It will come before your eyes enough and well that you will see it, and others will also see it; but you will not see it? This is

1) Here the Erlanger has reprinted from Walch's old edition: Is. 6, 9. On the whole, Walch has fourteen wrong Bible quotations in this writing, which the Erlanger edition has included all of them.

2) "it" is missing in the Erlanger.

3) Wittenberg: doch. Latin: etiam.

the reason (John 12:40) that such people cannot be converted: the truth presented does not do it; God must take away the painted glass, but we cannot do that.

(17) Even if I do not convert a master blasphemer, I shall not fail (if God wills) to place the truth brightly enough and dryly enough before their eyes, and to tear down some of their disciples, or to strengthen the simple and weak, and to protect them from their poison. Even if this is not possible (since God is in favor), I hereby testify and confess before God and all the world that I do not hold with these blasphemers of the sacraments 1) and enthusiasts, nor have I ever held, nor do I ever want to hold (whether God wills it,²⁾) and I will have washed my hands of all the blood of the souls who 3) steal, seduce and murder them with such poison from Christ. For I am innocent of it, and have done what is mine. For my sake, I may not write against them, but their own writing is my strength. When I read them, they make me strong and full of joy, because I see that the devil rages against God's word with such earnestness, and yet God does not allow him to do more than slander lame, stale, rotten things, so that I must speak: You would like to, but you cannot. So now, again, to despise the devil, I will take no more than Christ's one saying before me: "This is my body," and see what the devotees have broken off from him so far. Mostly because they are slippery and inoffensive, twisting and turning in a thousand directions, whether I would ask them in God's name to stand on the one saying and answer me correctly. I will save the other sayings for another time.

(18) And I have asked them kindly not to be angry with me for condemning their doctrine and ascribing it to the devil; I cannot do it or call it anything else than what I believe in my heart. Because they call us the

If they think that they are unbelievers and that the spirit of God has left them, they should be patient according to their spirit and their glory, and prove by deed the patience of which they click so many books full. For there is no end nor measure of praise in their writing, how holy martyrs they are, how much they suffer, how temperate and patient they are, how they seek glory in Christ alone. And yet they always cry out and complain with them, how they revile the servants of Christ, and thus give offence to the common people, and desire that they should be badly praised, and say: Vain spirit, vain spirit you are; vain truth, vain truth you teach; then they would be patient.

19. Because we godless unbelievers and impatient ones must suffer from such holy, moderate teachers that they blaspheme us idolatrously, and call our God the baked God, the gluttonous and boozy God, the brooding God, the weeping God, and us the denied Christians and the like, such thoroughly poisonous, devilish disgrace and blasphemy that is beyond measure; For one would rather be scolded full of devils than to have a baked God, and yet we must not be patiently or moderately praised above such suffering. Our servants of Christ are not reviled with it, and our people are not given any trouble with it; it must be called vain praise and correction, pleasure and joy, as they revile us.

020 But if they be but looked on crookedly, or not fallen to: o that is Christ's glory hindered, Christ's servants profaned, the whole world vexed; there is suffering, there is patience, there are all the martyrs' crowns in one heap. And where they are not publicly scolded, they martyred about a word, about written, and picked out a complaint about their suffering, as one breaks a thing from a fence; as Oecolampad does against the Pirkheimer at Nuremberg, that they may boast of their patience, that one may not speak to them. They make a howling and complaining out of it, without doubt before great patience and holiness.

(21) Because (I say) we unbelievers and impatient Gentiles must suffer such abominable blasphemy and shameful reproach from them, it is right that they should suffer something in turn,

1) Erlanger: Sacramentslästern. Latin: *Sacramentariis*.

2) "Whether God wills" is missing in the Erlanger, but is in the Latin.

3) "die" is in the Wittenberg and Jena editions, but is missing in the Erlangen edition.

than the holy Christians, even though they do not want to They say that one should have peace, and they suffer as much as we do. For they have to consider that themselves do not stop increasing such discord, as our conscience and faith is as serious about God's word everyone sees and hears. They say that one should have as theirs can be about their faith, because we also peace, and do not stop themselves to increase such wanted to be saved and come to God, and we also hope discord, as everyone sees and hears, is also their joy, the that we have done as much as they have, and before further it goes. They say that it is a small matter, and yet them. Thus says St. Paul: "We do not fight with flesh and there is not a single piece that they so nearly drive, worry blood" 2c., Eph. 6, 12. Therefore I do not look almost at about and stop; the other pieces all lie still. Here they them, but at the one who speaks through them, the devil become martyrs and saints; whoever does not rave here I mean, just as they also consider me full of devils. But is no Christian, and can do nothing in the Scriptures nor in we would gladly be the Kerich and Shabab 1) that they the Spirit, so excellent is the great art who can say bread may reign; only that we may be free to confess our faith, and wine; in the art the Holy Spirit alone now works. In and to shun and condemn that which is not of our faith. truth, however, it is nothing else than that our wretched Now let us get down to business. devil mocks by it; as if he should say: I will cause all

22 First of all, when they write and make books and unhappiness and disunity by deed, and then wipe his exhort that Christian unity, love and peace should not be mouth and say with words: I seek and desire love and torn apart for the sake of these things, for it is a small unity; as the Psalter also says: "They speak of peace with thing (they say) and a small quarrel, for which Christian 3) their neighbor, but they have evil in their hearts", Ps. love should not be hindered, they reproach us for being 28, 3.

so stiff and hard about it, and for making disagreements. (24) Now then, because they are so wicked, and mock Behold, dear man, what is there to saw? We are like the all the world, I will add a Lutheran warning, and say thus: sheep that went with the wolf to the watering place. The Cursed be such love and unity in the abyss of hell, the wolf stepped above, the sheep stepped below into the because such unity not only miserably divides the water. Then the wolf scolded the sheep for making the Christendom, but also, after the devil's manner, mocks the water murky. The sheep said, "How can I make it cloudy and teases it to such its misery. Now, I will not interpret it for you? You are above me, and you make it cloudy for so badly that they do it out of malice, but are thus blinded me. In short, the sheep had to be used, it must have by Satan, and perhaps make such a conscience among made the water murky for the wolf. So my enthusiasts themselves that bites them, namely, "We have truly also, they have lit the fire, as they themselves gloriously caused great trouble and set fire to it, so let us now paste boast, as a blessing, and now they want to shift the blame and cover it up with words, and pretend to find happiness, of the disagreement from themselves to us. Who called it is not a big thing. And even if we lost the matter, we D. Carlstadt? Who called Zwingel and Oecolampad to would have prevented ourselves from losing great things, and we would have put in a little disgrace, and, as they write? Did they not do it themselves? We would have say of singers, when they are missing, they have only liked to have peace and still do; but they would not admit made a piglet.

23. but I would still like, if such enthusiasts do not want No, not to me, dear sirs, of peace and love. If I strangle to fear God. a man's father and mother, wife and child,

2) "one" is missing in the Erlanger.

3) Erlanger: under.

1) Shabab - the scraped off, the waste, sweepings.

And I would choke him, and then say, "Peace, dear friend, let us love one another; the matter is not so great that we should disagree about it; what should he say to me? Oh, how he should love me! So, the fervent ones strangle Christ, my Lord, and God the Father in his words, as well as my mother, Christianity, and my brothers, and want to have me dead, too, and then they say: I should have peace, they want to cultivate love with me. But I want to expose the fools here, so that everyone can see what kind of spirit is in them, 1) so that those who follow them will know whom they believe and follow.

(26) This is a public thing in the day, that we are in dispute about the words of Christ concerning the Lord's Supper, and it is known by both parts that they are the words of Christ or of God. This is one. So we say on our part that, according to the words, Christ's true body and blood are there, when he says: "Take, eat, this is my body" 2c. We believe and teach in the unrighteous; counsel, what do we do? We lie to God, and preach "that which he hath not spoken, but hath spoken the contrary," we are surely blasphemers and liars against the Holy Spirit, betrayers of Christ, and murderers and deceivers of the world.

(27) Our testimony says, "That there is bread and wine, not the body and blood of the Lord. If they believe and teach therein unrighteously, they blaspheme God, and reproach the Holy Ghost, and betray Christ, and deceive the world. One part must be the devil's enemy and God's enemy; there is no remedy. Now let every devout Christian see whether this thing is small, as they say, or whether God's word is to be joked with. There you have the enthusiasts and their spirit, as I have often said that no godless person can esteem God's word great. This is what these fanatics honestly prove, how they consider the words and works of Christ to be nothing but human gossip, like the school bullies are conceited, which should give way to love and unity. But a devout Christian holds and knows that God's word concerns God's glory, Spirit, Christ, grace, eternal life, death, sin, and all

Things. But these are not small things. Behold, this is how they seek God's glory, as they boast everywhere.

28 It does not help them to say that they have always thought much and greatly of God's words and the whole Gospel, but only in this piece. Dear, God's Word is God's Word, that must not be much of a problem. Whoever blasphemes and blasphemes God in one word, or says that it is a small thing that he is blasphemed and blasphemed, blasphemes the whole of God, and despises all blasphemy against God. It is One God who cannot be divided, or praised in one place, blasphemed in another, honored in one place, 2) despised in another. The Jews believe the Old Testament, and because they do not believe in 3) Christ, it does not help them. Behold, the circumcision of Abraham is now an old, dead thing, and neither necessary nor useful; nor would it help me to say that God had not commanded it at that time, even though I believed the Gospel. This is what St. James means: "He that believeth in one thing is guilty of all things," Jac. 2, 10. He may have heard from the apostles that all the words of God must be believed, or none; although he refers to the works of the law.

29) What wonder is it, then, that frivolous enthusiasts, with the words of the Lord's Supper, fool with their own conceit, and even deceive, 4) because in this little piece they are convinced that they hold God's word and things in low esteem, and put them under human love; just as if God should have to give way to men, and allow His word to be valid according to it, after which men would be at one or at odds with one another about it? How can one believe such enthusiasts that they teach well and rightly, who are publicly found to be dealing with such devilish thoughts, and advise such things that are enough for God's contempt, blasphemy, disgrace, and for us eternal death and destruction, and yet think that they have done well and given a wholesome Christian teaching with it?

2) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: word. Latin: loco.

3) "an" is missing in the Erlanger.

4) "ebentheuern" - to sail into the unknown.

1) Thus the Wittenberg, Jenaer and Erlanger: stickt.

(30) But we poor sinners, who are without spirit, say against such holy Christians from the holy Gospel: "He that loveth father and mother, wife and child, house and home, and his soul more than me, is not worthy of me," Matt. 10:37, and again v. 34: "I am not come to give peace on earth, but the sword"; and Paul: "How rhyme Christ and Belial together?" Now if we are to be Christianly one with them and have Christian love for them, we must also love their doctrine and actions, and put up with them, or at least tolerate them. Let him do this who will; I will not. For Christian unity is in the Spirit, "since we are of one faith, one mind, and one courage," Eph. 4:4, 5.

(31) But this we will gladly do; worldly we will be one with them, that is, keep physical, temporal peace. But spiritually we will avoid them, condemn and punish them, because we have breath, as idolaters, transgressors of God's word, blasphemers and liars; besides suffering from them, as from enemies, their persecution and separation, as far and as long as God suffers, and praying for them, also admonishing them to desist; but we will not and cannot consent to their blasphemy, be silent or approve of it.

32 I have revealed all these things so that one may see how the devil can adorn himself with false humility, peace and patience, as a warning to all who do not humble themselves from the heart, so that they may beware both of the devil and of themselves. For God will not be deceived or fooled; He would take a donkey and condemn great prophets with her mouth, as He did Balaam, Numbers 22:28 ff. Therefore we may well say to such gushers and spirits who offer us such peace, as Christ said to his betrayer Judah in the garden: "O Judah, dost thou thus betray the child of man with the kiss?" Luc. 22, 48. Yes, indeed, a Jewish peace and treacherous kiss is this, since they want to be friendly to us, and obtain from us that we should be silent and watch their burning and murder, so that they bring so many souls into the hellish fire eternally, and have thought it small and nothing.

God warns us with this against the spirits, that he lets them go out like this and betray themselves and show how they deal with lies and falsehood. And whom such a little piece does not frighten nor warn, let him go, he will be lost. The Holy Spirit does not speak and preach such things through his poor sinners, as the devil does through his saints.

33) Now that we have come to the meeting, let us take before us the saying of Christ, of which Matthew and Mark write: "He took bread, gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, 'Receive, eat; this is my body which is given for you,'" Matth. 26, 26. 14:22 For I said that this time I would do this saying alone, in defiance of the devil and his spirits, that I might prove how this one saying is strong and powerful enough against all their idle babblings; and the other sayings shall find their time. There now stands the saying, sounding clear and bright, that Christ giveth his body to eat, when he giveth the bread. On this we also stand, believe and teach that in the Lord's Supper one truly and bodily eats and partakes of Christ's body. But how this happens, or how he is in the bread, we do not know, nor should we know. We are to believe God's word, and not set a way or measure to it. We see bread with our eyes, but we hear with our ears that the body is there.

(34) Against this saying they have not yet brought up anything in so many writings that has even a semblance, let alone a reason. I will let them boast and boast, and also swear confidently by God's judgment and wrath, that they are sure of things and have grasped the truth: but these are words so that they would gladly cover and adorn their uncertain conscience, so that no one should notice how their heart inwardly wavers and weaves, like a reed moved by the wind, before the great uncertainty of their conceit and madness. For I may well swear that this saying of Christ, "This is my body," is in their hearts like an eternal pen, which they cannot get rid of unless they are completely wicked, who no longer feel anything, Eph. 4:17, 18. I know well how wicked spirits are.

They do not know when they begin to wrap themselves in fig leaves and want to hide themselves. For because they lack God's word and follow their own conceit, it is easy to judge their heart from Scripture, which teaches us that "the wicked has no rest, but his heart is like a wave of the sea that cannot stand still," Isa. 57:20.

35 Their writings also prove how anxiously they write. Here they boast once, there they complain; here they ask for peace, there they desire instruction; here they shun trouble, there they seek the glory of Christ, and there is so much unnecessary fuss and fuss 1) that they seldom come to the point and write very little about it. And when they have to come to it, they tread as softly as if they were walking on eggshells, wipe over it afterwards as if the devil were chasing them, and fear that they will have to fall down their necks in all letters. When they are over, they wipe away the sweat and the fear, and thank God for the truth; and there is such a teaching and praising of the spiritual food of the body of Christ and of his memorial, 2c., about which no one disputes with them, and we have known it so well and before than they; that one grasps how they do not know what they are saying, or how they should make a nose at people. Rather, a sure conscience, which is certain of the matter, does not tatter and shred in this way, it says it dryly and freshly, as it is in itself; therefore only no one believes their swearing and boasting, they are certainly lying.

(36) Nevertheless let us hear how they take away our understanding from this saying of Christ, and put theirs into it. They say that the little word "is" is to be considered as much as the word "indicates," as Zwingel writes, and the word "my body" is to be considered as much as the word "my body's sign," as Oecolampad writes; that Christ's word and opinion, according to Zwingel's text, is thus: Take, eat, that is my body. Or, according to Oecolampad's text, thus: Take and eat, this is my body's sign. Oh, they are so sure of this opinion, and they also stand so firm in their heart, like a reed that the wind blows away.

and strikes back and forth, as has been said. They then quickly boast that we have no Scripture that says that Christ's body is in the Lord's Supper. Then they humble themselves again, wanting to be informed and to follow where we can prove with Scripture that Christ's body is there.

37 And this is indeed an excellent thing, just as if I had denied beforehand that God had created the heavens and the earth, and said with Aristotle and Pliny and other pagans that the world was from eternity. But someone would come and hold Moses up to me, Genesis 1: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"; would I make the text thus: God, which should be called so much as "cuckoo"; but created so much as "ate"; heaven and earth so much as "the warbler with feathers and with everything"; that Mosi's word according to Luther's text thus reads: In the beginning the cuckoo ate the warbler with feathers and with everything; and should not be called: In the beginning God created heaven and earth. That would be excellent art, which even the lottery boys could do. Or if I denied that God's Son had become man, and someone held up to me in front of John 1: "The Word became flesh", I would say: Word means a crooked piece of wood; flesh means a piece of meat; and the text would now have to read like this: The crooked wood has become a hay 2); and where my conscience would punish me here and say: You point freely there, Squire Martin, but, but 2c., then I would press until I became red, and say: Silence, you traitor, with your but, so that people do not notice that I have such an evil conscience; then I would boast and clap my hands and say: The Christians have no scripture that proves that God's word has become flesh; but again I would also humble myself and be gladly instructed, where they would do it with the scripture; which I would have turned thus before. Oh how I would rumble both among Jews and Christians, both in the New and Old Testament, if I were allowed such thirst!

38 Thus you speak: What devil do you want

2) Heie - mallet, wooden hammer, pile driver (Grimm). In Latin: miluus. The translator misunderstood "Heie" - "Stößer" i.e. pile-driver and substituted "Weihe" - "Stößer" i.e. bird of impact.

1) Geplätz - patching.

allow you to do this? Answer: Which devil should do it, because he allows Zwingel and Oecolampad? Otherwise I also know no one. Who has ever read in the Scriptures that "body" should mean as much as "body's sign", and "is" should mean as much as "interprets"? Yes, what language in all the world has ever spoken like that? It is only the arrogance and idle malice of the wicked devil, who mocks us with such enthusiasts, in this great matter, that he pretends to be instructed by Scripture, so far from first putting Scripture out of the way, or making his conceit of it.

39 As if I were to strip a man of his weapons with cunning words, and in exchange give him painted weapons made of paper like his own, and then offer him defiance, so that he would strike me with them or defend himself against me. O that would be a bold hero, whom one should spit at and throw out with lungs to the village, 1) where he would do it seriously, or would only be a good carnival laughter, where it would be shame 2). These enthusiasts do the same to us, wanting to change the Scriptures from natural words and meaning into their words and meaning, and then boast that we have no Scriptures, so that the devil may have his laughter at us, or rather, as the defenseless, may surely strangle us. But against this only one little word, that is no, serves from the measure; then they stand like butter in the sun.

(40) Now let us be judges between us, not only Christians, but also pagans, Turks, Tatters, Jews, idols, and all the world, to whom it should be due that he prove his text, whether Luther should do it, who says: Moses says: In the beginning the cuckoo ate the warbler, or whether he should do it, who says: Moses says: In the beginning God created heaven and earth? I hope that it will be judged that Luther should prove his text, because in no language does God mean so much as cuckoo. Well, Luther crept to the

Crosses, he is sorry, he can not prove that God is called cuckoo. For whoever dares to interpret the words in Scripture differently than they read, is guilty of proving the same from the text of the same place, or from an article of faith.

But who will be able to make the enthusiasts prove that "body" is as much as "sign of the body" and that "is" is as much as "interprets"? So far no one has been able to get them to do so. They scream and rave: Where is Scripture? Where is Scripture? and urge us to prove that in the Gospel it says, "This is my body," as the whole world reads and must read. But that it is written, "This signifies my body," or "This is the sign of my body," is so certain that they defy God's judgment, even though no one has ever read it in the Gospel, nor can read it.

God knows that I do not want to speak too close to the Zwingel with such crude parables, especially not to Oecolampad, to whom God has bestowed many gifts before many others, and I am heartily sorry for the man. I also do not look at them in such speeches, but only at the hopeful mocking devil, who has thus deceived and seduced them, 3) so that I in turn also atone for my pleasure in him, in honor of God, and mock him again in such his foolish jokes. For he shall and must be subject to God's words. And this year, if it pleases God, I will dare the devil, 4) that, if God wills, he should also come on a day that prevents me from doing other necessary things; God grant that he tie a rod over his butt, and wake up a slumbering dog, amen. For I write these things so that our people may have the opportunity to answer the ravishers. When they so mockingly ask where it is written that bread is Christ's body, and act so foolishly as if they had never read it, they should be asked again where it is written that "body" is the sign of the body. It is written in the smoke hole, there is their Bible.

1) The expression: "to throw out with lungs," that is, to chase away with disgrace, is also found in the Hauspostille. Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XIII, 1224, § 9. Latin: pi1lis ex stercore gHuino oonl66ti8 iZuominio8i88lrl6 6 xaZo ejieiatu.

2) Rant - Joke.

3) Erlanger: umführt. Latin: eireumvenit 6t 86-cluxit.

4) Here is "to dare" - to take on. Latin: äsMnabo.

(43) This is the sum of it, that we have for ourselves the light and dry scripture, which saith, Take, eat; this is my body; and it is not necessary for us, neither shall it be enjoined upon us, to write over such a text (though we may do it abundantly), but let them bring up scripture, which saith, This signifieth my body, or this is the sign of my body. For this time we do not want to do the devil the honor of leading more scripture than this saying, "This is my body"; for if we set aside all the glasses that are in the world, we do not find it written in any evangelist: Take, eat, this is the sign of my body, or, this means my body; but we find this without all glasses, so that even young children could read, "Take, eat, this is my body."

. 44 Therefore we ask the enthusiasts not to desire from us to prove this text: "this is my body. For they may ask boys of seven years old to learn such words in school, because the Bible is available in Greek, Latin and German. But they wanted to do that, to show a Bible, in which it was written: this is my body's sign. If they cannot do this, 2) that they will put their mouths and feathers in obedience for a while until they produce such a Bible, or else prove with good reason that such a text can thus be made; but keep silent and do not boast: Where is Scripture? Where is Scripture? for they would cry out such words to themselves, and not to us. For they act against their own conscience.

Here one defies me out of all measure: Oh dear Luther, how easily they will show you the cause and prove their cuckoo. But I am also truly so eager to hear them (believe me), if they are willing to do the same. Well, whistle up and don't spoil the round; let's see whether we should kick or jump. Against the mocking devil I speak thus, not against flesh and blood.

46 First of all, it is certain that Zwingli and Oekolampad are united in mind, as in-

1) letters - spelling.

2) Erlanger: "künnten". Latin: possunt.

the words are different. For the Zwingli says: "this means my body", is just as much as the Oecolampad says: "this is my body's sign"; the German language also gives it and all language, that it is the same, if I say: laughter means joy, and laughter is a sign of joy; that no question still has doubt, "to mean" and "to be a sign" is one and the same. But because here the power lies in whether the word "is" must apply as much in Scripture as the word "signifies," the Zwingli is obliged to prove this from Scripture. If he does not do this, his thing is dirt. Similarly, Oekolampad is also obliged to prove from Scripture that this word "body" must be as valid as the word "sign of the body"; if he does not, he is also dirt, and our text, "this is my body," remains like a rock. 3)

(47) Yes, that it may be seen how far they fall short of the truth, they are not alone guilty of proving from Scripture that "body" is so much as "sign of the body," and that "essence" 4) is so much as "to interpret," but one more thing. Even if they were to find this in one place in Scripture, which is not possible, they are nevertheless also obliged to prove that here in the Lord's Supper it must also be so, that "body" is "sign of the body. And it would be of no use at all if the whole of Scripture were to contain the same sign of the body in other places, and if it were not also contained in this place in the Lord's Supper. For now we are not primarily wondering whether in Scripture "body" is called "sign of the body"; but whether it is so called in this place of the Lord's Supper. The consciences want to be sure and certain in this matter. Therefore, whether you prove that in Genesis "body" is so much as "sign of the body," they are not satisfied with it, but mumble and say: Yes, dear, who knows whether it should therefore also be called so in the Lord's Supper? We must also be assured of this by God's word; otherwise the words stand there for us, and saw us with dry bright text: "This is my body.

3) The Erlanger edition has the words: "das ist mein Leiv" last.

4) Being - to be. In the old edition Walch erroneously: the being.

O how the devil's pants stink here! how he feels so well that he is guilty of this, and does it so sincerely. For we demand both and defy him in both. That is why the enthusiasts shun this debt more than any devil ever shied away from the cross; you must not hope that they will stand here and meet you face to face, or hear what you ask them; it is just a matter of escaping and rushing past; no one wants to bite the piece. Our pastor, Johann Pommer, once reproached the Zwingel in writing that he should prove how in the Lord's Supper "to be" means as much as "to interpret. Yes, the Zwingel, that he would have answered; he sang him a little song about his great suffering in return, and tried to find out whether it was called that way in other places of Scripture, and did not find it either. But that it should be so called in the Lord's Supper he would not touch. He would also have been a fool, and was not to be advised.

49 For thus he proves his interpretation. St. Paul says 1 Cor. 10, 4: "The rock was Christ," that is, the rock signified Christ, therefore it should also apply here "this is my body," and say: this signifies my body. Item, Genesis 2, Mos. 12, 11: "Effet das Osterlamm eiligend, denn es ist des HErrn Passah", that is, it means the Lord's Passover; therefore, "das ist mein Leib" should also read like this here: that means my body.

50 If I now asked Zwingel: Does St. Paul not say thus: the rock means Christ, but thus: "The rock was Christ"; how can you then prove that in the Lord's Supper there is interpretation, which is also not in Paul, by which you want to prove it? but just as you dream it in the Lord's Supper, so you seal it also in Paul. In the same way Moses does not say: "Eat quickly, it means the Lord's Passover," but thus: "Eat quickly, it is the Lord's Passover.^ It is just as necessary for the oppressor to prove his interpretation in Paul and Moses as in the Lord's Supper: for it is not evident in any place. Such an argument is taught to boys in school, that it is called kstitio prinoipii, ivosrtum per inesrtum prodara, and such high spirits do not yet know it. What does Zwingel want to say here to such a hole-laden matter? His

He should not confess error, for it would be shameful; he would much rather say that he is full of the Spirit and must suffer much, and boast until we believe him willingly that there is interpretation in Paul and Moses that no one sees in them.

51 Now I suppose it is true that in Paul and Moses there is interpretation, and we believed it to be his service: what did he accomplish with it? Let us see how he so finely and masterfully casts: Paul says, "The rock was Christ," that is, the rock signified Christ; therefore here also, since Christ says, "This is my body," it must be as much as, "This signifies my body. Dear, let us conclude in the same way, according to the beautiful art. Well, I will prove that Sarah, the holy archmother, remained a virgin, in the Zwinglian way, thus: Lucas writes that Mary remained a virgin, therefore Sarah must also have remained a virgin. Is it not well concluded and well proven? Item, I want to prove that Pilate was an apostle of Christ, thus: The evangelist Matthew writes that Peter was Christ's apostle, therefore this Pilate must also be Christ's apostle, and so on. What I want should and must be concluded from such art for articles of faith.

(52) Yes, you say, it is not true; you must prove each one in particular, how Sarah was a virgin and Pilate an apostle. Why is that? Zwingel is not allowed to prove that there is divination in the Lord's Supper: if it is only in one place in Paul or Moses, then it is enough. The children know it in school, that Partibus ex puris sequitur ml, atHua nsZatis. Nor is the highest art of our spirits to make such "argument" ex partieularidus without Scripture in such high articles of faith.

(53) Then we must conclude that it is a very arrogant mockery of the devil, who, with great certainty, fools us and mimics us with such lazy deception and jugglery. How else would it be possible that such learned men, without the effect of Satan, should be so blind, and praise such loose dreams so highly and propel them into the world for the very strongest reasons of faith? Surely it is not human to have such great thick darkness. So the Zwingel lies in the ashes with his interpretation, just as it has fallen before.

D. Carlstadt with his Tuto. For Zwingel can prove none, namely no interpretation in any place of Scripture, much less that it must be in the Lord's Supper, and does not do so, as he is nevertheless guilty of doing both.

54 For the interpretation in Paul and Moses is soon taken away from him, because Paul says: "They drank from the spiritual rock, but the rock was Christ. Here St. Paul himself shows that he is speaking of a spiritual rock. Now the spiritual rock does not signify Christ, but the rock was Christ Himself with the Jews; just as our rock now signifies nothing, but is nothing else but Christ, as all this also the preachers in Swabia, and I also before against D. Carlstadt have abundantly convinced. But the high spirits do not respect our Scripture, run over it, and only grumble a little about it; so we have answered enough.

55 Similarly, when Moses says: "Hurry up, it is the Lord's Passover", Zwingel cannot prove that it means the paschal lamb. Because one answered soon, thus: "Effet hurry, it is the HErrn Passah", as we say in German: Eat meat, because it is Sunday; drink water, it is Friday. Here no one will force out of me that meat means Sunday, or water means Friday. So also here: "Make haste, for it is the Lord's Passover," that is, it is the day when the Lord went into Egypt 2c.

(56) So also, what more of the sayings they use, in which there is interpretation, none is proven. As when Christ says, "I am a true vine," John 15:1, for he speaks of the true spiritual vine, which he was, and did not signify. How should it read: I signify the right vine; or: I am signified by the right vine? Who then should be the right vine without interpretation? Item: "I am the shepherd", "I am the door", "I am the life and resurrection" 2c., and what are the more. Everything is spoken and understood from the "being," not from the "interpreting," and will never consistently indicate any interpretation; it is vain reverie and one's own conceit. In addition, as I have said, if they already find some interpretation, they can nevertheless use it to

They cannot prove that this is also the case in the Lord's Supper, and all the effort and diligence they have put into it is vain labor.

You still give me so much credit for Carlstadt that I knocked down his tuto, and that there was no solid reason. But if I were to judge between Carlstadt and Zwingel, I would say that D. Carlstadt's "Tuto" would be better suited 1) to such an error than Zwingel's interpretation; it has nothing at all that 2) might adorn it, because he 3) wants to prove his thing out of vain ignotis, incertis, et particularibus. Which, for all reason, is mocking and ridiculous.

58 Oecolampad also wanted to help this insinuation, and since the preachers in Swabia had put it down with a mighty writing, that he himself could not deny that Paul spoke of the spiritual rock, and that there was no insinuation, he did not honor the truth, but rebelled a little against it and said: Paul had nevertheless thought of the physical rock in such speech and had looked there, which means Christ. It is as if we were asking here what Paul had thought or where he had seen, and not rather whether there was interpretation in Paul's words. We know almost well that the physical rock means Christ, and therefore Christ is and is called a spiritual rock, which they must not teach us; but whether there is interpretation in Paul's words, as Zwingel dreams. Then they are silent and rush on, and in their way they let us ask of God, and answer us from their cuckoo; then they boast that no scripture is brought against them. If it is true that one does not have to answer a scripture that has been brought forward, and may speak something else instead, then one does not bring a scripture against them, even if the world were brought against them full of scripture.

59 Now D. Oecolampad is to prove his body sign also from the scripture. Our scripture says: "Take, eat, this is my body"; and it does not say: this is my body's sign. But it is also impossible for him to find a place in the Scriptures where the body

1) i.e. was good.

2) Erlanger: that.

3) In all German editions "es" instead of: "er", namely Zwingli, as must be read according to the Latin.

so much as a sign of the body, let it not be said that he should prove it in the Lord's Supper; and for the sake of proof it lies as deep in ashes as Carlstadt and Zwingel. Nor do they confess so much to God's honor that it is true, and boast as no scripture is brought against them. But if they were not so careless despisers of the Scriptures, a clear saying from the Scriptures should move them as much as if the world were full of Scriptures; as it is true. For it is so to me that every saying makes the world too narrow for me. But if they flutter about and think it is the word of men, it is easy for them not to be forced by the Scriptures.

60 And even if Oecolampad wants to be of the opinion that there is all bread and wine, he still cannot conclude with certainty that "body" must mean "sign of the body"; that is, his reason is not consistent, since the word "body" may be interpreted differently from "sign of the body," and his interpretation cannot be certain or unanimous, as it should be if it were consistent. There are already many others who are of the same opinion with them, and yet accept neither the interpretation nor the sign. Carlstadt lets Leib Leib remain Leib, and stands on Tuto. Some martyr the text thus: Take and eat, "my body is given for you," hear, a spiritual food. These also let the body be the body, and yet are of one faith with him. Some crucify the dear words thus: "Receive and eat; that is given for you is my body." This is how many sects and heads this certain sect has, which in the main are one, and yet the Holy Spirit must be in all of them, as they all boast, and he must, to show evidence and reason in this, not only be diverse, but also repugnant to himself and at odds with himself. But he certainly testifies that one is as well mistaken as the other, because no one can hold the Scripture as it reads, nor prove that it is to be understood differently than it reads.

61 Yes, if swarming were an art, I would certainly want to be as swarming here as they are, and also keep that there would be all bread and wine, and yet raise a new one against them all, and be in harmony with none of them,

and bring forward my conceit, thus. D. Carlstadt in this sacred text, "this is my body," martens the little word "that"; Zwingel martens the little word "is"; Oecolampad martens the little word "body": the others martens the whole text, and reverse the little word "that," and put it behind, and thus say: Take, eat; my body, which is given for you, is this. Some half martyr the text, and put the little word "that" in the middle, and say: Take, eat; that which is given for you is my body. Some torture the text thus: This is my body for my memory, that is, it should not be my body here of course, but only for the memory of my body, so that the text reads thus: Take, eat, this is my body's memory, which is given for you.

62 Above all of these are the seventh, who say: It is not an article of faith, therefore one should not quarrel about it, and may well believe here whoever wants what he wants. These even trample it underfoot. Now the Holy Spirit is here in them all, and no one wants to err in such repugnant proofs and orders of the text, 1) and after all only one order of the text must be right. So grossly does the devil fool us. Well then, there is nothing left to martyr in the text, except the little word "my", which I want to pull through the swarms' hackles, so that no leg of your text remains whole and unmarred, and 2) want to leave no one anything more to swarm in it. But I will be the best of enthusiasts, and neither distort nor reverse the text, and not interpret any word differently than it reads in Scripture, but leave each one as it stands, so that Oecolampad may see that "body" need not necessarily be called "body's sign.

(63) And my enthusiasm is most simple. Since Christ says, "Take, eat; this is my body, which is given for you," let it be understood that Moses commanded in the Old Testament to sacrifice the body of the unreasonable beast, that is, the paschal lamb; but I will give you another body for the paschal feast, that is, the bread; on which I will give you the bread.

1) "Proofs" and "orders" set by us according to the Latin, instead of "proof" and "order".

2) "want" is missing in the Erlanger.

that it would be easy for anyone to have it, because you Christians must be poor, and only my memory is driven. But that bread may be Christ's body and be called, I will prove from the Scriptures exceedingly, because Oecolampad his body sign. For thus speaketh the Scriptures, that all things are and are called of God, as he called the Jewish land his land in Moses, and our good works his work, our word his word. Item, in Hosea Cap. 2, 8, he speaks of the Jews: "They took my gold, my silver, my grain, my oil, my wine, and gave it to their Baal" 2c. So here Paul 1 Cor. 15, 38. tells me that every gross thing is called *corpus* or body, since he says: "God gives to every seed its body, and other bodies are the heavenly ones" 2c.

(64) From this I can easily and delicately deduce that Christ is of the opinion that this bread in the Lord's Supper is His body, which He made as a God who makes all bodies, and calls them His bodies. In addition, he ordained the same his body to be his body in a new way, namely, to eat at his memorial. So that the bread is called his body for two reasons; first, because of creation; second, because of order; contrary to Moses and the body of the paschal lamb in the Old Testament, in which he calls the same bread his body, that is, a body for his use; as I call a knife my iron, a skirt my cloth, for the sake of custom, whether I have not made it according to the essence, but God alone, or according to the form, but the smith and tailor. So Christ can call the bread his body, because he needs and has made such a body for his will.

(65) For this I am helped by St. Paul's saying, "Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you. Which, according to the Greek language, may well be understood to mean: which is broken among you and divided or given, as the Scripture calls "breaking bread" distributing bread 2c. Likewise, the words of the cup may well be understood from the Greek and Hebrew: This is the cup, a new testament, which is poured out among you, as wine is poured out of a pitcher for the guests.

How I would like to make a greater impression here, if I were as bold and nimble as my dear enthusiasts.

66) But that in the words of the cup it is written, "A cup in my blood," but that the wine may not be called Christ's blood, I answer, O almost well, and yet may not tut, nor interpret, nor sign, but will lead Scripture to the fact that red wine is called blood in Scripture, Gen 49:11: "He shall wash his robe in the blood of grapes," that is, in red wine; and Deut 32:14: "That they may drink well of the blood of grapes. Now if red wine is blood, but Christ used wine of the same land, which is red, and all wine is his wine, as he made it and now needs it here for his supper, it must be understood in this way. Moses sacrificed much blood of the animals, also much red wine for the drink offering; but what may it be in the New Testament with the poor so much essence? This red wine, which is usually my grape blood, shall also now be my blood with you, instead of all the blood and wine that Moses used for the sacrifice. In German, too, a red wine can be called blood, and one can say: "How is the blood so good in the glass? Thus the philosophers say: The wine is the blood of the earth. Just as Christ says in John 4:34, "that his food is to do the will of his Father," which is like food, so he may also call his red wine and the blood of the earth his blood, because he is like the blood, especially because the Scriptures call red wine grape blood. In spite of Oecolampad, that he also leads his body sign thus from the scripture.

(67) Yes, you say, Squire Martin, you are a great man, but where are you going with this, that Christ says, "That which is given and poured out for you for the remission of sins"? Bread and wine are not useful for the forgiveness of sins, if they are broken and given over the table. Answer: Oh, dear one, do you want to see a fanatic with the Scriptures? I would be sorry to be called a swarmer, if I should not answer; I would at least throw up my trunk and say: You are pretending to conjecture, conceit and conceit. If that would not help, I would unbutton my pants and say: "You are a fool.

If I jump over it so that my ribs crack, I should also cannot prove that it should and ought to be called that, become lame immediately, and then say: "Marriage! he which he is nevertheless obliged to do. But he cannot, God has not brought me a scripture. Whoever cannot do this has denied it 3) to him before, it must be called his own should be thrown out of the swarmers' guild and guilds, dream and Oecolampad's drawing and yawning 4). But a for this is our swarmers' highest art and aid. Now do not pious Christian man, who listens to our raptures, how we watch me too closely, how I want to jump and flutter so play dice with the holy words of Christ, each one on his enthusiastically. Bread and wine are eaten and drunk for dream, would of course say: Oh, you are all boys, and the remission of sins; that is, because Christ ordains to respect God's word for jesting and smoking 5), I want to eat and drink, that one should keep his remembrance stay with the bad text.

thereby; so it is called a cheap eating and drinking of the 70 But you will perhaps chastise me here for giving remission of sins, because one should remember and act Oecolampad's sign so entirely to the devil, and argue that such remission thereby, as he says afterwards, "This do even if he cannot prove the word "sign of the body" with in remembrance of me"; just as one drinks wine for a like Scripture, there are nevertheless many Scriptures which purchase, 1) that there may be a cheap and like enforce that there must be vain bread and wine. Answer: purchase, which one should remember and hold fast. Where there, my beautiful love? They say: The Scripture

Have I raved enough? Have the words of Christ not contends against itself, and no man can bear it where it is been sheerly crushed around and around? I have truly not believed that there is bad bread and wine in the Lord's done it a little too well, more than befits a raving man. Supper. Answer: What Scripture? They say, "It is where Please forgive me, dear Christians, for thus mocking the the article of faith is established, that Christ has ascended wretched devil who mocks us. My wretched enthusiasts into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of God in His are still too young to be able to despise good ideas and glory. Item, that eating flesh is of no use, John 6:63: "Flesh thoughts; that is why they think that if they dream of is of no use." If there should be flesh and blood in the something, it will soon be the Holy Spirit. Oh how many Lord's Supper, then he could not sit at the right hand of fine ideas I have had in the Scriptures, which I had to let God in his honor, and would also give us to eat, which is go, which, if a fanatic had had them, all the printing of no use for salvation. Therefore, one and the same 6) presses would have been too little for him. And I still want Scripture must be made wise, and Christ's body must be to believe that if such thoughts of my enthusiasm would made a sign of the body; this must be the text in the Lord's have occurred to someone, perhaps neither Carlstadt, Supper.

Zwingel, Oecolampad, nor the others should now count Who would have provided such high wisdom to the for anything; nevertheless it is enthusiasm, and Christ's enthusiasts? Here is some of the best reason they have. words remain firm: "This is my body, which is given for Now if I ask them here if they have from Scripture and can you. prove that these two Scriptures are contrary to each other: Christ is seated in heaven, and his body is in the Lord's 69 O how my Oecolampad should rejoice, if he could bring up such a saying, that the body should be called the Supper; item, that flesh is not useful, and that Christ's body sign of the body, as I have now foolishly brought up, that is eaten in the Lord's Supper, and yet these things are bread and wine should be called the body and blood of written? they will answer me.

1) "Gleichlauf" - a lawful fully valid purchase or sale. Latin: eontraetus enapionis st veuäitionis; in the Wittenberg and the Jena missing: and.

2) Erlanger: Wider.

3) Erlanger: has.

4) i.e. foolishness.

5) Gäucherei - Gäuchelei.

6) ...one scripture" here in the meaning: any scripture. This meaning of "one of a kind" also occurs elsewhere in Luther, though rarely. Cf. Dietz, Wörterbuch, p. 5(W s. v. einerlei.

ten: Thou wilt love us with the Scripture; thou must believe us; we are certain without the Scripture, and more certain than when the Scripture saith it,

Seventy-two I answered, "How can this be? Open your eyes, you fool, do you not see that heaven is high above, where Christ sits in his glory, and the earth is low here, where his supper takes place? How can a body sit so high in honor and at the same time be here, let itself be disgraced and be traded with hands, mouth and belly as if it were a sausage? Should this rhyme with the glorious majesty and heavenly honors? Yes, it is more than certain. Thank you, dear sirs, I did not know that in articles of faith one should not ask anything about God's word, but rather open one's bodily eyes and judge with them according to reason what is to be believed. Now I understand what this means, *Fides est non apparentium*, which is said so much in a new interpretation of these spirits: Faith should not believe any further than the eyes can show it with fingers and reason can measure.

Now, he who asks much becomes unpleasant; but I must ask more, that I may become still wiser. But how can we be sure, dear sirs, that a body cannot be in heaven and in the Lord's Supper at the same time by God's power, because God's power has no measure nor number, and does such things that no reason can comprehend, but must be badly believed? Because he says, "This is my body," wherewith shall I satisfy my heart that God has no way nor power to do such things as his word says? And perhaps, even though One Body is not visible in many places, He would like to have a way and know how to keep One Body invisibly, even visibly, in many places. If he could do that, wouldn't you have betrayed us, you who say no to it before you know it? Do you also have proof from Scripture that would deny God's omnipotence in this regard?

Dear one, let us not swear by the Scriptures; it is not for enthusiasts to stand on the Scriptures: But thou shalt bring scripture, that God may do and do these things.

could. Well, here is my scripture: "What God says he can do", 1) Rom. 4, 21. God says he can do", 1) Rom. 4, 21. And no word is impossible in the sight of God, Luc. 1, 37. Because he says here: "This is my body", he can truly do it and does it. Now you must prove again that he does not do it, nor could he do it. For this is your glorious reason for wanting to strike these words: here is the strike, and we are standing on the right battlefield. If you do not prove that it is impossible, then we will overthrow you and break through with the word: "This is my body." God says it; God does it. Defend yourselves, dear knights, it is time.

You may say here: We can prove it well, we once secretly ascended into heaven at midnight, when God was sleeping most deeply; we had a lantern and a lockpick with us, broke into his most secret chamber, and unlocked all boxes and drawers, since his power lay within. Then we took a gold scale, so that we could be sure of it, and we weighed it exactly: but we found no power that could do this, that one body could be in heaven and in the Lord's Supper at the same time; therefore it is certain that "body" must be called "body's sign". God forbid you, Satan, you wretch, how shamefully and surely you mock us. But my mockery shall also tickle you again, what does it matter!

(76) This is the highly famous reason why they drool the most before others, and stand and insist the most stiffly on it, because they say that the two Scriptures are contrary to each other (Christ is seated in heaven, and his body is in the Lord's Supper), and yet they do not prove it. They do prove that these two Scriptures and their reason are contrary to each other. But this would have been unnecessary to prove, and I would have told them just as well. For that you say that Scripture is contrary to one another does not apply; who asks about your saying? But then I would praise and honor them if they proved this saying with writing or otherwise. Let them leave it, so that the text may stand firm: "This is my body."

1) Marginal gloss in the Wittenberg and Jena editions: "Was GOtt sagt, das kann er thun."

If we now receive this, that Oecolampad cannot prove such his saying, nor show how the Scriptures are contrary to one another before God, as he certainly never can do, then the whole matter is won, and we have received it all. For if this remains, that the words "this is my body", that is, that Christ is the body in the Lord's Supper, persist, then the saying of John 6:63, "Flesh is of no use", will soon come to pass: then miracles enough will be found, and the sacraments will not be bad signs, and all their sores, of which they have much, will dissipate and fly away like dust before the wind. For Christ's body and blood must not be left a useless or small thing; I know this well.

But if we, according to our reason and eyes, judge by our articles of faith and the Scriptures, as Oecolampad does here, then of course one piece of Scripture is contrary to the other. For the scripture that Mary is a virgin, and mother is contrary to the scripture: Grow and multiply; item: I will create a helper for man around him. That I should therefore deny that 1) she is not a virgin, and cry out: The Scripture is contrary to one another; would I be justified in answering, Yes, before you and your reason it is contrary to one another; but how is it contrary to one another before God, tell me? Then I would stand as Oecolampad stands here.

79. Item, that Christ is God, is contrary to the Scripture: "God created man"; if you now go on and say, He is not God, because Godhead and mankind are more contrary to each other than heaven and earth, and cannot at the same time be the person of Christ in Godhead and mankind, and let your reason be that such Scripture is contrary to each other, then you will be answered, Yes, you say it, and before your eyes it is contrary to each other; but show how it is also contrary to each other before God.

80 So also that Christ's body in heaven and in the Lord's Supper is contrary to each other, this is what Oecolampad says, and it is so before his eyes. Yes, but one does not desire that he teaches us his saying, and what is before him otherwise or

but what God says and how it is before God; there he lies, there he cannot do anything, and yet he must and should have certainty and certainty if he wants his teaching. Here let them answer. Here let them see how they want to commit crimes. But they do not do it; beyond that they will purr and whistle something else, so that one does not notice how they are pushed here in the hollow way.

81 Now hold them against each other, the enthusiasts and the writers. Carlstadt brought forth the xxxxx; that would not stand. Then Zwingel came, and wanted to make it better with his interpretation; that is even worse. After that, Oecolampad comes with his Leibs Zeichen, as with the very best piece; and passes most badly. For this is his reason: I Oecolampad say that the Scriptures in this piece are contrary to each other. Now is not this a tender, fine reason for faith? when a man thus says, "Although God's word stands there and says, "This is my body," yet, because I cannot understand nor believe it, and think it to be contrary to Scripture, it is not true, and must have another interpretation, regardless of how brightly God's word stands there. This is Oecolampad's spirit and highly praised truth, that human conceit and unbelief should prevail over God's word and establish our faith. Who could not do the same in all other articles? That is how deeply Satan should seduce such people. So this reason of Oecolampad's is overthrown with one word, that is, No, these Scriptures are not contrary to each other; one can say it and make oneself believe it, but not prove it. So then all his splendor lies in the mud.

82) Do you want to have the scripture from us, dear devotees? there it is: "Take, eat, this is my body. Bite yourselves with the same this time, after that you shall get more. O how sure ye were, and thought not that this saying might ever 2) be reproached or reproached against you. For ye had not crucified him alone, but buried him also, and laid guards round about the grave, that he was no more wicked. But now he rises again from the dead, and will never-

1) Erlanger: leugen. Latin: nexare.

more die, and throws you, his enemies, under him, and makes you footstools. This deceived the good man Oecolampad, that Scripture, being contrary to each other, must of course be reconciled, and one part take a mind that suffers with the other; because that is certain that Scripture may not disagree with itself. But he did not realize and consider that he would be the man to pretend and prove such disagreement of the Scriptures; but he accepted it and presented it as if it were certain and wanted to be proved. There it falls and is missing.

But if they would think beforehand, and see how they would speak nothing but the word of God, as St. Peter teaches, and leave their own sayings and doings at home, they would not do so much harm. This word, "Scripture is not contrary to one another," would not have deceived Oecolampad, for it is founded in God's word that God does not deny, nor does His word deny: but the addition of his word (I Oecolampad say that the Scripture here is contrary to one another) brings him into such sweat and misery that he denies, turns back, interprets, and tortures God's word as he wills. Lord God, how easy it is for such a horrible case to happen; and we are still safe and do not fear on such a slippery path.

But I will better touch and report their right reason, which moves them to such error, and will bet on it for my body and soul (which I also do not like to lose), that I do not want to miss; for I poor sinner also know a little of the spirit, and a large piece of the old mischief, which rages in us, I mean the flesh. She is most moved by this bit, that it is foolish in the sight of reason to believe that we should eat and drink Christ's body and blood in the flesh in the Lord's Supper. And truly I know, where they gain, that should be the final rejoicing: Yes, I thought it would not be right; I never wanted Christ's body and blood to be eaten in this way. As they are now talking secretly among themselves and the mad mob is obviously chattering. But they would gladly hide this, for they are ashamed to confess it, they know well that it is no good, and they see that it is not right.

but gladly that the great rabble drives out with it, speak and write also not dawider.

85. but it is shameful that there is not so much integrity and honesty in them to freely confess such things as they desire in their hearts, like to have, to see, and to hear, but pretend that the Scripture compels them, which they know is not true, but attack the Scripture with cunning and iniquity, to adorn themselves with it before men, and under the name of the Scripture to bring their poison among the people.

86 However, even though they hide such things with great diligence, the rogue still comes out and lets himself be noticed. Zwingel confesses so much that he has never believed it all his life; and I believe it well that he believes nothing everywhere. Yes, that is even more, he sits in judgment and judges all men's hearts and minds that no man has ever believed such things. If that is not too bold, it is bold enough, and it is not true, I know that all too well. Now from such a confession it is easy to notice that he did not get such conceit from the Scriptures, which he found long after, as his book *Subsidium in* particular, and others prove; but long before, before he found such Scriptures, he believed so, and now runs first of all, seeks Scriptures and forces them on such conceit, D. Carlstadt also, before he wrote, long before, he said to one: Dear, you will not persuade me that God is in bread and wine. So they go out unawares, by God's power.

The same Oecolampad, when he has jumped over the Scripture that is presented to him: help God, how he licks, how horny he is, how he dances in his conceit and asks: what is it good for? Why the disciples did not worship the bread? Why the Scripture does not indicate such a miracle? What good does it do that Christ is invisible? Why Christians should believe such hard things? How can it be rhymed that the King of honor should let such wicked men play with him? But especially the blasphemous words paint his heart well, since he calls our God the baked God, the baked God, the fleshly God, and of that he calls him the baked God.

1) "Licks" here will probably be as much as "licks" i.e. jumps. Jer. 50, 11. Latin: exultat.

beyond measure. Who should not grasp here what they think in their hearts? If they were moved by the Scriptures, they would probably stop such jokes and deal with the Scriptures.

It is the resentment and disgust of natural reason, which does not want and does not like this article; therefore it spews and köcket 1) thus against it, and then wants to cover itself in the Scriptures, so that one should not know it. It shall not be an article. If I wanted to follow reason's disgust, I would do just such spitting and coking against it, so that the blasphemers would not think that such spitting is the art of the Holy Spirit. I want to say about God: What is the use that he is man? Why should one believe such a hard thing? Why don't the apostles worship him in the Lord's Supper? How does it rhyme that such majesty allows himself to be crucified by evil men? O of the carnal God! O of the bloody God! O of the dead God; and so on.

My enthusiasts, however, prepare the way with such disgust that one will almost deny Christ, God and everything with each other; as they have already begun to believe nothing at all. For they step out of reason's conceit, which is to lead them rightly. But such mockery serves to excite the mad mob, which asks nothing of the Scriptures. For they themselves know almost well that such pagan mockery does nothing against this article. Or, if it smears against this article, it also smears against all articles. For the word of God is always foolishness to reason, 1 Cor. 2, 14. Therefore they would have kept silent about all this, if they were 2) serious about the Scriptures and did not have their hearts full of disgust and unbelief, of which their mouths must be so full. More about this hereafter.

90 Since Oecolampad in his first book of the Fathers' Proverbs desecrates and mocks, he must confess that he did not get his conceit from the Fathers' Scriptures. For they speak so powerfully that they often force the word out of him: Hoc apparot oontra nos "886, it seems as if it were against us. Dear, what is this said otherwise, because, the fathers

What are the strong words there? I cannot get my thing from their writing, but must work diligently to turn their noses on my mind. But he who has to work in such a way that he directs and forces the sayings to himself, confesses that he does not have it from such sayings, but rather has the contradiction from them, and carries and drives his thoughts into them. But what his turning of the nose in the fathers helps him, we will see later.

91 But it is a wonder that the fathers, as much as they are, have never spoken of the sacrament as these enthusiasts do; for they have no need of such words as, It is bad bread and wine; or, Christ's body and blood is not there. And yet it is impossible, because the matter is very much acted with them, that such words should not once have escaped them, It is bad bread; or, Not that the body of Christ is bodily there, or the like, when much is concerned that they should not deceive the people; but speak badly, as if no one doubted that there was Christ's body and blood. After all, among so many fathers and so many writings, there should be one *negative*, as is done in other articles. But now they all stand united and constant on the *affirmative*; our enthusiasts, however, can speak of nothing but the *negative*. Summa, Oecolampad has it neither from the Scriptures nor from the Fathers, but works and sweats to carry it into both.

(92) This is enough of an answer to the enthusiasts. For since we contend and win so much that Christ's saying "this is my body" still stands firm, and their best reasons are nothing, and without all proof naked and bare: so also all other sayings of Christ's supper certainly still stand firm. For I have taken the least and most simple before me, only in defiance of the impotent, lazy, lame babblings of the enthusiasts. In the book against the celestial prophets, too, I have not been industrious in this matter, and no fanatic has yet mislaid the same booklet for me. But I think they despise it and do not read it; or if they read it, they shut their mouths and run away from great humility and the fullness of all wisdom and holiness.

1) "köcken" synonymous with: to spit.

2) "it" is in the Jena; missing in the Wittenberg and Erlangen.

(93) But for the sake of ours, to strengthen them, I will go on, as the reason and causes of the rejecters are nothing; and, moreover, prove that it is not contrary to the Scriptures, nor to the articles of faith, that Christ's body is both in heaven and in the Lord's Supper; though I am not obliged to do it to the rejecters, but they are obliged to prove that it is contrary to the Scriptures, and cannot do it? as has been said. But if I have proved this, let the words go and stand, "this is my body," as they read. For that I should visibly show with eyes and fingers that Christ's body is in heaven and above the table at the same time, as the enthusiasts desire of us, I truly cannot do. He who does not want to believe God's words must not demand anything further from me; I do enough when I prove that it is not contrary to God's word, but according to the Scriptures.

94 And first, let us take the article that Christ sits at the right hand of God, which the enthusiasts hold that he does not suffer, that Christ's body could also be in the Lord's Supper. If we ask them here what they call God's right hand, where Christ is seated, I think they will tell us how children are used to imagine a gilded heaven with a golden chair in it, and Christ sitting next to the Father in a choir cap and a golden crown, just as painters paint. For if they did not have such childish, carnal thoughts of the right hand of God, they would certainly not allow themselves to dispute the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper, or to be so puffed up with the saying of Augustine (whom they believe nothing else, nor any other), Christ must be bodily in one place, but his truth is everywhere 2c.

From what childish thought must it follow that they also bind God Himself in One place in heaven on the same golden chair, because apart from Christ there is no God, and where Christ is, there is the Godhead completely, as Paul says Col. 2, 9: "In Him dwelleth the whole Godhead bodily"; and Joh. 14, 9. 10: "So long am I with you, and ye know me not: Philip, he that beholdeth me beholdeth the Father; believest thou me?"

do you not know that the Father is in me and I in the Father?" Ans this will follow still further, that also we and all creatures sit in the same chair of God, perhaps like the lice and fleas in his choir cap, because Paul says Apost. 17, 28.: "We are his kind, and in him we live, weave and are."

We further ask them: Where is the Scripture that thus forces God's right hand into One place? So they say: Help God, do we not have enough Scripture? Are you blind? Do you not see how full of sayings our books are from the Scriptures? Surely I see that you are useless spouts. You talk a great deal where there is no need; for example, about spiritual food, about Christ's sitting in heaven, about his memory in the Lord's Supper, and the like, since no one asks you. It is your cuckoo that lets itself be heard, there you are full of scripture; but where it is necessary, there you pass by and are as dumb as the blocks, let yourselves dream after it, the whole scripture sounds on your conceit, as Solomon says Ecclesiastes 5:2, that in the world so goes what is due to one, there dream of it. And Virgilius: 1) Qui amant sibi somnia fin^a gunt. There one does not bring him also from.

(97) Why are you not thoughtful and see beforehand whether it is Scripture or not, that God's right hand is a special place, because Scripture teaches abundantly about God's right hand? But now you build such a great and dangerous fancy on your vain dream, and then boast that you have much Scripture. And because you dance so gladly at this round dance, you think that the sky hangs full of violins; and as one says: Who gladly dances, one may easily whistle to him. So because you like that Christ is in heaven and not in the Lord's Supper, you let St. Augustine's saying so easily persuade you to say yes, that God's right is a place in heaven, who are otherwise so rigid, clever and immovable in all the fathers' sayings that, 2) even if they all unanimously urge you to say yes, you nevertheless make no of it. Nor do you think that no one should notice why you write a great deal about unnecessary things and not about necessary ones.

1) Luooliea, Lei. 8, v. 108.

2) Erlanger: da.

Pieces not a bag, but Alone leads your dreams.

The Scriptures teach us that God's right hand is not a special place where a body should or may be, as on a golden chair; but is the almighty power of God, which at the same time can be nowhere, and yet must be in all places. Nowhere can it be in any place (I say), for if it were in any place, it would have to be understood and decided there, just as all that which is in one place must be decided and measured in that same place, so that it cannot be in any other place. The divine power, however, may not and cannot be decided and measured in this way. For it is incomprehensible and immeasurable, apart from and above all that is and can be.

Again, it must be essential and present in all places, even in the smallest tree leaf. This is the reason: for it is God who creates, works and sustains all things, 1) by his almighty power and right hand, as our faith confesses; for he does not send out officials or angels when he creates or sustains something, but all such things are the work of his divine power itself. But if he is to create and maintain it, he must be there and make and maintain his creature in the most essential as well as in the most essential.

For this reason He must be in every creature in its innermost, innermost, around and around, through and through, below and above, in front and behind, so that nothing more present or more inward can be in all creatures, except God Himself with His power. For it is he who makes the skin; it is he who also makes the bones; it is he who makes the hair on the skin; it is he also who makes the marrow in the bones; it is he who makes every bit of the hair; it is he who makes every bit of the marrow; it is he who must make everything, both pieces and whole: so his hand must be there to make it, that cannot fail.

101. here the scripture goes violently Isa. 66, 2. from Gen. 1: "Did not this

1) Erlanger: contains.
2) Erlanger: not.

all my hand made?" Ps. 139:8, 9: "Where will I go before your Spirit? Where shall I flee before thy face? If I go to heaven, you are there; if I go to hell, you are also around me. If I take the wings of the dawn (which are greater wings than half the world), and sit down at the end of the sea, thine hand shall hold me there.

The Scriptures give all the miracles and works of God to His right hand, as Acts 4:10: "Christ is exalted by the right hand of God"; Psalm 118:15, 16: "The right hand of God does miracles. 4, 10: "Christ is exalted by the right hand of God"; Psalm 118, 15. 16: "The right hand of God does wonders, the right hand of God exalts me" 2c. And Apost. 17, 27. 28. Paul says: "God is not far from each of us, for in Him we live, hover and are", and Rom. 11, 36.: "From Him, through Him and in Him are all things"; and Jer. 23, 23. 24.: "Am I not a God who is near, and not a God who is far away? Do I not fill heaven and earth?"

103. Is. 66, 1: "Heaven is my chair, and the earth is my footstool." He does not say, "A piece of heaven is my chair, a piece or place of the earth is my footstool; but what and where heaven is, there is my chair, whether heaven is below, above, or beside the earth; and what or where earth is, whether it is on the bottom of the sea, in the grave of the dead, or in the middle of the earth, there is my footstool. Now guess, where is his head, arm, breast, body, if he fills the earth with his feet, the sky with his legs? Far, far he reaches above and beyond the world, above heaven and earth.

104 What can or does Isaiah mean by this saying? For as St. Hilarius also speaks about God being essentially present at all ends, in and through all creatures in all their parts and places, that the world of God is full and he fills it all, but is not determined or encompassed by it, but is also at the same time outside and above all creatures? These are all things beyond all comprehension, but they are articles of our faith, brightly and powerfully attested in Scripture. It is little

against this piece, that Christ's body and blood are in heaven and supper at the same time, and if the devotees began to come here with reason and eyes, they should soon fall away and say, "It is nothing," and, as is the virtue of the wicked, to say, "There is no God," Ps. 14:1.

For how can reason suffer the divine majesty to be so small as to be present and essential in a grain, in a grain, over a grain, through a grain, inwardly and outwardly? And even if it is a few majesties, it can still be completely and utterly in every single one, 1) which are so innumerable. For he makes every grain special 1) in all things, inwardly and everywhere; so his power there must be everywhere in and on the grain. Now his power is one and the same, and is not divided, because he made the skin of the grain with his fingers and the 2) marrow in the grain with his feet: then the whole divine power must be there in and on the grain everywhere, because he does it all alone. Again, that the same majesty is so great, that it cannot compass this world, nor a thousand worlds, and say, Behold, he is here.

Here let me now answer the enthusiasts. Body still has a comparison with body and may rhyme together. As, bread is a body, wine is a body, Christ's flesh is a body. Here one may be in another, as I may be in the air and in a garment or house, as money in a bag, wine in a cask and jug. But here, since not body, but spirit, yes, who knows what is called God; it is above body, above spirit, above everything that can be said, heard and thought; how can such a one at the same time be completely present in every body, creature and being everywhere? and again, apart from and above all creatures and beings, nowhere must be nor can be, as our faith and the Scriptures both testify of God? Here reason must immediately conclude: "Surely this is nothing, and must be nothing.

1) Thus the Wittenberg. Jenaer and Erlanger: special.

2) Thus the Jena. Wittenberg and Erlanger: den.

If he has now found the way that his own divine essence can be completely in all creatures and in each one in particular, deeper, more inward, more present, than the creature itself is, and yet again nowhere and in none can and can be encompassed, that he indeed encompasses all things and is in them, but none encompasses him and is in him: should he not also know a way in which his body would be completely in many places at the same time, and yet none of them would be, since he is? Ah, we wretched children of men, who judge God and his doings according to our own conceit, and think that he is a cobbler or a day laborer.

(108) Yes, they say, we believe that God's power is everywhere, but that does not mean that his divine essence or right hand is everywhere. Answer: I also believe that in the depths of your heart you believe nothing either of God or of God's power, and I am sure that you should skip all these mighty sayings that I am speaking and acting here, and open your mouths and say, "He speaks of grains and tree leaves, but does not write. For this is what you do, and then you talk about your patience or about unnecessary things. That must be writing.

But we know that God's power, arm, hand, being, face, spirit, wisdom 2c. is all one thing. For apart from the creature there is 3) nothing but the one simple Godhead itself, and thus before the creation God's power and hand, God's essence itself, was without doubt; so after the creation of the creature it will not have become 4) something else. He does nothing except by his word, Genesis 1 John 1. This is his power; and his power is not an axe, axe, saw or file, by which he works, but he himself. If then his power and spirit is everywhere and in all things most inwardly, most outwardly, thoroughly present, as it must be, if he is to make and maintain all things everywhere; then his divine right hand, being and majesty must be in all things.

3) Erlanger: is.

4) So the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: nothing different. Latin: in atiuā trnsmutata.

He must, of course, be present if he is to do and maintain it. Now if he is in one place, as in the virgin's womb, essentially with his own person, and at the same time with

And to top it all off, I will also prove this with the Father, as our faith requires, 2) then he is also certainly example and a story from the Scriptures, and that in this so at all ends. For there may be no reason why he should way: It is our faith, as the Scriptures teach us, that our be in the virgin's womb, and not be so at all ends.

Lord Jesus Christ is an essential, natural, true God, and But in Christ there is something different, higher and the Godhead dwells in him completely bodily, as St. Paul greater than all other creatures. For in Him, God is not only says Col. 2, 9, that is, that apart from Christ there is no present and essential, as in all others, but also dwells in God or Godhead. As he himself says John 14:9: "Philip, Him bodily, so that One Person is man and God. And he who sees me sees the Father; do you not believe that although I can say of all creatures: There is God, or God the Father is in me, and I in him?" Well, there goes Christ in them, I cannot say: This is God Himself. But of Christ, on earth, and is the whole Godhead, personally, faith says not only that God is in him, but also that Christ essentially in him on earth.

Tell me now, how can it be true at the same time, that called a murderer of the thing that is God and that God is God is completely in Christ personally, present, essential within. But he who strangles Christ has strangled the Son on earth, in the womb, yes, in the manger, in the temple, of God, God and the Lord of glory Himself. That God is not in the desert, in cities, in houses, garden, field, on the only in him, but also dwells in him, so that God and man cross, grave, and yet also in heaven in the bosom of the become one person, is the great work and miracle of God, Father? If this is true and irrefutable according to faith, which makes fools of all reason, and faith alone must hold; that the Godhead in Christ is essentially, personally, otherwise it is lost.

present on earth, in so many places, and yet at the same Therefore, we speak now of the first alone, as God is time in heaven and with the Father, it follows that he is in all things Himself personally, without which presence everywhere at the same time, and essentially, personally God could not have become man, and One Person out of fills heaven and earth and everything with his own nature divinity and humanity; for He had to be there beforehand and majesty, according to 1) Scripture, Jer. 23, 23. 24.: in the womb, as He is in Himself in the divinity. O Lord "I fill heaven and earth, and am a God who is near"; and God, where are they who believe all this? What will Ps. 139, 7.: "Where shall I go before your face?" become of them when reason comes here with its

(112) Also, since Christ, the Son of God, was to be swarming? The sacrament's rapture will then become a conceived in the womb of the mother and become man, delicious thing against these. Well, God remains, and so he had to be essential and personal already there in the do his own.

womb of the virgin, and there put on mankind. For the (115) This is a powerful enough proof that God's right Godhead is immovable in itself, cannot move from one hand is not a special place, as the enthusiasts dream, place to another, like the creature. Therefore he did not where Christ's body is seated, but is the power of God ascend here from heaven as on a ladder, or descend as Himself. For God's right hand cannot be a creature, but on a rope, but was there before in the virgin body, must be something above and apart from all creatures. essential and personal, as in all other places everywhere, But there is according to divine nature, kind and power. Is he

1) Erlanger: still.

not, but only God Himself, who is everywhere in all things; therefore it must also be true that God's right hand is everywhere in all things, as we have heard. I mean that here we do not, like the scribblers, run over the Scriptures, or deal with other things than belong to the matter, but have firmly established and decided, on the right clear ground of the Scriptures and articles of faith, that God's right hand is everywhere; but they, the scribblers, lose the piece and cannot stand, because they say: It is a strange place, as they comfort their carnal thoughts from St. Augustine.

Now let us speak to them. They confess that Christ is at the right hand of God, and by this they want to have won that he is not in the Lord's Supper. This, of course, is the terrible sword of the giant Goliath that they insist upon. But how would it be if we took the same sword from you and cut off your head with it, and proved with the saying that Christ's body must be in the Lord's Supper, so that you would prove that it must not be there? Would you not take it for a true thing of David? Well, look and listen to us. Christ's body is at the right hand of God, that is known. But the right hand of God is at all ends, as you must confess from our previous revelation. So it is certainly also in the bread and wine above tables. Now where the right hand of God is, there Christ's body and blood must be; for the right hand of God is not to be divided into many pieces, but a single simple being. So also the article does not say that Christ is in one part, as in a little finger or nail of the right hand of God, but that he is at the right hand of God, that where and what the right hand of God is and is called, there is Christ, the Son of Man.

This is also what Christ wants, as often as he confesses in the Gospel that all things have been handed over to him by the Father, and "all things have been put under his feet," Ps. 8:7, that is, he is at the right hand of God; which is no different than that he is also over all things as a man, has all things under him and rules over them. Therefore he must also be close to it, in it and around it, having everything in his hands 2c. For according to the Godhead nothing is handed over to him, nor

He has put all things under his feet, if he has made and kept them beforehand. But to sit at the right hand is as much as to rule and have power over everything. If he is to have power and rule, he must of course also be present and essential, through the right hand of God, which is everywhere.

What does it want to become here? It wants to become this: If Christ in the Lord's Supper had never said these words, "This is my body," nor had he ever said them, yet these words, "Christ is seated at the right hand of God," compel that his body and blood be there, as in all other places, and may not here be some transubstantiation or change of the bread into his body; yet it may well be there, just as the right hand of God must not therefore be changed into all things, even though it is there and within. But how this happens is not for us to know; we are to believe it, because the Scriptures and articles of faith so powerfully confirm it.

We poor sinners are not so foolish as to believe that Christ's body is in the bread in the crude visible way, like bread in the basket or wine in the cup, as the fanciers would like to put on us to tickle ourselves with our foolishness; but we believe straightway that his body is there, as his words on it read and indicate: "This is my body. 2c. But that the fathers and we sometimes speak thus, Christ's body is in the bread, happens in simple opinion because our faith wants to confess that Christ's body is there; otherwise we may well suffer it to be said that he is in the bread, that he is the bread, that he is where the bread is, or however one pleases. Let us not quarrel about words, but let the meaning remain that it is not bad bread that we eat in the Lord's Supper, but the body of Christ.

120. so also the enthusiasts should consider that God has more ways to have one thing in another than this coarse one, which they pretend, as wine is in the cask, bread in the box, money in the bag. "Levi was in the loins of Abraham," says the apostle 1) to the Hebrews Cap. 7, 5. as the Scripture calls all the children in the loins of the fathers and out of the loins.

1) Erlanger: the zun Ebräern.

describes. Item, all color and light, and what one sees is He is already present at all ends. For through his called to be in the eyes, that also heaven and earth may transfiguration he has not become another person, but, as be in the eye. Item, everything is in the mirror, what stands before, so also afterwards, present everywhere. Although before it. Item, trees and all fruits are in the kernels and Oecolampad wants to have done a great honor to Bilibald seeds. All things are in our heart, even God Himself, Pirkheimer at Nuremberg, and does not know how great a which is as great a wonder as any. Who will doubt that sin it should be that Pirkheimer interprets such a saying God has more ways that he does not tell us, since one is about the man Christ. But if I were Pirkheimer, I would in another, or since two are in one place at the same time? send Oecolampad a pair of glasses and ask him to count

(121) It is as great a wonder that many bodies are in the letters, if it would help, so that they do not lead so one place, as that one body is in many places. He who lightly over the sayings of Scripture and click their dreams can do one thing can do another. Now we have clear into the books for us.

scripture that Christ came to his disciples through a locked door, and from his tomb also through a sealed stone. If he came in through the window or the door, his body and that by which his body had disappeared had to be in one place at the same time, both intact and unchanged. The evangelist does not say that they saw him come in, but that he stood or stood in their midst. That is, as if he had been hidden there before, and had revealed himself; as he also did to Mary Magdalene at the tomb, and to all to whom he appeared. And Apost. 7, 56. he appeared to St. Stephen standing in the council house at the right hand of God; and Apost. 22, 17. he appeared to St. Paul in the temple; item Matth. 17, 1. 2. 3. the Father appeared in the cloud on Mount Thabor; and Luc. 3, 21. 22. also the

What does Filius hominis descendit, adscendit mean? He speaks so clearly of the Son of Man, how he descended and ascended. Now it is certain that Christ neither descends nor ascends after the Godhead, but after mankind. And if Oecolampad wants to boast so gloriously, he should first prove that such a saying of Christ speaks according to the Godhead, and teach what descending and ascending would be, and act the saying diligently and mightily. But this is not necessary for us enthusiasts, it is enough that we enthuse in this way, so it is said as soon as it is written. But because some teachers have interpreted the descent from heaven, I will save it until I hear my enthusiasts; I cannot write it all at once.

(124) Upon this saying, I may now get other enthusiasts, who will see me, and pretend: If Christ's body is at all ends, I will eat it and drink it in all wine houses, out of all bowls, glasses and jugs: there is no difference that both God and Christ are not far away, but near, and between my table and the Lord's table; oh, how we will devour it! For we unholy Germans are such shameful down, nor back and forth, because God is immovable and swine that we have neither discipline nor reason, and Christ also sits at the right hand of God, and does not when we hear from God, we regard it as much as if it were the jugglers' fairy tales. Speech and history are now going

122 Christ also says Joh. 3, 3: "No one leads to heaven on among the rabble against the Sacrament, who are except the one who descended, namely 1) the Son of Man seduced by the doctrine of the jesters, that one should who is in heaven. This indicates that his body is in heaven rather die than write a sermon among them. For they and on earth at the same time, quickly go away when they hear that [it] is nothing.

1) "namely" is missing in the Erlanger.

And they want to do it and wipe their butts on it. Secular authorities should punish such blasphemers. It is fornication and impudent thirst, because they know nothing about it and still blaspheme like this. And God knows, I write such high things very unwillingly, because it must come under such dogs and sows. But how shall I do it? The enthusiasts must answer for it, who force me to do it.

Hear thou now, thou sow, dog, or swarm, who art thou unreasonable ass, though Christ's body be at all ends, thou shalt not therefore soon eat, nor drink, nor take hold of it; neither speak I to thee of such things; go into thy sow-house, or into thy dung. I have said above that the right hand of God is in all places, but at the same time it is nowhere and incomprehensible, above and apart from all creatures. There is a difference between his presence and your grasping; he is free and unbound wherever he is, and does not have to stand there as a knave in the stocks or forged in the irons.

Behold, the sun's rays are so close to you that they sting your eyes or skin, so that you feel them, but you cannot grasp them and put them in a box, even if you grope for them forever. Thou canst hinder it, that it may not appear at the window; but thou canst not grope and take hold of it. So also Christ, although he is everywhere, cannot be grasped and held; he can peel himself off, so that you get the shell and do not grasp the core. Why is that? Because there is another when God is there and when he is there for you. But then he is there for you when he gives his word, and binds himself with it, saying, Here you shall find me. If then thou holdest the word, thou mayest surely take hold of him, and have him, and say, Here have I thee, as thou sayest. Just as I say of the right hand of God, Although it is everywhere, as we cannot deny, yet, because it is nowhere, as has been said, you can truly grasp it nowhere, but it binds itself to you, and makes you stay in one place. But it does so when it enters and dwells in the humanity of Christ; there you will find it in a place where it is not only in the humanity of Christ, but also in the humanity of God.

Otherwise you will run through and through all creatures, groping here and groping there, and yet you will never find it, even though it is truly there, because it is not there for you.

127 Therefore, because Christ mankind is at the right hand of God, and is now also in all things and above all things, after the manner of the divine right hand, you will not eat him nor drink him as the cabbage and soup on your table, if he will. He is now also become incomprehensible, and thou shalt not catch him, though he be in thy bread, except he bind himself to thee, and appoint thee to a special table by his word, and signify the bread unto thee by his word, when thou shalt eat it; which then he doeth in supper, saying, This is my body. As if to say, "At home you may eat bread, since I am close enough to it, but this is the right thing, this is my body. If you eat this, you eat my body, and not otherwise. Why? Because I want to attach myself here with my word, so that you do not have to swarm and seek me in all the places where I am: it would be too much for you; you would also be too little to take me there without my word.

How few there are, even among the learned, who have ever so deeply considered this article of Christ, or ever believed that it is so exceedingly incomprehensible that God should be man, and man should be God. But the Scripture says so, and faith certainly believes it to be true. If it is true, then we have herewith overthrown the enthusiasts of their best reasons, namely, that it is not contrary to one another, but in accordance with Scripture and faith, that Christ's body is both in heaven and in the Lord's Supper. And it is actually founded in the first article, where we say: "I believe in God the Father, Almighty Creator of heaven and earth". This same article protects and preserves our understanding in the Lord's Supper, as we have heard. It is not that I want to measure and encompass God's power with cubits, as the prophets do, as if he did not have more ways than I have now demonstrated. To have one body in many places. For I believe his words that

He can do more than all the angels can understand; but in this way he has shown us how to shut the mouths of the enthusiasts and to answer for our faith.

But since they are so far from boasting that their opinion is certain truth; certissima, certissima veritas it must be called: they are truly also guilty of proving that Christ's body may not be in heaven and the Lord's Supper, and that such articles are contrary to each other, and that the right hand of God is a special place. For if their fame is 1) true, that they have the truth for certain, then they must also be certain that the right hand of God is a special place, and even more certain that a body may not be in heaven and the Lord's Supper, and that such articles are contrary to one another. For the sake of glory 2) let them be defiant, that they prove it, as they ought and owe. If they do, I will recant and come to them; but there I am assured. But I warn them that they bring clear writing and lay good ground, better than they have done so far. For I will tell them beforehand that they will have overseers, and if I live, and God helps me, I will tell them honestly, if they do not meet it.

130) That now Oecolampad wants to be seen here, how he almost seeks Christ's honor, and drives his mockery against the Pirkheimer, and says: There must be a fine king of honor, who lets his body be thrown back and forth on the altar, even by godless boys 2c. Such words and the like serve to make a minty saint read them and say: He would do well to the king of honor and show him the butt. What then is the honor of Christ, that his body is in the Lord's Supper? Here I answer: It is true, according to Oecolampad's wisdom, Christ has no other honor than that he sits at the right hand of God on a cushion of garments, and lets the angels sing, violin, sound and play for him, and is unburdened with the toil of the Lord's Supper; but according to the faith of our poor sinners and fools, his honor is manifold, that his body and blood are in the Lord's Supper.

1) In the Jenaer: "jrthum" and in the "Correctur" again a misprint: "jrthun" instead of: "jr rhum".

2) Erlanger: still.

is. First of all, that he makes fools of the learned and prudent, and makes them angry and hardened by his words and works, which he speaks and does so foolishly that they cannot believe, as St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 1:23: "We preach Christ as an offence to the Jews and foolishness to the Gentiles. And again v. 25: "The foolishness of God is wiser than men."

Now this is a great honor of divine wisdom, and with us fools is a glorious and praiseworthy God, who saw the wise with vain foolishness and put their wisdom to shame, so that they must be blind where they want to be the wisest. Such wisdom and honor no other king has or is capable of, as St. Paul says 1 Cor. 1:27: "Has not God put to shame the wisdom of the world?" To put wisdom to foolishness and to shame is not a small honor and virtue.

132. On the other hand, it is an honor and praise of his unspeakable grace and goodness that he takes such hard care of our poor sinners and shows such kind love and benevolence, and does not let him be satisfied with being everywhere, in and around, above and beside us, but also gives his own body for food, so that he assures and comforts us with such a pledge that our body, too, shall live forever, because here on earth he is blessed with an eternal and living food; Now we poor fools think that honor comes when someone proves his virtue, goodness and benevolence to others. For that someone lets himself be honored and served by others is a bad honor and not a divine honor: therefore one would like to lead the enthusiasts to school, so that they learn what honor means.

(133) And here the false-hearted show themselves honestly what kind of spirit they have. For since they do not know the Scriptures for themselves, they fall on this piece and want to confirm their error through Christ's glory, making themselves useless enough and concluding thus: It is not honest, but shameful that Christ is in the Lord's Supper; therefore he is certainly not there, and cannot be there. For Christ must be honest. Now when I ask them who

does it say that is not honest? Answer them: We say so. I ask further: Who are you? How do you know it, and how do you prove it? Ho, is it not enough that we say it? One should always answer you with the Scripture.

(134) Be ashamed in your heart that you make such a show with this piece and cannot prove anything about it, and do not see that if the result were good and effective, 1) I would also boast and boast that God's Son was not born of a woman, as the pagans boasted against St. Cyprian and Augustine. Cause: It is not honest for God to be born of a frail body of a vain man. Item: It is not honest for Christ to be led by the devil out of the wilderness to the temple and the high mountain, therefore it did not happen. Item, it is not honest that he was crucified, therefore it did not happen.

Oh Lord God, are these the high spirits? Shall one lead the people away from the bright and certain words of God with such idle and vain talk: "This is my body"? Is the honor of God of all things made worldly and carnal, just as it would be dishonest for a worldly king to be hanged or crucified? But the glory of our God is that, if for our sake He gives Himself down most deeply into the flesh, into the bread, into our mouth, heart and bowels, and suffers for our sake to be dealt with dishonestly, both on the cross and on the altar, as St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 11:27, that some eat of this bread unworthily.

He suffers without ceasing that before his divine eyes his word, his work and everything he has is persecuted, blasphemed, desecrated and abused, and yet he sits in his honor. If I had not read it in their books, I would never have believed that they would have wanted to found this article with such foolish things. But they are blinded by God's wrath, and are not serious about instructing the consciences and making them certain, but only about confusing them, and opening the mouths of the mad mob, so that they should listen to their cuckoos and

astonish you. For, as I said, the devil mocks us.

(137) But because we poor sinners must be accused of profaning and blaspheming Christ with our faith and doctrines, that Christ's body is in the Lord's Supper, let us hear how they honor and praise him. First of all, they take and deny the love, grace and good deed in him, that he wants his body to be our food in the Lord's Supper bodily, and in return they give him to sit in one but a single place, like a bird in a farmer. Doesn't this mean that Christ would be considered a child or a fool, if he took a florin and gave him a penny or an aspen leaf for it, and said that it was more precious than the florin? Summa, our faith is that all works of God are honest. As the 111th Psalm v. 3. says: Confessio et decor opus ejus, that is, "what God does is praiseworthy and beautiful." God cannot do anything dishonest or ugly; but the beautiful is not everyone's knowledge, it is spiritual.

It is also of the same high spirit that they lay such a hard rock at their foundation. Yes, they say, because this work is such a great miracle, that Christ's body is both in heaven and in the Lord's Supper, why do not the apostles and evangelists praise it as a miraculous work, as they do other miracles? Answer: How can one do it? He that hath not scripture must have his thoughts; he that hath not lime maketh mud. Who can answer such an excellent objection? But someone might say: The apostles and evangelists may have been so poor that they could not have produced so much vermilion or silver, 2) so that they could have painted a little hand on the edge and written at the same time: Here stands a miracle. For our enthusiasts want to have Christ and his disciples badly bound, where they describe a miraculous work of Christ, that they should write to it that it is a miraculous work; if not, then they want to dispute by this that neither work nor miracle, but badly nothing is. Because Christ says, "This is my body," and does not add, "This is a miracle.

1) i. e. proved.

2) i.e. red color from Brazil wood.

great wonder, it is nothing, since he says, "This is my body." This is almost the same as D. Carlstadt came with his point and big letters, and should also become a rock on which Christianity had to stand, or fall down and sink completely.

Sensible, honest people see that it is a disgrace to let out such talk among the people, and that it is not worthy of being answered. People still fall for it, cling to it, and it must be called vain scripture and truth, against such clear, dry, bright words: "This is my body. Not that they can hold it for truth in conscience, but would gladly that [it] were truth. But we are to thank God, the merciful Father, that He thus puts to shame those who are false in their own prudence, so that they must report themselves as they deal with lies and dreams, to warn us that it is vain devil's spew and mockery 1) so that everyone may beware of such falsehoods; but whoever does not allow himself to be warned, that he will be condemned all the more severely. So we believe that all the words and works of Christ are miracles. Therefore Isaias 9, 6. his name is called: "Wonderful". But we leave the evangelists and apostles free to call them miracles or not.

But they have one reason, which I consider to be the strongest and which they also mean seriously, and I believe it to be true; that is this: It weighs down, they say, the people of such articles. For it is hard to believe that One Body is in heaven and in the Lord's Supper at the same time. I praise my enthusiasts for freely confessing for once the right reason that moves them. They might well have long since kept silent about the other reasons and so much writing; this one alone would certainly have been enough to prove their faith. For from this reason all the other reasons spring. They would not have made such an effort with the others if this one had not urged them on.

141 Therefore, if anyone finds anything difficult to believe, let him believe and say, "It is not true.

1) Jenaer: mockery. Latin: luäkria.

This reason is conclusive and proves it. Therefore it is certainly not true that Christ is God and man. For it is difficult, even impossible, to believe, except for the saints, for whom it is not only easy, but also a pleasure and joy, yes, life and bliss, to believe all the words and works of God. But they do not concern us.

Now we have the enthusiasts with their own confession that they are hostile to the Sacrament, that they have resentment, disgust, disgust and abomination in their hearts against it; that is why they rave so against it. Oh, they should be a little more careful, leave such little pieces in the pen, but God does not want. The Greeks say: A liar should have a good memory. Thus Hilarius says: A godless man cannot be thoughtful. The devil always seals his thing and leaves a stench behind him. Why? Oh, it is not to be fenced against God's wisdom, he still wins.

They also have more reasons, namely, because it is not read that the apostles paid homage to the sacrament nor worshipped, but sat as to other food; so it is concluded that the apostles did not believe that Christ's body was there, therefore it is certainly vain bread 2c. This is a very good and solid reason, from which I will conclude: The apostles sat over the table in the Lord's Supper and did not worship Christ, whom they saw sitting there in the flesh, and did not pay him homage, so it is concluded that they did not believe that he was sitting there; therefore it is certainly not true that Christ was sitting at the table in the Lord's Supper. Mary and Joseph did not worship Christ when he was born, so it is certain that Christ was not there, but Mary gave birth to a moon child.

Such faith should have such evidence, such church should stand on such pillars. Should the apostles worship the sacrament they did not see, and not worship Christ whom they saw? But they should have shied away. Yes, if they had been enthusiasts. But now they cling to Christ with full love, so that they believe his word without all shyness, 2) as love is wont to do.

2) In the old editions: ohn alle Scheuen.

She believes everything," and she thinks nothing is impossible, especially what she hears from her beloved. She is more attached to his words than to what the words say. Mary Magdalene at the tomb thinks she wants to take Jesus herself, so her heart burns with love.

But my enthusiasts measure the apostles' hearts according to their own hearts, which are full of abomination and hatred of the sacrament, and think, We are disgusted and abhorred by the sacrament, and would not have believed it nor honored it. In the same way, the apostles would have had no desire or love for Christ's word, and would have shied away if Christ's body had been there. I can stand it that the devil mocks us with such ridicule. For I think he mocks himself more than he mocks us.

146 One more. Yes, they say, the works and miracles that Christ did were visible, as when he made wine of water, the blind to see, the deaf to hear, and so on. But since the miracle is not visible here, Christ's body is certainly not there. Mend, dear fellows, mend, the fur may be well, it is skin and hair not well off. Such little pieces are called vain scripture and the truth among such people. Now I accept it, let it be true: What miraculous sign is not visible, that is nothing and never happened. Christ, the Son of God, was conceived in Mary's body by the Holy Spirit, the greatest miracle of God; but it was not visible to the eye, therefore it is certainly not true. The Godhead dwells in Christ on earth and still for eternity; but it is not visible, therefore it is not true. But how will they do to their chief foundation and cornerstone: Christ sits at the right hand of God, but it is not before their eyes, therefore it is not true? But it is perhaps no miracle with them that Christ sits at the right hand of God, but a common thing, as when a teacher sits in his chair.

If these are good reasons and causes that teach us certain truths, prove our faith, and assure our consciences, then we are truly in a bad way. If someone were to bring me such books without title and name, and [I] did not know that [there are] such lofty

I would certainly think that they had been made by a gypsy or a loose lad, making a mockery of us Christians. There is no appearance that they are deceived by spiritual blindness, as happens to the heretics, but it seems as if it is vain will to deceive with God's word. It should not be possible that such lazy, lame, stale talk would seriously move a man who was in his right mind, even if he were a Turk or a Jew, let alone a Christian.

But the great resentment and disgust that they have against the holy sacrament, and the fierce desire that they have for their conceit, makes them so rash that they think that everything that they can grasp, even if it is a straw, is a spear and a sword; they think that with it they can kill a thousand at one blow. The own conceit has the heartache with us all, God forbid him, amen.

So our rock and dry light text still stands firm: "This is my body," and has confidently allowed itself to be stormed with stubble and chaff, which has been scattered and blown away by a small wind.

150 Now we want to attack their other cornerstone and the other best reason. For although they have many other loose reasons besides the first reason, which we have now attacked, about which we have told; yet I will now leave it enough at this one, and at the other cornerstone I will also do some, lest I also become a gossip about such loose, lazy frivolities. For I am truly hostile to such gossip, because they are not sayings of the Scriptures, where one could usefully act on some spiritual teaching, but must give word after word, and yet lose time over it and leave better things. But Satan must do so and always cause misfortune and hindrance.

151) So their other best piece is the saying John 6:63: "Flesh is of no use," which Oecolampad boasts is his iron wall, and he truly believes it to be true. But if everything is false that is hard to believe (as they say), then it is certainly also false that this is his iron wall.

I find it almost hard to believe; methinks it is paper, but perhaps it would like to have an iron color.

First, when they are to prove with Scripture that the flesh, in this place, must be and be called Christ's body, in which they are most concerned, for which reason they are also asked, they do as is their way, wipe it away, accept it and pretend it, as if it were certain, and as if they had fought it out chivalrously, and say: "Well, it is certain truth with us. Dear Lord God, who asks you about your conceit? Or, who seeks from you what you think is certain? How often have you heard that these two things, possibile and necessarium, may and must, are farther apart than heaven and earth? as even children and laymen of all languages know well. If you are asked whether what you teach must be so, you answer, "It may be so. Yes, Judas wants to be pious; follows very finely, therefore Judas must be pious. Pilate wants to become a Christian 2); therefore Pilate must become a Christian.

153] So here also: since you are to prove that flesh here must be called Christ's body, you are all mutes, since you are nevertheless obliged to speak, and therefore tell us that it should be called Christ's body. There you are all too washful and garrulous. Yes, it would also like to be called a roast pig, if the "to be called" is to stand with me and to apply to chattering and washing. For one can testify most powerfully against you that Christ, whenever he speaks of his flesh or body in Scripture, adds the word "my" and says: "My flesh," "my body," as he says in the same chapter of John 6: "My flesh is the right food. Item, "who eats my flesh" 2c. Item, "if ye eat not of the flesh of the Son of man" 2c.

154 But since he does not say here, "My flesh is of no use," but rather, "Flesh is of no use," you are truly in distress and fear that you would have to prove that this is called Christ's flesh. There is a great difference between Christ's flesh and bad flesh. For they cheerfully demand of you, and defy you, who shall afflict you.

1) Wittenberger: "from".

2) In the old editions: "Christians" instead of: a Christian.

I told you to change and improve the text and to make "flesh" into "my flesh", and you would have to be humiliated about it. Item, you are not able to prove it, and yet you accept it and insist on it as if it were proven in the most certain way. So the reason also lies there and is unproven, also remains eternally unproven. That is Oecolampad's iron wall.

(155) Yes, they say, the circumstances of the speech indicate that flesh is called Christ's body here. Where there? The word Christ speaks, "Flesh is of no use," and does not say, "Fleshly sense or mind is of no use," as you carnivores say; the word "of no use," in Greek *ὠφελεί*, *conducit*, *prodest*, actually means that which is of no use or good, or of no use. Now if Christ had wanted to understand the fleshly sense here through flesh, and not his own flesh, he would have had to speak like this: Flesh hears or understands nothing. But since he says that flesh is of no use, he must speak of his own flesh, which understands much, but is of no use when eaten. Behold, I thought that ye would answer otherwise than ye were asked, and pass by when ye were called. You are to prove that flesh here means Christ flesh, so you prove and teach us that *percipere et conducere*, to hear and to be of use, are two different words. Who asked you and asked for this? We know all this well ourselves, and the *Vocabularius Exquo* 3) or *Gemma* would also have taught us, without such high spirits and masters.

156 It is still unproven that flesh here means Christ's flesh. For let it be that here not the word *percipere* (to hear), but the word *conducere* (to use) is written, what does that help you? Shouldn't Christ speak like this: Flesh is not useful? That is, everything that flesh understands, hears, wants, speaks, does, lets, has, suffers, in short: flesh and what is flesh, which is of no use. And if I want to condemn fleshly sense, I must not be bound to speak thus: The carnal mind hears nothing; indeed, it is much better condemned if I say, "The carnal mind is of no use. Now we have no great power here, whether flesh here is not so much fleshly as carnal.

3) Thus in the old editions. Erlanger: 6X quo.

The word "flesh" means the sense of the flesh, but flesh comprehends everything that is in the flesh, sense, reason, will, word, work, 2c., as has now been said. All this is of no use, and neither forces nor proves such a word use) nor that therefore flesh here must be understood of Christ's flesh; since it can well be spoken of and understood of bad flesh, as I have now proved. Where is the iron wall here? Where is the certain truth?

157 So the iron wall is blown down with a little word, which means *mea*, "my," because since it does not say, "My flesh is of no use," but simply, "Flesh is of no use," we have won first of all that it cannot be understood of Christ's body. For since he does not add it himself, saying, "My flesh," it is forbidden to amend his words and add anything to them, even if we do not understand it of his flesh.

158 Secondly, that they may not prove with a few letters that flesh here means Christ's flesh. For if we were to admit to them, without any proof, that "flesh" here means as much as "my flesh", who would then refuse that Christ's flesh is not called everywhere, where flesh is written in the Scriptures? Soon all the old heresies would swarm in with crowds, saying that Christ did not naturally have flesh and blood, and was not really man, because they saw that so much evil is said of the flesh in Scripture; as, the Manichaei, Valentiniani 2c. And indeed, such bumblebees are already buzzing around the head of the Zwingel, and sting quickly, since he writes against D. Ecken zu Baden thus: If Christ's flesh is eaten, then nothing but flesh comes of it, because everything that is born of flesh is flesh, as we want to hear. Fie, that the devil should fool and ape us so shamefully, that for the sake of such loose talk we must deny such brightly revealed words: 1) "This is my body", and pretend that the Scriptures are against each other, and force us to it; but our ingratitude deserves well.

Although this foundation and iron wall has been sufficiently overturned, yet because there is no measure to their defiance and boasting, we still want to reveal their foolishness. We also want to swarm with them, and immediately admit that the flesh here is called Christ's flesh, as they are joking; not that [it] may be so; but thus we want to fool and run along this carnival in such foolishness, so that one may see what is to follow from it. Let the iron wall stand firm that Christ's flesh is of no use.

160 Now here I ask: Mary the Virgin, when she was bodily pregnant with the Son of God, and carried Christ our Lord in her womb for nine months, and after that gave birth to him bodily, as a mother, as our faith and the Gospels say, whether she also bodily carried and gave birth to Christ's flesh, in and through her flesh? I, as a fan, do not believe this. Why is that? Because that Christ's flesh, bodily conceived, borne and acted, is of no use. If it is of no use, it is not done, as our reason says: Christ's flesh is of no use; therefore it is not there. For if in the sacrament his flesh is not therefore, that flesh profiteth not, neither is it in the womb, even therefore, that it profiteth not. It is the same cause in both pieces.

161 The angels told the shepherds, and the shepherds found that Christ was lying in the manger, bodily and in his flesh. But who will believe that it is true? If Christ spoke with all the angels: My body is in the manger, we say no. For flesh is not useful, therefore your body cannot be there bodily, but the swaddling clothes and the manger signify your body; because it is one thing, flesh is not useful, and is not there.

162 Item, Simeon took him bodily in his arms, when his parents brought him bodily into the temple, Luc. 2, 28. But great lies are all these together, and is contrary to the glory of Christ, because that flesh is of no use, that is, it cannot be there bodily. This is our ground, this is where we stand, and this is our iron wall. Item, Christ

He was baptized in the Jordan, he walked in the deserts and cities and on the sea, and all this in the flesh, Matth 3, 13. ff. This is all a fictitious thing. Why? Flesh is of no use, that is, Christ's bodily presence is not there, as is now said. Item, Christ sat bodily at the table, in the Lord's Supper, and also talked bodily with His disciples, and they with Him, Matth. 26, 26, and also washed their feet bodily Joh. 13, 5. Yes, it is said, but it is a lie, and blasphemed God's honor. For flesh is of no use. Therefore he was certainly not there in the flesh, but only in the spirit.

Do you say: Stop for God's sake, you are probably raving yourself to death. In the same way, you should also swarm Christ out of the garden, the cross and all his suffering, so that none of them would ever have happened

in the flesh, because he had to be there in the flesh in all of this, and his flesh is of no use where it is there in the flesh. Yes, dear one, I will also let him rave about the right hand of God, since everything is up to us, and prove that he is not there. For flesh is of no use. Even though his flesh sits at the right hand of God, it is the same flesh of Christ. For there is no other flesh at the right hand of God. If then it is the same flesh, it is of no use there; if it is of no use, it is not there, and is nothing at all, and goes through this saying just as in the Lord's Supper.

164 And more than this, I will prove that the body of Christ is not spiritual in their hearts, which is their greatest gossip. For, as I have said, flesh is of no use; but flesh is and abideth flesh, whether in the belly, or in bread, or in the cross, or in heaven, or in the Spirit, or wheresoever thou wilt. For the places do not change it; yet wine, grain, money, and cloth remain just the same as they are; they come in a thousand places in one day. Should Christ's flesh not remain the same flesh, be it in heaven, spirit, crib, mother, or wherever you want? If then it be bodily, as it must be, it is no good: if it be no good, it is not there, and nothing at all.

(165) Behold, what a mighty swarm the saying, "Flesh is of no use," can bring about, so that it can destroy the heavens and the earth for Christ's body.

He has made the earth too narrow, and he has driven him out of heaven and out of the spirit, where the devotees had sent him, as into a strong fortress, fortified with iron walls, so that he would be well guarded, so that the boys on the altar would not be able to deal with him dishonestly. Therefore this saying is indeed the strongest foundation and a real iron wall; yes, for us against them, and they could not have raised anything stronger against themselves than this very saying, which they boast of most highly for themselves. So it is with us poor sinners

and unthinking, defenseless servants of the baked and bloody God, that whoever wants to strike us brings us weapons enough for us to strike them and defend ourselves.

166 Here they will perhaps answer thus: We do not say that Christ's flesh is of no use in all things, but only when it is eaten bodily. Otherwise, if one eats it spiritually, that is, if one believes that it is given for us in death 2c., then it is useful according to the word of Christ Joh. 6, 55: "My flesh is a true food" 2c. I thank the good instruction. But it still remains that this does not prove that Christ speaks of the bodily eating of his body. For he does not say thus: Eating my flesh in the flesh is of no use, but badly thus: Meat is of no use. Therefore such teaching

does not help the matter; it must and should be proved that he speaks of bodily eating. This you will never do.

167 And if you prove this (as you could not), I would like to hear why Christ's flesh is of no use when it is eaten in the flesh, and not also when it is conceived in the flesh and born, placed in the manger, taken in the arms, seated above the table in the Lord's Supper, hanging on the cross 2c. Are all these external ways and customs of his flesh as well as when he is eaten bodily. What is better than that it is in the womb than that it is in the bread and mouth? If it is of no use here, it cannot be of any use there; if it is of use there, it must be of use here also, since no

more can be made of it anywhere than that it is bodily and outwardly Christ's body, whether eaten or received.

I am not born or borne, seen or heard, and there is nowhere the spiritual food that is useful, but only the bodily need or action, according to your way of speaking. Who wants to report me here? Is there no one at home here? Well then, the previous teaching is also of no use, and helps me nothing, and must remain on the fact that I have said that Christ's flesh must either be of use in the Lord's Supper, or must be of no use at all, whether it be in heaven or in the Spirit.

168 But again I ask, How? if I eat Christ's flesh in the Lord's Supper bodily, so that I eat it spiritually at the same time, will you not admit to me that Christ's flesh in the Lord's Supper is almost useful? But how can this be? So it can be: I will eat his body bodily with the bread and yet at the same time believe in my heart that it is the body that is given for me for the forgiveness of sins, as the words are Matth. 26, 26: "This is my body, given for you," which you yourselves call spiritual eating. If there is spiritual food, then the physical food cannot harm, but must also be useful for the sake of the spiritual food. Now answer me, I am allowed to give necessary instruction here.

Yes, you say, we but the spiritual food from the bodily. Thank God! Are you the hair, 1) and so pious honest people, that you with impudent lies into the world through so many books so disgrace and blaspheme us innocent poor sinners? Is this your new art and high spirit, which the blinded Luther cannot comprehend? When have you ever heard of us eating or teaching to eat the Lord's Supper in such a way that it is only an outward bodily eating of the body of Christ? Have we not thus taught by many books that in the Lord's Supper there are two things to be remembered? One is the highest and most necessary, which are the words: "Take, eat, this is my body" 2c. The other is the sacrament or bodily eating of the body of Christ. Of course, no one can pass the words through the throat into the belly, but must grasp them through the ears into the heart. But what does he take into the heart through the words? Nothing else, but that they are lukewarm.

namely, "the body given for us," which is the spiritual food. And we have further said that whoever eats the sacrament bodily without such words, or without such spiritual food, it is not only of no use, but also harmful, as Paul says 1 Cor. 11:27: "Whoever eats the bread unworthily is guilty of the Lord's body."

(170) Therefore you should not have taught us that bodily food is not useful. We say more and say that bodily food is also poisonous and deadly. But this does not prove that Christ's body is not there. Rather, it proves that he is there. For if it were not there, the bodily food would be harmless and useful. But since it is not useful, and is also harmful, it must of course be there and be eaten. Neither is it proved that the saying belongs to the Lord's Supper, since Christ says: "Flesh is not useful. And so your dream stands everywhere with vain lies and shame. The mouth that eats Christ's flesh does not know what it eats, or what the heart eats in it; it would be of no use to it, because it cannot grasp or hear the words. But the heart knows well what the mouth eats. For it grasps the words, and eats spiritually that which the mouth eats bodily. Since the mouth is a member of the heart, it must also live forever for the sake of the heart, which lives forever through the word, because it also eats the same eternal food that its heart eats with it spiritually.

We ask you, dear sirs, if you want to rave against the Lutherans or the new papists (as you disgrace us), please abstain from lies and preach and write nothing else about us than what we teach. For as ye have lied unto us hitherto, so do we not teach as ye have now heard. Or if you want to write against us, then write and prove how the Lutherans are such idols that they teach that there is no word of God in the Lord's Supper, but only the body of Christ in the bread. Item, that they have neither heart nor soul to grasp and eat such words, but only the mouth to eat the body of Christ. If you prove this, then I confess that your Scripture is right and well-founded out of measure.

1) i.e. are you like this?

is founded. For your enthusiasm goes against such people, and against no one else; as if mice or sows ate the sacrament, it would be of no use to them.

But if you leave us the words in the Lord's Supper, and admit that we have souls, we will cheerfully ask what devil commanded you to separate the word from the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper; item, to separate the heart from the mouth in us, and to drive only the bodily food into the Lord's Supper, and to tear out the spiritual. For although in the Lord's Supper the ungodly practice such separation for their own condemnation, and eat only the body of Christ without the word, with the mouth, without the heart, only bodily and not spiritual, yet Christ did not institute it in this way, but did both together, eating the word and his body, spiritually with the heart and bodily with the mouth. Now, of course, the abuse of the wicked cannot and should not break or change God's order and appointment.

From all this we conclude that the iron wall of Oecolampad, or the saying, "Flesh is of no use," cannot belong to the Lord's Supper at all. For, as we have heard, in the Lord's Supper a spiritual food of Christ is instituted, besides the bodily, because in it is God's Word, which says to the heart, "Take, this is my body," which the belly or mouth cannot bodily eat nor grasp. Although the ungodly, the papists, and the fanatics do not respect such words, and thus lack the spiritual food, the Christians meet it with their faith.

174 For this reason it is less than nothing, since they say, "Flesh is of no use"; therefore it is not there. For in this way I would also prove that there is no God nor creature, if I only put away God's word, as they do in the Lord's Supper. If you take away the word: "God created the heavens and the earth," then I would like to see who has a God, or what God is good for. Take away the word, "Christ, the Son of God, is our Savior," and I will see who has Christ, or to whom he is useful. In the flesh he is well known, for God and Christ would still be there.

even if he did not let a word of it be preached. But who would it help? Who would benefit, because no one would know that he was anything? If it is of no use, then it is certainly of no use, as the iron wall shows that what is of no use is not.

So also, if God's Word does not say that the heavens and the earth are His creatures, to whom would they be of use? Or what do they help? They are useful to the belly, but not to the soul; if they are not useful, they are nothing everywhere 2c. But where the word of God is added, the heart needs and enjoys the same word spiritually in the word that the body needs and enjoys outwardly and bodily. Oh, what can I say! The old rogue, the devil, has blinded the enthusiasts in such a way that they do not know what they themselves are saying; they talk a lot about spiritual food, but do not know either what spiritual or bodily food is. Therefore, we will speak a little about it here, for the instruction of those who need it to further expose the folly of the devotees and to betray the mocking devil.

First, it is not called spiritual eating, drinking, or acting, if that which is eaten, drunk, or acted upon is spirit, or a spiritual being. For then Christ's flesh might not be spiritually eaten or drunk; since Christ's flesh, wherever it may be, in spiritual or bodily essence, visible or invisible, is truly, naturally, bodily flesh, which can be grasped, felt, seen, and heard, born of a woman, died on the cross: but therefore it is called spiritual, that it comes from the Spirit, and wants and must be spiritually eaten by us. *Objectum non est semper spirituale, sed usus debet esse spiritualis.* We must prove this with examples.

When Mary, the virgin, conceived and bore Christ, Christ was a real bodily, visible man, and not only a spiritual being; nor did she also conceive and bear him spiritually. How so? So she believed the word of the angel that she should conceive and give birth. With the same faith in the angel's word, she conceived and gave birth to Christ spiritually in her heart at the same time as she conceived and gave birth to him in her womb.

gave birth bodily. For if she had not conceived Christ in her heart spiritually, she would never have conceived him bodily. God might have made Christ's body from her body, in her sleep, without her knowledge, as he made Eve from Adam: but then she would not have become his mother, just as Adam is not Eve's mother.

Now what did she receive in her heart? Nothing else, but the word of the angel, namely: "You shall be pregnant with the Son of God" [Luc. 1, 31]. Since she grasped the word and became pregnant with it in her heart through faith, she also became bodily pregnant with that which the word in her heart told her. Her womb does not know what it receives, for it does not hear the angel's word; but her heart does hear what the womb receives. Now she is pregnant in two ways, spiritually and physically, and yet with one fruit. And the bodily pregnancy would have been of no use to her, if it had happened without the spiritual pregnancy. Now here you see that spiritual pregnancy does not force the fruit to be a spiritual being. Yes, the fruit is bodily, but it is also a spiritual conception next to the bodily one.

Item, the shepherds saw the Lord, the child, in the manger bodily, and also Mr. Simeon in the temple, Luc. 2. But the seeing would have helped them nothing, if there had not also been a spiritual seeing. But who gave them the spiritual sight? Without doubt, not the sight of the Child, but the word of the angel that sent them to Bethlehem to see the Savior, and the answer of the Holy Spirit that came to Simeon, that he should see the Christ of the Lord before he died. Through the same word, spiritual sight, that is, faith, arose in their hearts, so that they first saw the child spiritually as the Savior, and then with their physical eyes as well. Now it is one child, one Savior, and yet it is seen in two ways: spiritually by the word, bodily by sight. But the eyes of the flesh do not know what they see, for they see the Savior, but cannot understand that he is the Savior. For they cannot comprehend the word. But the heart knows well what the

Eyes see. For it hears the words, and knows that the eyes see the right Savior. Now here the thing is bodily, and yet a spiritual seeing beside the bodily.

180) The woman with the issue of blood did not touch a spiritual thing when she touched the hem of Christ, but the bodily garment of Christ; nevertheless, there was a spiritual touching of the same garment in her heart, because she said to herself, "If only I would touch the hem of his garment, I would be healed. Behold, such word and faith in her heart is a spiritual touching. For her hand, of course, could not grasp the word that her heart spoke, "Touch," nor knew what she was touching. But her heart knew that her hand touched the garment of the Savior. But how did it know? Not from touching it, but from the word, "This is the Savior." Now what touches the heart spiritually? Nothing else, but the same bodily garment that touches the hand bodily. The bodily garment is one, and yet there are two kinds of touching, spiritual and bodily.

The land of Canaan was given to Abraham by God. Now the land is a physical thing, but there is also a spiritual taking of the same land. For Abraham took it spiritually by faith, because his heart said: I believe it, and take it. But from where did he take it? Doubtless not from the land, of which he never possessed a foot; but from the word which he said, "Unto thee and unto thy seed will I give this land." Now that his children Since his children took it bodily, their body or hand did not know what they took. For the body does not hear the word of God, but Abraham's heart knew and saw what his children's bodies took. Now they take nothing else bodily than what Abraham had previously taken spiritually through faith in God's word.

182) And when he begat Isaac his son by Sarah, the same was a man in the flesh: neither is there two witnesses, spiritual and corporeal. For Abraham begat Isaac spiritually by faith, when his heart said: I believe that I will beget Isaac. But where did he get the witness? Not from

His body, or of Sarah, but of the word, "Sarah shall bear thee a son." Now when he begat the son in the flesh, his body knew not what he did, because it could not hear the word. But his heart knew what his body did, for his heart heard the word and knew that his body begat Isaac, whom he had begotten before by the word of God in faith. Now it is the same Isaac in the flesh that his heart begat spiritually through faith and his body begat bodily through the work, as St. Paul Rom. 4:3 almost praises this faith of Abraham.

Henceforth, all that which our body does outwardly and bodily, when God's word comes to it, and is done by faith, it is and is called spiritual; that nothing can be so bodily, carnal, or outward, it becomes spiritual when it is done in the word and faith. That "spiritual" is nothing else, but what is done by the Spirit and faith, in and through us, God grant, that the thing with which we deal, be it bodily or spiritual, scilicet in usu, non in objecto, spiritus est; be it seeing, hearing, speaking, grasping, bearing, carrying, eating, drinking, or what it may. For he that serveth his neighbor, and doeth it bodily, it is no good to him. For the flesh is of no use. But if he does it spiritually, that is, if his heart does it through faith in God's word, then it is life and blessedness. Now there is one kind of bodily neighbor, that he may walk, but two kinds of doings. The body does not know what it is doing, it is driven like a beast; but the heart knows what the body is doing. From where? Not from the neighbor, but from the word of God, which says: "Love your neighbor.

For so God does with us, that he sets before us both his work and his word. The work is to be done by the body, the word by the soul; for if the work were presented without the word, it would be of no use to anyone. As if he had sent Christ to Mary without a word, the work would be of no use to her. For she would know nothing about it, nor would she know it. Item, if he had let Christ die and rise again, and let such a work remain hidden and not proclaim it by word, to whom would it be of use? What use is it even now, to whom he has preached?

Is it bodily carried by the eyes, and they do not accept the word in the heart? Since our body is to deal with such works bodily, and yet cannot hear the word; again, the soul cannot go out and deal with the work bodily, God thus divides it according to both measures, and gives the word for the soul, and the work for the body, so that they both may be saved and enjoy the same grace in two ways, each his own humble portion.

Now tell me here who are the true Capernaïtes. For Oecolampad chides us that we are Capernaïtes, because we eat Christ's flesh bodily in the Lord's Supper. But I say that dw gushers are right Capernaïtes. For the Capernaïtes also separated the work from the word, and fell upon the bodily meat-eating; even as our enthusiasts do, separating the words, and leaving them, wherein is the spiritual meat, gazing and yawning 1) while at the bodily meat, as fools look into the mouth, and gape with their eyes, that they cannot perceive the words which are plainly written, "Take, eat; this is my body." This is what the Capernaïtes did.

But we may not be Capernaïtes, for we keep both bodily and spiritual food. The mouth eats the body of Christ bodily, for it cannot grasp the words nor eat them, and does not know what it eats, tasting as if it were eating something other than Christ's body. But the heart grasps the words in faith, and eats the same spiritually that the mouth eats bodily. For the heart sees what the mouth eats bodily. But from where does it see? Not from the bread, nor from the eating of the mouth, but from the word which is written, "Eat, this is my body," and yet is one body of Christ. For both. mouth and heart eat, each in its own measure and manner. The heart cannot eat it bodily; so the mouth cannot eat it spiritually. God therefore makes it equal, that the mouth may eat for the heart in the flesh, and the heart for the mouth in the spirit, and so both may be satisfied and saved with one food.

1) Thus the Wittenbergers: "gehnemeulen" i.e. yawning open the mouth. Jenaer and Erlanger: "genemeulen". Latin: xatulo ors indiant.

For not even the body with no understanding knows that it eats such food, so that it should live forever. For it does not feel it, but dies and rots, as if it had eaten other food, like an unreasonable animal. But the soul sees and understands that the body must live forever, because it eats an eternal food, which will not leave it in the grave or dust rotting and decaying.

Yes, they say, Mary, when she was with child and gave birth, she also saw her child in the flesh; the shepherds and Simeon also saw him, and so on; the others saw everything they believed. What shall we say: I hear you, you tender, disgusting fruit, want to teach your God how He should present Himself to you in the flesh; perhaps you also want to become Mary, His mother, and Simeon, and are not satisfied with the way He presents Himself to you? As you wish, go and make your own, you will see. But we trust in our God, who has willed to give birth to Mary spiritually and physically, and not to be eaten or drunk either physically or spiritually. Of the shepherds and Simeon he would be seen spiritually and bodily, and not born, neither eaten. So according to his pleasure, to whom he desired to be seen, heard, born, suckled, borne, touched, and the like, both bodily and spiritual.

But of us here he will neither be born, nor seen, nor heard, nor not touched, but only eaten and drunk, both bodily and spiritually, so that by such eating we may have as much and be as far away as those who gave birth, saw, heard, bore, 2c. and be as near to us bodily as he was to them; but that there must be another way, so that he may be so near in all the world, which could not be where he appeared visibly. For this purpose he has not denied us sight, but has promised it; only that it may be kept up and saved until the last day, that there may be room for faith, and that we may not be saved here in this miserable life. What more can he do?

But that all this is right and well said, which means spiritual, I hope, is quite obvious. For this must be spiritual

are called what the Spirit does and comes from the Spirit, just as what the flesh does and comes from the flesh is carnal; as Paul says Rom. 8:5: "Those who are of the flesh are carnally minded; those who are of the Spirit are spiritually minded." Item Rom. 8:13: "If ye put to death the works of the flesh in the spirit, ye shall live." There you hear that also the fruits 1) and works of the Spirit are called spiritual, because they come from the Spirit, as he also says Gal. 5, 22: "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, patience," 2c. And Summa, the whole life of Christians he calls spiritual, and they all at once spiritual, 1 Cor. 1, 30. and Cap. 2, 12. that [there] is no doubt that whoever eats Christ's body in the Lord's Supper in faith spiritually, that the same also eats spiritually in the bodily meal and lives and walks spiritually.

(190) But our enthusiasts have a dizzy and fluttering spirit, (2) think that there is nothing spiritual where there is something corporeal, and pretend that flesh is of no use; so that the contradiction is true, that the Spirit cannot be with us except in corporeal things, but in the Word, water, and Christ's body, and in his saints on earth. Have we now almost overthrown the iron wall?

Now let us take Christ's saying before us, "Flesh is of no use," and see if we can do it better than the scribes. And let our reason be this, that where the two words "flesh" and "spirit" are set one against the other in Scripture, flesh cannot be called Christ's body, but is always called the old flesh, 3) which is born of the flesh, John 3:6: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." For why should they set the Scriptures against each other, if they could get along together? Now Christ's body and flesh are almost compatible with the Spirit; indeed, he is the Spirit's dwelling place in the flesh, and through him the Spirit comes into all others.

192. the first is Moses, Gen. 6, 3., "My spirit will not be judge forever.

1) Erlanger: Fruit.

2) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer and Erlanger: fladdern spirit. Latin: *sxiritu verti* *Zinis et erroris agitantur*.

3) "the old flesh" is missing from the Erlanger.

among men, because they are flesh"; item, Is. 40, 6. 7.: We were not so far off the mark when we interpreted the "All flesh is hay, but the Spirit blows into the hay, so that flesh to be the mind of the flesh. For in the flesh, where it withers"; and Christ Joh. 3, 6.: "That which is born of the there is no spirit, the highest and best is of course the Spirit is spirit, that which is born of the flesh is flesh." But mind, spirit, will, heart and courage. If then flesh is of no St. Paul, Rom. 8, more or less throughout the whole use, neither is its mind, understanding, will, and all its chapter, always sets spirit and flesh against each other; doings and abilities of any use, and the opinion of Christ and Gal. 5, 17: these two, "spirit and flesh, are against in this place must be this:

each other" 2c. And I consider that this is known to Dear disciples, you who murmur and take offense at everyone who reads the New Testament; but if anyone my words, you do not understand me well, for you fall into does not believe it, let him read it, and he will find that the the work of eating flesh in the flesh, and understand it as flesh and the spirit, where they are set against one it is torn with teeth and digested in the body, as flesh from another, are certainly condemned there, as being sinful, the womb. 1) This is a carnal, deadly mind. Such flesh I God's enemy and adversary, so that there is no need to will not give you to eat so 2); there must be spirit here, not introduce all the sayings here. flesh; spiritually my words must be understood, of spiritual

Since this is true and irrefutable, the flesh, where it is flesh. All my words are spirit; therefore both flesh and set against the Spirit, is not called Christ's body, but the food, and all that I speak of, are also spirit and spiritual to old Adam, born of the flesh, it is certain that also John be understood and used. "For the spirit quickeneth; flesh 6:63, "Flesh is of no use," cannot be understood of is of no use."

Christ's body, because Christ holds flesh against the (196) If then the fervent are allowed to stand so stiffly Spirit. For his words are clear: "The spirit gives life, flesh on this saying, "Flesh is of no use," which must be quite is of no use. My words which I say unto you are spirit and dark and uncertain with them, but with us it is almost life." You see that he separates the flesh from the Spirit certain that it stands against them, they should also hold and sets it against the Spirit. For he teaches that life and it against us, whether we stand firmly and stiffly on the spirit are in his words, and not in the flesh. But to the flesh saying, "This is my body," which is quite bright, certain, he gives that it is of no use. And how shall it be of use, if and clear; so that it cannot be made dark and uncertain neither life nor spirit be in it? If there is neither life nor spirit by any art or power, and all fervency about it will come to in it, there must be death and sin in it. But which heretic shame. For we do not yet see the Scriptures, 3) which has ever been so desperate (except the Jews), who held should strive against this saying, as they boast and such things of Christ flesh? Now let the heretics here try pretend, for whose sake we should not stand so stiffly themselves; let them see what they can do; they have upon it. We see that their blind conceit sees through a boasted that it is an iron wall and certain truth; if they can painted glass, and lets itself think that the Scripture strives confirm the fame, I will watch. in many places against this saying; but it rather rhymes

194 If then we have that in this place "flesh" may not with it, and strives against their enthusiasm.

mean Christ's body, but certainly the old Adam, and that is contrary to the Spirit, or ever without the Spirit and not the Spirit (which is as much as contrary to the Spirit): then I hope that we poor sinners

1) i.e. Schranken, butchers' stalls. Cf. Erlanger, vol. 47, 386.

Latin: onro6xi "a66U06mxta. The

the same expression is also found in Luther's "Hausrechnung," De Wette - Seidemann, vol. VI, p. 330. There Seidemann explains "Fleisch ynn Schernn" by "Krebse"; likewise incorrectly the Erlangen edition, vol. 65, p. 234.

2) "so" is missing in the Jena.

3) Scripture----Scriptures.

But Zwingel is first of all an unskilled carpenter and hews rough chips, since he writes in Baden 1): "That which is born of flesh is flesh", Joh. 3, 6. Now if Christ eats flesh, nothing but flesh comes of it. Fie and shame to him who says this; nor does it follow according to the mind of the eye. *Haec ille*. I say that you enthusiasts are bold, 2) insolent people. You pretend to be very humble, patient and patient toward men, but you are equally foolish and foolish toward God and His Word.

198. Behold now, how subtle is this: "That which is born of flesh is flesh"; therefore, where Christ is eaten flesh, nothing but flesh can come of it. The saying John 3:6 speaks of the birth and nature of the flesh, so it refers to fleshly eating; this spirit even has the Scriptures under its control.

199. for I hold that Zwingel here speaks of natural flesh; as bread and flesh, where it is eaten, becomes flesh and blood of him that eateth it, and would that Christ's flesh were eaten, it should be digested, and become flesh and blood, as other meat. And this is what the saying of John 3:6 means: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh. Rhyme well down the stairs. But if his opinion is this, that he who eats Christ's flesh becomes flesh, or carnal, and not spiritual, then it rhymes even more finely, and may be concluded likewise: He who eats bread becomes bread, and he who eats sausage becomes a sausage, and he who drinks wine becomes wine. So it would be a wonder that the wolves have not long since created 3) or become vain sheep, because they eat so much. Well, such alfenzen we want to let go.

200 But the blasphemy is not to be suffered, that these enthusiasts also want to weave Christ flesh into this saying, "That which is born of flesh is flesh"; and their opinion is bad, that Christ flesh is born of flesh. Thus they indicate how finely they read and understand the 6th chapter of John. The wretched Satan drives them to

To believe and speak with such thirst and stubbornness. How can they think anything good of Christ's flesh, because they insist that it is born of flesh and is flesh? Then they must go on and on saying that his flesh is of no use, and may not deny it.

201. But we poor sinners and servants of the baked God say thus: That Christ flesh belongs under the saying, That which is born of the Spirit is spirit; for his flesh is not born of flesh, but of the Holy Spirit, as also the children and all the world confess in faith, saying, "I believe in Jesus Christ our Lord, who is conceived of the Holy Spirit." And the angel, Matth. 1, 20., speaks to Joseph in his sleep: "Do not be afraid to take Mary, your spouse, to yourself. For that which is born in her is of the Holy Spirit",

202. and Luc. 1, 34. 35. when Mary consulted with the angel how it should be that she should have a child, because she knew no man, Gabriel said: "The Holy Spirit will come into you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the holy thing that is born of you will be called the Son of the Most High. Here you hear that Christ's body is born of the Spirit and is holy, therefore it must certainly not be flesh but spirit, according to Christ's saying, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." But of no other man does the Scripture speak thus. Not that I put these sayings before the zealots, for they should be able to revile them and quickly jump over them, as their virtue and high spirit is wont to do; but I want to strengthen and comfort us poor Capernaïtes and carnivores with them against their arrogant devil. For if their ravings continue that Christ's flesh is of no use, soon Marcion, Manichaeus, and Valentine will come, teaching that Christ had no right body, but a ghost of a body, because it does not rhyme that Christ's body is of no use, and yet should have a right body.

203. Now from these sayings we learn what is called spirit or spiritual, what is called flesh or carnal, so that we do not follow our eyes and fingers.

1) To D. Eck. Cf. 8158.

2) Erlanger: "bold and".

3) "schüfen"----- sheep-like. Latin: oviles.

But, as I have said above, that all things are spirit, spiritual, and of the spirit, and that which comes of the Holy Spirit, however bodily, outward, visible it may be; again, flesh and carnal, whatever comes without the spirit from the natural power of the flesh, however inward and invisible it may be. For also St. Paul, Rom. 8, calls carnal sense flesh, and Gal. 5, 20. among the works of the flesh also counts heresy, hatred, envy 2c., which are nevertheless completely inward and completely invisible.

(204) Now if Christ be separate flesh from all flesh, and only spiritual flesh above all, born not of the flesh, but of the Spirit, it is spiritual meat: If it be spiritual meat, it is eternal meat, which cannot perish, as he himself saith, Joh 6:27: "Work 1) meat that perisheth not, which the Son of man shall give unto you." And again, v. 33, 48, 50, f.: "I am the living bread come down from heaven." Item: "He who eats me lives forever." And so on through the whole chapter he teaches how his flesh is the true, living, eternal food, which makes alive and keeps all who eat it, and whoever does not eat it must die 2c.

205 Why is this? Because his flesh is not of the flesh, nor carnal, but spiritual; therefore it cannot be eaten, digested, or changed. For it is incorruptible, like all that is of the Spirit, and is food altogether and of a different kind from corruptible food. Perishable food is transformed into the body that eats it; this food, in turn, transforms into itself the one who eats it, making him like it, spiritual, living, and eternal, as it is when he says, "This is the bread from heaven that gives life to the world."

If Christ's flesh is eaten bodily or spiritually, the same body is the same spiritual flesh, the same incorruptible food, which is eaten in the Lord's Supper with the mouth bodily and with the heart spiritually,

after Christ's institution, or eaten only with the heart spiritually through the word, as he teaches, John 6:35. For the fact that in the Lord's Supper he is eaten with the mouth bodily does not break him off, so that he must become flesh or carnal food; but if he goes into the mouth or heart, it is the same body; just as when he went on earth, he remained the same Christ, if he came into the hands of the pious or the wicked.

Therefore, the disciples should not conclude thus: If Christ is eaten meat, then nothing but meat is made of it. This is true if one speaks of beef or boar meat, and Capernaïtes speak in this way. But thus: If Christ is eaten flesh, nothing but spirit comes of it. For it is spiritual flesh, and cannot be changed, but changes and gives the spirit to him that eateth it. Since the poor sack of maggots, our body, also has the hope of the resurrection of the dead and of eternal life, it must also become spiritual and digest and consume the old fleshly things in it. This is what this spiritual food does, when he eats it bodily, it digests his flesh and transforms him, so that he also becomes spiritually alive and blessed forever, as Paul, 1 Cor. 15:44, says: "The body will rise spiritually."

For in this eating it is so, that I give a gross example, as if the wolf devoured a sheep, and the sheep was such strong meat, that it changed the wolf, and made a sheep of it. So we, if we eat Christ's flesh bodily and spiritually, the food is so strong that it transforms us in itself and makes spiritual, holy, living men out of carnal, sinful, mortal men; just as we already are, but still hidden in faith and hope, and is not yet revealed, on the last day we will see it. And if they can badly eat bread and wine and drink without harm, because they also eat Christ's body and blood spiritually, they should also admit to us that it would be harmless to eat Christ's flesh bodily, besides the spiritual food; because Christ's body is as good as bread and wine, as I have written against D. Carlstadt. But it is not worth that

It 1) such high spirits should read and answer, therefore 2) I must let it pass here also.

209] Here I will leave it with the two main points and cornerstones of the prophets, since they say: Christ is seated at the right hand of God, and flesh is of no use, therefore his body may not be in the Lord's Supper. Where these two pieces lie down, they have lost the matter altogether, as they themselves well feel and also confess. But I hope they have become stubble and dust, and the truth has smelled itself on the devil. For this he can do nothing better, but come again and bring straw support, so that he can settle such a case. So he who has helped me now will also have more in store than they think (peace I would like to have where it could be), 3) and bring forth the prophets; but if it should not be, then let go what goes there. I trust to do more with one book than they with ten. For lies need much washing and chattering; truth is soon told.

210 But when they lay little foundations, and make a pretense, Matt. 24:23, "If they shall say unto you, Behold, here is Christ; believe ye not. I have answered this sufficiently in the book against the heavenly prophets, and have not yet been overthrown by them. In the same way, when they say: If the bread is Christ's body, then the bread is crucified for us, I have also answered that there. For the two pieces are D. Carlstadt's, which he leads against me among others. Item, that they ask: Where Christ commanded to eat his body in the Lord's Supper, is also D. Carlstadt's and easy to answer, so: Let them put on Brill, or a boy spell these words: "Take, eat, this is my body", then they will find it well.

211. summa, if we conquer these two main pieces, so that they do not contradict each other: Christ is seated on the right, and yet is in the evening.

I will teach them where Christ commanded his body to be eaten, where it is written that in the Lord's Supper there is forgiveness of sins, consolation of souls and strength of faith, and all their questions, since they so beggarly with places and mending, and yet can nowhere cover nor warm their evil conscience with it. Of such art I may well boast myself a master, by the grace of God. For where Christ remains for me, there all shall remain for me and be found, that I know well.

D. Oecolampad also has mercy on us, and wants to help us poor people, and complains: If Christ's body were in the bread, we would have to worry so much and have so many thoughts about such a miracle, as Christ's body would become bread, that we would forget about his memory, which he commands so harshly: Therefore, it is better that there is nothing to it, than that we have to have such sorrow. Truly, it is a yearly trade here, and should still give the spoiled lazy student cause for concern, as the cow would have gone through the door, and would still have had to leave its tail attached, or as the ox would have had to hang its dung on the top of the beam. It is a tiresome thing to waste time and words with such devilish jiggery-pokery, just as if Christ had commanded us to investigate how his body was in the bread. So I also wanted to say: Christ is not God. For if this were true, we would gain so much to think 4) about such a great miracle, how the Godhead might become man, that we should forget about faith. But lest this should happen, it is better that Christ be not God.

After that he first of all comes into great distress, whether the bread is nobler than the virgin's body; and there is a great deal of such talk in their books. In all of which this is the very best, that they bear witness to how they have a restless, uncertain, insecure heart in this matter, which cannot cease nor desist, ever more and more.

1) "it" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) darum" is missing in the Erlanger.

3) .These brackets are set by us. The meaning will be: GOtt, who has helped me so far 2c., will bring the prophets to the day. In the editions por "peace" is a dot.

4) Jenaer: commemorate. Latin: ooNtationum st inäaZationum.

And yet, because they have seen that I am full of joyful words, they want to persuade us with high defiant words as they are also certain of the matter from the measure. But words do not do it, truth and sure conscience must do it; a sure conscience does not beg thus.

214 So that I now keep her on the two main pieces, will now leave all other her chatter and have enough of these told. For I know such spirits well, I have also had many of them before me, how they slip, flutter to and fro and only seek cause, even if it is not, to chat, only that they do not have to stand and answer to the right main pieces, since one asks them and presses them. For they think it is answered, when they make a book, and write on it the little word: answer.

At the end, we will also discuss one or two of the Fathers' sayings, as D. Oecolampad discusses them. They consider St. Augustine as their own, because he often uses the words: *mysterium, sacramentum, signum, invisibile, intelligibile*. But Oecolampad cannot conclude anything certain from it, as he boasts that he has the certain truth. For although St. Augustine often says that bread in the Lord's Supper is a sacrament and sign of the body of Christ, Oecolampad has not yet concluded anything certain from this. Oecolampad has not yet established that there is only bread and not Christ's body, because one can say that Christ's body is invisible under a visible sign, as the same St. Augustine says: *Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae visibilis forma*. Sacrament is a visible form of the invisible grace.

Here St. Augustine himself explains in his own words what he means by the words *sacramentum, signum, invisibile, intelligibile*, much differently than Oecolampad interprets them. For St. Augustine does not say that sacrament is a figure or sign of a future or absent thing, as the stories of the Old Testament find; but a figure of the present and yet invisible thing. Because we have Augustinum himself, who is in contact with his own

If we explain it in words, we may not interpret or explain it to any other stranger.

217 As often as St. Augustine uses such words: *8Loramsntuiv, vsl: siZnum oorxori8 st 8LvZuim8 Domini*, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and the like, he stands strongly on our side against the enthusiasts, and wants bread and wine to be a visible form of his invisible body and blood present. But it is due to Oecolampad that he proves how St. Augustine uses the little word sacrament and the like here for a sign of an absent or future thing, as he invents from his head and interprets St. Augustine with falsehood and lies. If he does that, let us depart. We have St. Augustine's explanation ourselves, as has been said. If they now take many sayings from St. Augustine, since he has such a way of saying that the bread is his body's sacrament or sign, and must be invisible, spiritually understood, 2c., then they do nothing more than bring us weapons,' so that we should strike them on the head, if we were not otherwise equipped enough.

218) But what do they say to the saying that St. Augustine ad Januarium, epist. 118, writes thus: It is evident that the disciples, when they first received the body and blood of the Lord, did not receive it sober; but it pleased the Holy Spirit that, in honor of such sacrament, the body of the Lord should first enter the mouth of the Christian before any other food.

219 To this, you interpreters, interpret us this saying, here St. Augustine stands and calls the Lord's Supper a sacrament and yet says: The disciples took the body and blood in the sacrament. St. Augustine calls the Lord's Supper a sacrament, yet he says: "The disciples received the body and blood of the Lord in the sacrament. Item, that the body of the Lord should go into the mouth of the Christians before other food, in honor of this great sacrament. What does Christian mouth mean here? What does it mean that the body of the Lord enters the mouth before other food? And this happens in this sacrament? Is it clear enough what Augustine means by the word sacrament? Does it still mean a mere empty sign of an absent thing? What does the Lord's body mean? Does it mean a piece of bread, or does it mean a piece of bread? There it is that Augustine sacramentum corporis

et sanguinis means an outward visible form, under which Christ's invisible body and blood is truly present, received and taken into the mouth bodily, like other visible bodily food. Item, Psalm 33. St. Augustin says: Christ was carried in his hands, when he gave his body to the disciples and said: "This is my body"; yes, he carried the same body in his hands. Is the saying also dark?

I must address their conscience a little here. For their mouth and pen have gone so deeply into the no (as they say) that they cannot turn back to the yes. Their conscience (I say) must therefore think: Truly, we interpret and direct St. Augustine and the Fathers to our mind; but it does not want to be certain. It is not a matter of liking, but of needing. It is not great art to say: This or that may be understood in this way; but this is art, this is also demanded of us, that we prove that it must be understood in this way and cannot be understood in any other way. Possibile does not do it; necessarium does it, as the logicians say. Now we boast of certain truth; but truly we do not prove it, and especially because there are one or two sayings of St. Augustine that are quite clear and bright, that Christ is the body in the sacrament, and sacrament is not a mere sign, as we say. So it is indeed possible that Augustine also uses the word "sacrament" or "sign" in all other sayings, and all his sayings are of no help to us. What does it matter (I say), their conscience must tell them so? For how do they know that Christ's body in the sacrament should go into the sober mouth of the Christian, and that Christ's body should be in his hands and carried, when he says: "This is my body"?

After the apostles, holy Christianity has no better teacher (of my understanding) than St. Augustine, and the holy, dear teacher should be so defiled and blasphemed by the scribblers that he should be kept under cover and protection of their poisonous, blasphemous, seductive teaching, then I will say no to it, because I have a breath, one does him wrong. And it is indeed good to say no to it, because the blasphemers will not accept his words.

alone point to their meaning, and such interpretation nevertheless do not prove, nevertheless boast, they have the bright pure truth certainly. Their proof gives no more than this: it may thus be understood. When they have this, they fall on it and defy that it must be understood in this way. For he who boasts that he is certain of truth, as these enthusiasts do, speaks of course that it must be so. And yet they hit themselves in the cheeks and punish themselves by lying, because they prove no more than: it may be so, potest esse, ergo necessario est; the children in the schools know what that means.

They look only to see whether they will make the sayings of the Scriptures or of the fathers uncertain and bring them into doubt before the people. When they have done this, they leave it there; then they immediately boast that they have the truth for certain, and do not even think that they should prove their actions, just as if they were doing this to spite us. But what kind of spirit this is, which alone directs its art to make the sayings of the Scriptures uncertain and doubtful, and does not also again build certainly and firmly on the other side, and thus on the sand, and boasts of certainty, which it itself makes uncertain, is easy to recognize. For it is certainly not Christ's Spirit who makes certain and certain all that he teaches, as St. Paul praises the Plerophoriam, Rom. 4, 8, and 2 Cor. 1, 19: "In Christ JEsu is not yes and no, but yes yes."

Now Oecolampad does nothing else with the sayings of the fathers, but that he throws them out of the sense, so they were held until now, and makes them uncertain. And again he does nothing to make them certain and firm in his mind, so he lets them float and hover between heaven and earth with all those who follow and adhere to him. This is not teaching, but deceiving; and to boast of such as certain truth is to lie twofold, and to deceive the poor consciences.

224 Tertullianus, the oldest teacher of the time of the apostles, in the fourth book against the heretic Marcion, says thus: "The bread that Christ took and divided among his disciples, he made his body, saying, 'This is my body,'" which is as much as to say: "This is my body.

as the form of my body. But it could not have been a form if it had not been a real body. Now that which is vain or nothing (as a ghost is) can of course take no form. Or did he make the bread a vain thing, or a ghost of the body, because he had not a right body? then he should have given the bread for us. This saying is to help Oecolampad that in the Lord's Supper there is vain bread, and stands stiffly on the word *figura*, since Tertullianus interprets the words of Christ thus: "This is my body," that is, my body's *figura*, or form. Hence Oecolampad has his reason for making the word of Christ in the Lord's Supper "my body" of my body sign.

Here I must once again remind them of their duty and office, which they always and forever forget, namely, that they should prove that Tertullianus' statement is not only possible or possible, but should and must be understood on the basis of their delusion. If they do not do this, then we justly reproach them as liars and deceivers, because they boast that they are certain of the matter and have the truth, condemning us with our faith. Now he is never able to prove that *figura* here is so much as a sign, as others have shown him before, but he forces Tertullianus with his conceit that *figura* must be called a sign here, and yet cannot be called so, Tertullianus does not suffer it; as we shall hear. Because Oecolampad thus forces the same word and does not prove it, he is already down, and Tertullianus helps him nothing everywhere. How should one interpret it differently? Then you see, what do I ask about it? You shall prove it, it is your duty to speak, to listen to me: There stands the mute.

226 But we do not deal now with whether Tertullianus and other teachers teach rightly or wrongly. For we do not want to build our faith on men, but on God's word, the one rock. Not that we despise them, for they certainly meant it as well as we can always mean it, and offered their work to benefit us; but we act whether the fathers' enthusiasts use sayings rightly, or whether they deal in lies, and see what the fathers held. Now Tertullianus stands and says: Christ

made the bread his body in the Lord's Supper, according to the words: "This is my body. Here is no conceit nor wavering; for to make bread his body is to speak aridly, clearly and brightly. Oecolampad lets this go, and jumps once; for it is for us.

But that follows: "that is so much as my body's *figura*," which Oecolampad accepts as for itself. But *figura* is a conceit and a fickle word. He would like to interpret it as a likeness, model, or sign of interpretation, just as the stories in the Old Testament are called figures of the New, as Adam is called a figure or model of Christ, as a bride of Christianity is called a model or figure. But *figura* according to Latin kind does not mean such model; but the little word *figura* is misused there. For Oecolampad almost gladly accepts the abuse, for it serves him well; but he should prove it and yet cannot. For we say that Tertullianus uses the word *figura* according to the proper manner of the Latin language, since it means a form or shape, mathematice, which is long, thick, broad, round, white, black, which can be seen, felt, "traded"; as we Germans also say of the Sacrament that Christ's body is under bread's shape, and his blood under wine's shape. This is what we call Gestalt, which Tertullianus calls *figura in* Latin.

If Oecolampad cannot prove that *figura* is called a model here, then he is invented a falsifier of Tertullianus and a fraud, and his bodily mark goes to the ground. But when will he prove it? When the cuckoo becomes a nightingale. What is it, nuy, to so excellently insist on the teacher's sayings, and to present them so falsely and fraudulently, and then to boast that it is the truth? That is what I said, with vain dreams and uncertain conceit they mislead the consciences, shutting the mouths of the simple, as if something great were there, and nothing is behind it. False coiners are burned, but forgers of the Scriptures are called holy teachers.

229 Now to understand Tertullian's opinion, it is to be noted that the heretic Marcion teaches how Christ would not have taken natural right body from Mary, as also other more heretics taught, but would have been

The devil has been only a shadow or ghost of a body that can neither be grasped, felt nor held; as the devils sometimes appear in various ways, and yet is nothing and 1) a vain ghost before the eyes.

230 Now Tertullian contests this Marcion, and wants Christ to have had a true natural body, and thus concludes: "What is a vain thing, a shadow or a ghost, cannot take on any form. For a ghost has neither color, nor thickness, nor length, nor width; it is a vain appearance. If it had color, one could grasp it and take the color; if it had thickness or length, one could break it, lift it and carry it, set it and lay it. Item: one can also make no color, thickness, length on it, on it, around it or over it. That is one. Now Marcion confesses that Christ's body (that is, his body's shadow or ghost) is in the bread. Tertullian replies: "How could Christ's body be in the bread, and take the form of bread, if it were not a true body; because it is not possible that form should exist where there is a ghost and not a true body?"

This is the one syllogism or conclusion of Tertullian; this is what he wants, since he says: The bread, which Christ took and divided among his disciples, he made his body, when he said: "This is my body", that is, my body's form. He made the bread into the form of his body, so that Christ's body was under the bread; for form cannot be without body, as he says afterwards. But he had to speak of form, because Christ's body is seen invisibly, not differently than under bread's form; yes, it is no longer bread's form, but it is Christ's body's form (says Tertullian). But it could not have been a form (he continues) where it was not a true body. For that which is vain (as a ghost is) can take no form. Then you hear again that the bread could not be the form of Christ's body unless his body were a true body, because a ghost cannot take form.

232. what such conclusion Tertulliani against

1) Erlanger: "and one".

Marcion, I leave it, it does not concern us now. But we can see that Tertullianus is of the opinion that Christ's real natural body is in the bread of the Lord's Supper, so that the shape of the bread, its thickness, width, length, and color, has become the shape, thickness, length, and color of Christ's body through his word, when he says: "This is my body. I do not add my words here, but I show Tertulliani's own words. And what kind of fencing would it have been against Marcion, if Tertullian wanted to prove from the Lord's Supper that Christ had a real suffering, and did not believe himself that Christ. Body would be in it? But now he says that. The form cannot be without the body, and the bread is the form of his body. So surely Christ's real body must be truly there, since his form is, which from the bread, through the word, has become his form. This is Tertulliani's opinion, I truly know, and his words are dry and clear.

233 The other syllogism or conclusion is: But if this should not be, and Christ should have made the bread a ghost of his suffering (as you, Marcion, would like to say), because he should not have a proper body, then you must say that he gave bread badly for us, for the forgiveness of sins, because he says: "This is my body, which is given for you. If there is nothing but ghost in the bread, and the ghost cannot be given for us, then the bread must be given for us, because there is nothing left to suffice the words, "This is my body, given for you." That is what he says. Or if for this reason he made the bread a ghost of his body, because he did not have a right suffering, he had to give the bread for us. Then we can see that Tertullian wants to have in bread the body that was given for us, so that we do not have to say that bread was given for us. So that he clearly confesses that the words of Christ: "Take, eat, this is my body, given for you," summarize bread and body, that the body is in the bread. But no one would say so who held the bread in the sacrament.

234 From all this it is (I think) clear enough that Tertullian does not understand *figuram* here in Oecolampad's way for an equivalency.

It is called the form of the body of Christ, because Christ's body is in it and under it, and speaks out dryly: Where Christ's body would not be there, it would remain bread and bread's figure, which would be given for us. Let Oecolampad prove his figure also thus. They are strange saints to me. The holy teachers have the way of interpreting the Scriptures, that they take bright, clear sayings, and thereby make the dark, wavering sayings clear; it is also the way of the Holy Spirit to illuminate the darkness with light. But our enthusiasts do something absurd, they take a dark, shaky word from a text that pleases their conceit, leave out what is written next to it, run after it and want to make a bright, clear text dark and shaky with it, and then say that it is the truth. This is the way of the devil, who is a master of darkness and wants to make the light dark with darkness.

As here in Tertullian, Oecolampad takes the dark word *figura*, which he himself is not sure what it means, and also does not see it right. This must now be the bright sun; then runs to the bright words: "This is my body", which must badly be the clouds and darkness; just as they are the dark sayings: "Flesh is of no use," "Christ is seated at the right hand of God," also for suns, and thus want to darken the words of the Lord's Supper; not that the Scriptures are dark, but their conceit is blind and lazy, so that he cannot see the clear words rightly; just as a lazy man does not open his eyes to see the right light, and takes the gleam for light.

236) Tertullian has another saying in the book against the Jews, where he deals with the saying Jer. 11, 19. They said: "Let us throw the wood into his bread. 1) Tertullian interprets this as follows: "Without doubt the wood is thrown into his body. For this is how Christ Himself interpreted it, when He calls the bread His body, which body the prophet had previously proclaimed to be bread.

237 I am not fencing here whether Tertullian has

Jeremiah's saying properly interpreted. Demi in the Hebrew it says thus: Let us root up the tree with the food, that is, with fruit and with everything; from this we do not act now, but we act what Tertullian understood in this. Now it is certain that by the wood he understands and interprets the cross that Christ bore, and by the bread his body, and calls the bread in the Lord's Supper; for Christ nowhere else calls the bread his body. John 6:35 says that he is bread, but does not say that bread is his body. Whoever then calls the bread in the Lord's Supper the body of Christ crucified, beloved, does he also confess that there is bread in it? Now Tertullian does it here and speaks clearly of the bread, that Jeremiah called it crucified, and threw the wood into it, and that the same bread was his body, making bread and body one thing.

In the same way, in the third book, he writes against Marcion, and he repeats the same saying of Jeremiah: "Let us cast the wood into his bread. Without doubt (says Tertullian) "into his bread", that is, into his body. For this is how God Himself interpreted it in your Gospel (you Marcionites), when He calls the bread His body; so that it may be noted that He made or gave the bread into the form of His body, which body the prophet showed beforehand in the form of bread, which mystery the Lord Himself was to interpret afterwards 2c. Here Tertullian speaks again how the bread is a figure or form of the body of Christ, and Christ gave such a form to his body when he said, "This is my body"; just as we heard in the first sentence above. So that it may be taken that he is speaking here of the bread and the body in the Lord's Supper, and says: *mathematice*, that is, the prophet gives the body of Christ of the bread form so long before; which afterwards Christ has done more clearly, since he says: "This is my body", *et dedit panem sui corporis figuram*.

239 These are all Tertullian's words, that Jeremiah, with his prophecy, had previously given the bread to the body of Christ, which Christ then accomplished by giving the bread to his body. All this

1) In the Vulgate: *Miliamus liMum in pansm "to"*.

must be spoken of the natural bread, which has a form, as it is in the Lord's Supper, not of the spiritual bread, of which John 6:35. For this does not give form to Christ's body, but is Christ himself, as he says: "I am the bread from heaven" 2c. Since Tertullian understands that this is natural bread, of which Jeremiah says that the Jews threw the wood into it, and says that it is Christ's body crucified, I think it is powerfully proved that Tertullian confesses in the Lord's Supper, under the form of bread, Christ's true body, to which the wood of the cross was thrown. Let us see what our finetechs and conceiters want to do here in this light.

240. And that they may try their thinness and prove their art, I also give them as a gift this saying of Tertulliani, which he writes in the book of the resurrection of the flesh and says: The flesh is washed, that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated to God; the flesh is marked, that the soul may be kept; the flesh is shadowed by the laying on of hands, that the soul may be enlightened in spirit; the flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may be fattened by God.

241 Now here teach us how our flesh is nourished with the body and blood of Christ. Turn it around once; and as you say in the Lord's Supper that bread signifies the body, and wine the blood of Christ; so again teach us here that the body of Christ signifies bread, and the blood signifies water or wine, by which the body is nourished. But see to it that you also make the interpretation certain that this must be so. For we are not satisfied, either here or elsewhere, if you alone say that it must be so.

242 What kind of spirits and people are these, who play the good old teacher in the world with lies and deception, to seduce and confuse the simple consciences, and then boast that it is the pure truth, blaspheming God and the Holy Spirit. It would be much better that they freshly deny the dear fathers, than that they want to draw them to their mind with such deception and falsification, and deceive the world.

under the fathers' names, whom they wrong before God and the world.

Irenaeus is also one of the oldest teachers, who had to fight against the Valentine heretics, who taught that Christ was not the Son of God, and the resurrection of the flesh was nothing; the body would also not be saved, but only the soul, because St. Paul says: "Flesh and blood do not inherit the kingdom of God", 1 Cor. 15, 50. Against this Irenaeus writes that the body also becomes blessed, and is a resurrection of the flesh, as our faith confesses. And among other things he gives this proof against it: "If the body is not also saved, why is it fed with the body and blood of the Lord in the sacrament? If he eats an eternal food, he will certainly live on it eternally. But let us hear his own words. In the 4th book, chapter 5, he says: "Just as the bread that comes from the earth, when it is called by the name of God, is no longer bad bread, but a sacrament, which stands in two things, an earthly and a heavenly. So also our bodies, when they receive the sacrament, they are already no longer rotten, because they have the hope of resurrection.

244 How do the enthusiasts do here, who boast that Irenaeus stands with them, and want to be sure of the matter? Oecolampad wants to be a knight against the papists and their transubstantiation, and against Valentinum. But I would like to hear and see him who would interpret this saying to mean that there is only bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. There stands Irenaeus, and says: the bread is not bad common bread, after it is called or appointed by God, but *Eucharistia* (so the ancients call the sacrament); but what may be the calling, since God calls the bread with? It can be nothing else, but the word, when he says: "This is my body", then he calls it and gives it a new name, which it did not have before, because it was bad bread, and says: "The bread stands after such naming or word in two things; the one is earthly (that is bread, which comes from the earth, as Irenaeus says here), the other heavenly; that must be Christ's body,

who is in heaven. What other heavenly thing can there be in the sacrament besides the earthly one, which is there by God's naming or word?

Here, Oecolampad makes earthly and heavenly into one thing, namely bread, which is earthly because it comes from the earth, and also heavenly because one gives thanks and praise to God about it. In this way, one should move Irenaeum around and teach it to swarm. If one asks: How can we be sure that this is the opinion of Irenaeus? or who has ever heard that our thanksgiving or word is a heavenly thing? The answer is: I Oecolampad say it; if it is not enough, you have no spirit. In this way, all the bread on all the tables, when the *Benedicite* is said, is called heavenly, because there is thanksgiving. Shall one now believe this badly, and may no proof, but is the certain truth, if only the enthusiasts say it? Certainly, defiance, who demands further proof. Well then, that is jumped over Irenaeum and answered nothing at all to his words; nor must it mean not only answered, but also the certain truth.

But Irenaeus does not want to suffer it. For we know that bad, common bread remains bad, common bread, even if Christns and all the apostles themselves speak the *Benedicite* over it, and no heavenly thing comes of it. Just as Christ divided the bread among the people, and gave thanks and praise to God over it, yet bad bread remained there and did not become heavenly.

But Irenaeus says here that according to the word of God there is no longer bad bread, but besides the earthly bread there is also a heavenly thing. And it is an impudent thirst, where someone wanted to interpret the calling of God to mean humanly thanking, blessing or praising. Paul teaches us Rom. 4, 17, what God's calling or calling means, since he says: "God calls or calls that which is not that it is. So here Irenaeus also speaks of God's calling or calling, as also Moses testifies in Genesis 1 that God creates everything by calling or calling (that is, by the word). Or be you master and tell me what *vocatio Dei* might otherwise mean, quando

Deus vocat, dicit, appellat, nominat; that is his word, since he speaks: "This is my body", just as he speaks Gen. 1,3: "Let there be light", so it is light. Rather, it is God who names or sets up, and what he names, that stands as soon as there, as Ps. 33, 9. says: "He speaks, so it stands."

248 So there are three parts in the sacrament according to Irenaei. The first is *vocatio Dei*, the word or naming of God, which is, since he says: "This is my body", by the naming or word the bread (he says) becomes Eucharistia, or Sacrament, so that the bread is now two things, since before it was bad bread and one thing. Before it was vain earthly; but now both earthly and heavenly. What the heavenly thing is, let the scribblers show us, if it be not that which is shown in the naming or God's word, when he saith, "It is my body." For that it is our thanksgiving or word, Oecolampad says freely, and yet is as certain of it as he is of this whole article. Therefore it is a vexatious thirst to boast of something so boldly as certain, which one must take for granted that it is uncertain and its own dream.

Item, Irenaeus says that our bodies are already no longer corruptible when they receive the sacrament, but have the hope of resurrection 2c. For we see how the ancient teachers spoke of the sacrament in such a way that it also gives the body an immortal being, but hidden in faith and hope until the last day. Now bad bread cannot preserve the body eternally, nor make it imperishable. For it is perishable food, even though Christ Himself gives thanks for it, as He Himself called bread perishable food, which He divided among the people. Thus, according to Irenaeus, there must be something heavenly in the sacrament, which may live forever and give eternal life. For he speaks of the bodily food, since our bodies (he says) receive the sacrament, through this same bodily food our bodies are already incorruptible in hope. This cannot be because the body of Christ, since he speaks of Joh. 6, 55: "My flesh is meat, and he that eateth my flesh liveth forever.

The enthusiasts should take such pieces before them and answer them with diligence, not fluttering about and drooling over something else, as Oecolampad does; for they should think that such pieces would move us to address them and not let them go like this. For such a thing shows to a haughty heart, which despises all men as blocks; just as if they had to let it suffice them, if a gusher murmurs a little to it, and should then be accepted immediately for certain truth. If we are not as learned and holy as they, we nevertheless also have consciences that move and drive us to search for the truth; so they are guilty, because they certainly boast of the truth, of proving this to us who say that their truth is vain quicksand 1) and uncertain whirl.

251 Item, hard before it Irenaeus speaks thus: How can they say that the flesh must decay and may not come to life, if it is fed with the body and blood of the Lord? Here we see that the body is fed with the body and blood of the Lord, so that it may live forever and not decay, as the heretics say. Irenaeus speaks of bodily food and the food of the body, and yet the same food should be the body and blood of the Lord. It is not enough to say that the body and blood of the Lord are called bread and wine, as a sign of his body and blood. For these do not give the incorruptible life to the body, of which here Irenaeus speaks against the heretics, that they do not allow the incorruptible life to the body, when it eats such food as gives it. Nor is it enough that they interpret it to their liking; they must prove it and make it certain, as they boast that they are certain.

252 In the fifth book, chapter 5, he says: "He confesses that the cup (which is a creature) is his body, through which he strengthens our bodies. And behold, the body of Christ in the cup strengthens our bodies. This is spoken of the bodily food without any doubt, and yet it is the body of Christ, even though the cup is also a creature. Item,

soon after: When therefore the mixed cup and the made bread come upon the word of God, it becomes the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, by which our body's nature increases and endures. How then can they say that the body should not be able to receive the gifts of God, which is eternal life, when it is nourished with the body and blood and is its member?

Here we hear that bread and wine are the word of God, which he calls the calling of God above, and interprets itself that the sacrament is not a sign of the absent body of Christ, but is the body of Christ itself, so that not only our body is fed bodily, but also our body nature and being is nourished, strengthened and preserved for eternal life, and thereby becomes a member of the body of Christ 2c.

I long and desire to hear how the enthusiasts not only want to resist these and similar sayings, but also immediately bring them to the contrary mind, and that in such a way that it is tangibly certain that Irenaeus holds with them. For we do not believe their 2) mere uncertain interpretations and word matters, as Oecolampad does; it should be dry, clear proof, stronger than this is ours. If they do this for me, I will praise them of the Holy Spirit's own heart.

254 Let us also hear St. Hilarius, who was also one of the ancient teachers and an excellent man in the Scriptures. He writes against the Arians lib. 8. de *Trinitate* thus: If the Word truly became flesh, and we also truly take the Word that became flesh to ourselves in the food of the Lord, how can it be believed that he does not naturally remain in us, who 3) took upon himself the nature of our flesh when he became man, never to leave the same 4) and in addition has mixed the nature of his flesh together with his eternal nature under the sacrament of the flesh, of which we are partakers in common?

255 Here Hilarius speaks that we are true-

2) Walch's old edition and the Erlanger: theirs.

3) Wittenberger: "die die Natur", a misprint. Latin: qui naturLm.

4) In the editions: the same. Latin: inssparavUsna.

1) In the old editions: Trebesand.

Hastily take in the food of the Lord (that is, in the Sacrament) the Word that became flesh, or, as we would like to speak more clearly, the incarnate Word, and therefore let Christ remain in us naturally or with his nature and essence, not only spiritually, as the spirits dream. And calls the sacrament *sacramentum carnis nobis communicandae*, a

Sacrament of the flesh, which is shared among us in common, that there not only bread is shared among us, but also flesh. And further says: that Christ under the same sacrament mixes together, not only spiritually, but the nature of his flesh together with his eternal nature. But what does the nature of his flesh mean? Is it bread and wine? Or does it mean his natural essential body? Now let whoever wants to gloss and interpret here, only that they make their gloss certain, and interpret the words Hilarii with good reason differently than they read. For as they stand there, they give us in the sacrament not only Christ naturally in the flesh, but also his eternal divinity.

Soon after this he says: "If we want to speak how Christ is truly and naturally in us, if we do not learn to speak it from him, we will certainly speak it as fools and ungodly men. For thus saith he, My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood drink indeed: he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him," John 6:55. f. There can be no doubt that the body and blood are true, because they are both, by the Lord's own confession and our faith, truly flesh and truly blood, which, when taken and drunk, make us in Christ, and Christ in us. St. Hilarius, in the same place, is quite clear that just as Christ, according to the Godhead, is natural in the Father, and one thing essential; so Christ, through the sacrament, if we open and drink, is natural and essential in us, and we in him. For this purpose, the word "natural" is used everywhere, so that it proves a natural union of the body of Christ with us, and not only a spiritual union, which is in the will and sense.

257 Thus Hilarius says: *Haec accepta*

et hausta efficiunt in nobis, does not say: *Haec credita et intellecta spiritualiter* etc.. The true body, the true blood is taken and drunk 2c. What does *accipi* pere et *haurire* mean? It is easy for the enthusiasts to invent a gloss on it here, and call it *mysterium*, *cibum dominicum*, *accipere*, *haurire*, whatever they think. Which we could do just as well as they, and do not need their mastery; but no one desires such art from them, but that is what one desires, even if they have interpreted and glossed most artfully, that they also want to prove that such glossing is certain and right, must be so and could not be otherwise. They have not done this to this day in any writing or saying, and they despise doing it. Just as if it were not necessary, nor they guilty to do, and was equal enough, if they only say: God is called a cuckoo. But if they do, they will not make me so many books, I know that well. Let their spirit and art be small and thin enough. Anyone can interpret and gloss according to his own will, and does not need a special spirit to do so.

258 The holy martyr St. Cyprianus. Cyprianus, writing to Pope Cornelio on how Christians in persecution should be strengthened to suffer through the Sacrament, speaks thus: Now, however, peace is needed not only for the sick but also for the healthy, and we must give communication, the sacrament, not only to the dying but also to the living, so that we do not leave those whom we incite and provoke to strife bare and unarmed, but strengthen them with the shield of the blood and body of Christ; For since the sacrament is administered so that those who receive it may have protection from it, whom we want to have safe against the enemy, we must equip them with the Lord's food. For how shall we teach them or provoke them to shed their blood over his name's confession, if we deny them Christ's blood when they should fight? Or how can we make them drink the cup of suffering, if we do not first allow them to drink the cup of the Lord in the church, as is fitting in the sacrament?

259. in this saying we see how with

Cypriano Communicatio, Eucharistia, Pax Be One Thing, and speaks of the presentation of the Sacrament to those who are to contend, for strength, and speaks out arid that they receive the Lord's body and blood in such presentation. It is true that a fanatic can make a blood sign and an insinuation out of the blood, the chalice, the sacrament, that Cyprianus must speak as they wish; but that they also prove this is not necessary, it is enough if the spirit says it.

260] In the sermon against the apostates, he says: "When they return from the altars of the devil, they come to the sanctuary of the Lord with unclean hands, which still stink from the smell of sacrifices, and still 1) smell from the poisonous food of idols, and want to touch the body of the Lord with their mouths, which still stink from their evil deeds, and still smell from the deadly flesh, despising everything that St. Paul says against it. They despise everything that St. Paul says against it in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11, but commit sacrilege and violence against his body and blood, and now sin against the Lord with their hands and mouths more grievously than when they denied him.

261 Then you hear that Cyprian shows how they take Christ's body in the throat and mouth, and act freely with hand and mouth on his body. Now the mouth cannot spiritually eat Christ's body. But a scribbler soon answered that the body and blood of Christ are called bread and wine here, as a sign, and must not prove it; summa, if this applies, that one may change the words and interpret them anew, so freely that he is not even obliged to prove it, then no saying, indeed, no letter in all the world, it serves for the scribblers. But if the words are to be accepted for what they are according to the languages, that bread is called bread, body is called body, 2c., or if other interpretations have to be proved with good reason, then there is neither a saying nor a letter in all the world that helps the enthusiasts, and their fame is vain lies that they have certain truth.

262 For even the saying of Augustine does not stand with them, who has the most appearance of all when he says, Psalm 98: "You will not eat the body that you see, nor will you eat the body that you see, nor will you eat the body that you see, nor will you eat the body that you see.

drink the blood which they that crucify me shall shed: a mystery have I given you, which if ye understand spiritually, it shall make you alive 2c. And Joh. 6: What do you send teeth and belly to? Believe, so you have already [eaten]. For Augustine, because he speaks of teeth and belly, is certainly his opinion against the Capernaïtes and our enthusiasts, who think that Christ's body should be torn and bitten with teeth, and digested with the belly, like a piece of beef. Christians do not teach this, nor do we poor sinners; they know this, but they do not want to know it.

263 So also, when St. Augustine says: one shall not eat the flesh that one sees, 2c., he also says of eating as one eats beef, as he himself declares that he speaks against those who think that Christ would cut his body into pieces and divide it. Yes, if they want to hold on to this saying of Augustine, it will take away Christ's body and flesh completely, even spiritually. For this is how it reads: Not the flesh that you see, not the blood that is shed 2c. Just as if one should eat other blood and flesh than Christ's flesh and blood. Now we eat no other flesh and blood, even spiritual, than the very same that was seen and crucified. So St. Augustine does not have to deny or condemn that one eats Christ's body and blood, as his words read, but the fleshly food, as one eats sausage and bread, tears it with teeth and digests it with the stomach.

The enthusiasts lack everything in that they do not distinguish Christ's body (as St. Paul says 1 Cor. 11, 29.) from other flesh, and do not speak differently of it, except as if it were perishable, digestible, consumable flesh, which one buys in the shops 2) and cooks in the kitchen. So coarse are they that they do not see how this flesh is an imperishable, immortal, imperishable flesh, as the 16th Psalm v. 10. sings of it: "Thou wilt not let thy holy one decay", and "my flesh shall rest in hope" [Apost, 2, 26.]. Death has probably tried it once, and wanted it ver-

1) i.e. spit.

2) See the note to § 195 of this paper.

But he could not, but it tore his belly and neck more than into a hundred thousand pieces, so that death's teeth were crushed and flew apart, and he remains alive. For the food was too strong for death, and it consumed and digested the eater. God is in this flesh; it is the flesh of God, the flesh of the spirit; it is in God, and God in it; therefore it is alive, and gives life to all who eat it, both body and soul.

265 If the fanciers had seen the little piece, they would not have been so mad as to call us carnivores, but would have taken themselves by the nose. For they are real carnivores, because they act with such carnal thoughts in this matter, and believe that Christ is flesh like other flesh, of no use at all and perishable. And all their defiance and glory is that they think that if they twist and turn the Scriptures and the sayings of the fathers to suit their conceit, it is enough, and so the truth is certainly established; but there is still a long way to go.

266 I have also written before against the heavenly prophets, and asked how it is that with them bread and wine in the Lord's Supper is useful, and does not prevent the suffering of Christ from being remembered, and that Christ's body and blood should not also be as useful or good as bread and wine, so that Christ's suffering can still be remembered? Or why this should follow: "Christ's flesh is not useful, therefore it is not there," and should not follow: "Bread and wine are not useful, therefore they are not there. But there you have to rush over and not answer. But this is the summa of it, the fanciers direct all their teachings and writings to this, there they penetrate and work after, that they make our text and faith in this article uncertain and shaky. If they could do that, they would think they had won. But if they could do it right away, and make us uncertain and unstable, they still have not made their faith certain, because they do not prove one letter of the glosses they give.

What kind of spirit is this, then, that wants to make this part uncertain and misleading, and yet cannot make its part certain nor firm;

Yes, he does not want to do it, nor does he take it upon himself to make it certain? Of course, there is no other spirit than the devil, who has the desire to shake hearts everywhere, and does not let them be sure and certain on any part, but rather stirs and floats, after which his wind weaves like aspen leaves. But the Holy Spirit is such a teacher, who is certain, makes certain, and does not let them so weave and float. For in Christ there is not yes and no, but "yes and amen", 2 Cor. 1, 20. And St. Paul teaches and praises in Christ plerophoriam, the complete, certain, secure mind, on which one can die and dare everything [Rom. 4, 21. Col. 2, 2.].

268 But I would advise the revelers to revel as much for full as for half, and, since it should be daring, to come through briefly and do these words, "This is my body, given for you," entirely out of the Lord's Supper. For as they believe and partake of the Lord's Supper, they must not include these words at all, but it is enough for them to partake of the Lord's Supper with these words: Christ took bread, gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat: this do in remembrance of me [Matt. 26:26]. For these words are sufficient for a man to eat this bread, and to remember Christ in it. But this is the supper of the scribes altogether: why then should the useless, unnecessary text be written, "This is my body given for you," since it is sufficiently comprehended in the remembrance of the Lord, when it is proclaimed how his body is given for us? For what else is to be remembered but how he was given for us, as St. Paul interprets?

269 O how gladly we would do this, if the words were not in all evangelists 1). O there 2) is good advice to, you must be bold and say, they are put in from the margin into the text, but not written by the evangelists themselves. Because your reason is that what seems to you to be useless and unnecessary is not true, just as Oecolampad cleverly says, "It is not true.

1) Erlanger: Evangelion. Latin: LvavZelistis.

2) Erlanger: the.

There is no use nor need for Christ's body to be in the bread, therefore it is not true. So here also, it is a vain and useless thing to say that the words are in the Lord's Supper, therefore they should not be in it, since without them the Lord's Supper is completely described, instituted, and used, and no need or benefit has yet been shown that they should be in it; but if any were shown, it would be easy to make up something to the contrary. It is in your hearts that these words are left over and of no use, and you would very much like them not to be in there, because they do you the burnt harm.

270 For these are also two of Oecolampad's shameful blasphemies, that he asks why it is useful or necessary for Christ's body to be in the bread. And if we do not indicate it, he wants to conclude: there is nothing to it. What am I to say to the infernal Satan's wicked thirst? Well then, if we cannot declare it, as it would be useful and necessary that Christ's body be in the bread, should God's word therefore be false or to be twisted according to our conceit? A devout, God-fearing heart does this: It first asks whether it is God's word; when it hears this, it muffles this question with hands and feet: for what is it useful or necessary? For it speaks with fear and humility: "My dear God, I am blind, I truly do not know what is useful or necessary for me, nor do I want to know, but I believe and trust you that you know best and mean it according to your divine goodness and wisdom; I am content, and I am glad that I hear your mere word and hear your will.

But those who are possessed with devilish hope turn this around, and want to curb God's word with the question: "for what it is useful and necessary", set themselves free to the judgment seat, demand God's word before the court, and ask the poor culprit why he says and speaks such words? what use and need is it to do and speak such things? If he does not show benefit and need, they crucify him there and then as an evildoer, and then boast with the Jews, as if they had the certain truth, and God had done them a service. Is this not terrible to hear? Thus

one runs at, if one wants to act God's word with humans conceit.

Now, dear sirs, who have such teachers, be warned herewith, that you see what kind of preachers you have. They are the devil's larvae, who, under good appearances and fine words, model the devil for you in God's stead. For here they show that they do not understand anything about God's word and faith. St. Paul says Rom. 8, 26: "We do not know what to ask." This was also known to the pagan Socrates, who said: "We should ask God to give us what is good for us, because He knows best. And our enthusiasts want to go even higher, badly about God, and set a goal for him, and know what is useful or necessary for us to believe, or stand there, and want to say to him: You deny.

But if they had some understanding in faith, and had ever felt a little of it, they would know that the highest virtue, nature and honor of faith is that it does not want to know what it is useful or necessary for what it believes. For he does not want to question God, or to ask why, for what purpose, or for what need he has, but rather to be unwise, to give glory to God, and to believe his mere word. Be ashamed, you leaders of the blind, that you should not yet know such things, and spout so many books with such great glory into the world, so that you reveal your own foolishness and ignorance to everyone!

God commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son Isaac, Genesis 22:2, and Abraham was of course deep enough to know what it was necessary or useful for. If he would have quarreled with God (like our enthusiasts) and wanted to know what it would be useful or necessary for, or if he would have wanted to turn his word against Him, what blessing would he have received? Just that Lucifer deserves in heaven.

275. again our mother Eve also had God's word that she should not eat of the one tree, Gen. 2, 17.; then the swarming Abgott came to her with this very question, and said: "Why did God command this?" Cap. 3, 1. ff. As if to say: What is it good for? What is the need? Well, it is nothing

God's word does not mean this, and interprets God's word differently. Then it fell, and drew us all along with it, in all measure, as he is now also raising us up through these gushers, and creeps along on his serpent's belly: Why did Christ put his body into the bread? What is it good for? What is the need? Well, it's nothing, his word doesn't mean that; and so he interprets his poisonous lies and blasphemies for divine understanding, and praises the bright truth. Therefore St. Paul warns us against such a serpent, 2 Cor. 11:3, saying: "I fear that just as the serpent deceived Evam with his deceitfulness, so also your minds may be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." Isn't it true? These fanciers lead us away from the simple-minded meaning of these bright simple-minded words, "This is my body," by their deceitfulness.

276 I suppose that it is possible that Christ visibly and bodily cuts up his flesh and gives it to us to eat, as the Capernautes understand and as the enthusiasts dream, but it is not useless, and the saying, "Flesh is not useful. Why is that? Because there is the public article of our faith, that Christ is flesh full of divinity, full of eternal good, life, blessedness, and whoever takes a bite of it takes eternal good, life, all blessedness and everything that is in the flesh. And if he believed it, he would also have life and blessedness from it, but if he did not believe it, it would not help him, but rather harm him with such treasure.

Now it is impossible that the flesh should be cut, divided, torn, corrupted, or decayed, for it is a blessed, divine, incorruptible flesh, as Peter says in Acts 2:27: "It was impossible that death should retain the flesh. 2, 27.: "It was impossible that death should keep the flesh", because the 16th Psalm v. 10. speaks: "You will not let your holy one decay", and Joh. 19, 36. from Moses: "You shall not break a bone in him" [2 Mos. 12, 46.]. Suffering and dying it has once been able, but to dismember, to divide, to break, to chew, to digest, to consume, to decompose is not possible. It must be completely at once

to be conceived, born, borne, eaten and believed. And where it is, there it must be of use; for there is good in it, without, where it is without faith; for without faith nothing is of use, as St. Paul says [Titus 1:15], "To the unclean all things are unclean." And Rom. 14:23: "That which is without faith is sin."

278. Therefore, as has been said, this is one of the greatest blasphemies heard in our times, and truly horrible to hear that Zwingel and Oecolampad may say: Christ's flesh is 1) of no use where it is eaten bodily, even to believers; just as if eternal good could not be good, eternal life could not be life for the sake of our custom, and would have to change its essence, nature and kind, according to whether it was eaten by men or not; or as if it were bad an empty flesh, since there was no divinity in it. And from this we may certainly judge that the wicked Satan speaks through it. For the Holy Spirit is not so forgetful that he should so shamefully blaspheme the flesh of Christ, and cry out for a useless flesh, since he himself dwells within, and works vain good and profit thereby, whether it be in bread or heaven, or in the heart. It cannot be useless, that is not possible.

279 Neither does it help them to boast as they otherwise rightly teach and praise Christ in other things. For whosoever earnestly denies, blasphemes, and profanes Christ in one piece or article, cannot in any other place teach or honor him aright; but it is vain hypocrisy and deceit, be it what it may. For this is what it means to lose Christ completely or to keep him completely. He does not split or divide himself; he wants to be loved and honored with all his heart, with all his soul. But the devil prepares the way for other heretics who will come and say that Christ is not, that he has neither flesh nor Godhead, as happened in the beginning of Christianity. If this little piece does not move and convert them, and if it does not help the others to beware of them, to notice and shun their devil, then there is no more counsel, they will be lost; but without my fault,

her blood was on her head, I warned her enough.

280 Although no Christian desires to know what good it is to believe that Christ's body is in the bread, but badly believes the words of God with fear and humility, we still want to show some benefits; not to teach the enthusiasts, because they do not respect it, nor do they ask to know it, but the devil mocks us through them. First of all, this is also a benefit, that arrogant clever spirits and reason may be blinded and defiled, so that the arrogant may stumble and fall, and never enjoy the supper of Christ; on the other hand, the humble may stumble and rise, and enjoy the supper alone, as St. Simeon says: "This is set for the fall and resurrection of many in Israel" [Luc. 2, 34.]. For it is expedient and good that the arrogant, ungodly blasphemers should be thus separated, that they should not partake of the holy Sacrament; "for one should not cast the sanctuary to the dogs, nor pearls to swine" [Matt. 7:6]. But now the scribblers believe that there is vain bread and wine, so it is certainly so, as they believe, so they have it, and so eat vain bread and wine, enjoying the Lord's body neither spiritually nor bodily. This is very good and useful, so that our goods are not scattered among the unworthy, but are kept holy and pure among the humble alone.

281 Secondly, we have heard above how Irenaeus and the ancient fathers indicated the benefit of our bodies being fed with the body of Christ, so that our faith and hope might endure that our bodies also might live forever on the same eternal food of Christ's body, which he eats in the flesh; which is a bodily benefit, but nevertheless exceedingly great, and follows from the spiritual. For Christ will also make our bodies eternally alive, blessed, and glorious, which is much greater than that he should give us his body to eat for a little while on earth. Therefore he wants to be in us naturally (says Hilarius) both in soul and body according to the word Joh. 6, 56: "He who eats me abides in me, and I in him." If one eats him spiritually through the word, he remains spiritually in us in the soul. If you eat it in the flesh, it remains in the flesh.

As he is eaten, he abides in us, and we in him. For he is not digested nor changed, but without ceasing changes us, the soul into righteousness, the body into immortality. This is what the fathers said about the bodily meal.

The third benefit, I hope, will be tremendously proven. For they will have to confess to us that we have God's words in the Lord's Supper, namely these: "This is my body, given for you, this is my blood, shed for you for the forgiveness of sins. So I ask them again, is God's word of any use? If it is of no use, why does the prophet Isaiah Cap. 55, 11. say: "God's word does not return empty, but creates benefit"? Why does St. Paul say Rom. 1, 16: "God's power, which makes blessed all who believe in it"? Why is it called "the word of life" [Phil. 2, 16], "the word of grace" [Apost. 14, 3], "the word of blessedness, the word of wisdom" [1 Cor. 1, 24], and so on? Is life, grace, blessedness, wisdom, strength, power vain things? What then wants to be useful?

Why then do my nobles 1) rage and ask what Christ's body is good for in the Lord's Supper, just as if it were bad beef, and put the Word of God out of sight, as if we had a Lord's Supper without the Word of God? Who are the capernaum and carnivores here? We have God's word in the Lord's Supper, they must confess to us. But God's word creates innumerable benefits, yes, it does all things: it brings and strengthens faith, overcomes sin, the devil, death, hell and all evil, it makes us obedient to God, yes, children and heirs, it praises God, delights all angels and saves all creatures. But all this must also be in the Lord's Supper, because God's Word is in it.

Yes, they say: 2) We do not ask whether God's word is useful, but what the body of Christ is useful for itself in the bread? There, there, Luther, take a bite. Here one's heart might well fall away before the high spirit, if he wants to ask in this way. But if I

1) In the old editions: Junghern.

2) So in the Wittenberg and in the Jena. In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlanger: they say.

Again, if I say that I will not let the body of Christ be separated from the word, then they should whistle and whistle at me. 1) Well then, let it be as they dream that Christ's body is in the bread alone, and that there is no word of God with it, which is not possible; but let them see what they gain, and they will escape the rain and fall into the water. For if Christ's body is without the outward Word of God, it cannot be without the inward eternal Word, which is God Himself, John 1:14, for this Word became flesh and is in the flesh.

Now I ask again: whether God himself may also be of some use? Indeed, when he walked on earth, he was so useful that whom he touched through his flesh, he helped. He called Lazaro out of the grave with a bodily voice through His body (Joh. 11, 43.), He touched the leper and made him clean (Matth. 8, 3.), He walked on the sea and reached out His hand to the sinking Petro (Matth. 14, 21.), and He went about in the land and did wonders and good deeds (Matth. 9, 35.). It is also his way and nature to do good where he is. How then could he be useless in bread, since it is the same flesh, the same word, and the same kind, and must be good and useful.

Thus they say: Yes, one does not see and feel the benefit. Well, my dear, is that where the error lies? Of course, it is of no use to the enthusiasts, who would gladly grope and feel, so that they would not have to believe, like the carnivores and Capernaïtes, who would also feel and bite. But we who believe know that the body is useful to us wherever it is. If it is in the bread, and is eaten bodily with faith, it strengthens the soul to believe that it is Christ's body which the mouth eats, and so faith clings to the body which is in the bread. Now this is not useless, but blessed, which lifts up, supports, and fastens faith. In the same way, the mouth, the neck, the body that eats Christ's body, shall also have its benefit, that it may praise forever, and on the last day rise again to eternal blessedness. This is the secret power and benefit that comes from the body of Christ.

1) "Pfisten" in Latin: sannis ras xploäant.

in the Lord's Supper enters into our body; for it must be useful, and cannot be in vain; therefore it must give life and blessedness to our body, according to its nature.

I would have said this if it were possible for Christ's body to be in the Lord's Supper alone and without God's word. But this is not the case, for there are God's words: "This is my body," which grasp, comprehend and give us the body of Christ bodily, therefore the body of Christ must be useful through the word. Yes, even if it were true that Christ's flesh was like beef, and yet God's word was with it, and if it 2) were to be eaten by us, it would still be useful for the word's sake. When Abraham was promised his son Isaac [Gen. 15:6] (who was bad flesh and a child in the flesh), Abraham was justly praised by God, because he believed that he would have the son Isaac, Rom. 4:22. Here, the enthusiasts would also ask how Isaac would be of use to Abraham's faith, and then say that Isaac would never have been nothing, the spirit must be there, flesh would not be of use.

And what is the wonder that Isaac or beef is useful, if it is put into God's word and presented? After all, the devil, death, sin, hell and all misfortune will be of use and help if it is put into God's word and presented to us and believed by us. Can death be useful to me for body and soul, if I have Christ's word for it, which says: "Whoever loses his life for my sake will find it" [Matth. 16, 25.], and must therefore death, through the word, drive and strengthen my soul to righteousness and obedience of faith, and chase my body through to life: should not Christ's body, which is in itself vain life, blessedness and full of God, also be as useful to me through the word as death, sin and the devil? Yes, one does not feel and see it. Neither do we feel and see how the devil and death are useful through the word. But faith feels it. Come now, my dear, and persuade us that because death without the word is not useful but harmful, it must of course be nothing, because that is your reason, that nothing is good.

2) "it" is missing in the Erlanger.

that which is of no use, so that Christ's body must also be of no use to you.

The great arrogant prudence, by which they despise God's word so shamefully, as Oecolampad does in his blasphemous antisyngram, leads them to not see the word of God in the Lord's Supper, and only look and gape at the bodily food, thinking that the divine word should present vain spiritual things and not act outwardly bodily things. This is still the seed of M nzer's and Carlstadt's spirit, who also did not want to suffer anything outwardly until they were completely drowned in the flesh.

But God turns this around and does not give us a word or a commandment, since he does not bind a bodily external thing and reproach it to us. He gave the word to Abraham when his son Isaac was bound. To Saul he gave the word, when the Amalekites were gathered to kill. To Noah he gave the word when the rainbow was bound. So from now on you will not find a word of God in the whole scripture, where a bodily external thing is not bound and presented. If we were to follow the enthusiasts, we would have to say that all such bodily external things were of no use and vain. So here also in the Lord's Supper we are given the word, when Christ's body (crucified for us) is taken in, that it is to be eaten bodily, and that such eating is to avail for the forgiveness of sins, as the words read. Just as Isaac had to come bodily and become Abraham's son, as the words read, and the rainbow had to stand bodily, also as the words read.

They themselves, the scribblers, must admit that even in their spiritual food a bodily thing is presented. For Christ's body, though it be at the right hand of God, is nevertheless a body, and an outward bodily thing, having bone and flesh, which hath no spirit, as he himself saith Luc. 24:39: "Spirit hath neither flesh nor bone, as ye see that I have." If then they want to be almost munificent and not suffer flesh and bone, they must not eat Christ spiritually, for they eat flesh and bone. Now what is the difference? Yes, what is better that they eat flesh and bone with their soul, than that they eat it with their mouth?

isset? If it is of no use in the mouth, how can it be of use in the soul, because it is the same flesh and bone everywhere? But they want to have a vain spirit, which they also have, that is, the devil, who has neither flesh nor bone.

I have written this little piece, that external things are of no use, diligently against D. Carlstadt, how it should be distinguished, thus: External things without God's word are of no use, as the Pope's laws are; but external things, taken with God's word, are salvation and blessedness, because they are in the word and fasten faith; as I have now said of Isaac and the rainbow, which are both external bodily things. But because they are written in the Word, Abraham had to attach his faith to the future Isaac, who was written in God's Word. But the devil with his enthusiasts is so hostile to the word that he always wants to separate it from the outward things, but God wants them undivided and puts them together. What one then says: Here is not a vain outward thing, but put into words: "This is my body," 2c., they do not hear, they rage past as the foolish, and cry out: External things are of no use, external things are of no use. They will not let go of such a minting spirit until they also cause misfortune like the minting man. Because they have the same spirit, it is to be feared that they will bear the same fruit. As the tree is, so it bears fruit.

For from such a spirit it must follow that worldly authority is of no use as an external thing, because one does not want to hear nor see that it is written in God's word, and to believe that it is God's order, Rom. 13:1, which faith is not useless before God, and this fanatic spirit must remain rebellious and murderous. Now behold, worldly order is an outward thing; nor does it bind faith, and is also an article of faith, for the sake of the word into which it is put, Romans 13: "All orders that are in every place are of God. But it does not help with the nonsensical until they bash their heads.

But I would like to know where they got that there is a God, that the Son of God is a man, that one must believe, and

all the other articles of our faith, which have never fallen into no understanding, whether they have known them by the Spirit before they have heard or read of them bodily and outwardly? Here they must say no, that I know for certain; for they have it by the bodily outward word and writing. How then shall such an outward word be of no use, by which the Holy Ghost is given with all his gifts? Ah, it is blind hope, that they have shut up Christ at the right hand of God in a chamber, and do not believe that he is present in his word and outward things, since his word speaks of them; therefore they themselves do not know (as St. Paul says) what they speak of, or what they put, wanting to be masters of the Scriptures, and have become useless washers, 1 Tim. 1:6. Another time we will speak of it more fully.

295 They go on to say: But what need is there that Christ's body should be in the sacrament? Faith can be strengthened without it by the Gospel, which is otherwise preached. That is right, but let us bring God to trial once more and hold before Him what is His need, or what we need, that He should hold before us such His word and work. Does he now want to make fools of us, as if we ourselves did not know as well as he what is necessary for us and for him? does he think, even if he is a god, that he alone is therefore wise, and wants to master us, the clergy? 1) If he has flesh and blood, then we have the spirit, and his flesh is of no use; but our spirit is alive, and we want to sing to him something else, so that he may think and say such words to us, and present such works to us, which we recognize to be necessary to us; if not, then we have decided that he should be a Capernait, Atreus, 2) Thyestes and carnivore, and we want to see how he will fight against us.

How do you think about this spirit? is he not humble and reasonable, moderate and sedentary? I mean, yes, he lets his evil words

and blasphemies to Basel and punish Luther finely for his scolding and biting. But who are the worst scolders and reproachers? Are they the ones who both reproach God and the people? Or are they the only ones who reproach 3) the seducing spirits? That is, to have the beam in one's eye and to master the mote in another's eye.

This is Oecolampad's other blasphemy. For he who asks why it is necessary what God speaks and does, wants to be smarter and better than God. This is the right coining spirit, which also said that he would put both in Christ and in the Scriptures, if they did not want to conform to his spirit. Immediately after the Zwingel, when it was held up to him that we eat Christ's body in the Lord's Supper invisibly in an unspeakable way, he goes on and cries out about Christ, saying: "O how is Christ such a fine light of the world? How finely he enlightens us, if we are not to know how his body is eaten in the bread! He would not be far off if, like the coiner, he were to enter into Christ.

One's heart might burst at such impudent talk of the infernal devil and his enthusiasts. They want to know how Christ's body is in the bread, or should it be false that he is in it, and cannot yet know how it is that they open their mouths, move their tongues, take the pen in their hands, and much less, I will be silent, that they should know how they see, hear, speak, and live bodily. We feel all these things, and are daily in them, and yet know not how it is; and want to know how Christ's body is in the bread, or let Christ be neither light nor master.

299 But we want to show, although we are not obligated to do so, also for the sake of abundance, why it is necessary that Christ's body be in the bread. And recently the first need is for God's sake. For if it were not so, Christ would be a liar in his words, since he would be

1) Walch and the Erlangeners: "und wolle uns die Geistlichen meistern?"

2) Atreus put the flesh of his son before Thyestes in revenge for committing adultery with his wife.

3) In the old Walch edition and in the Erlanger wrongly interpungirt: "Or are's die allein, die verführischen" 2c.

says: "Take, effet, this is my body, given for you". Then you beautiful devil have the trouble: "God is true, what He says, He does, and can do" [Ps. 33, 4]. Because he says here: "This is my body", and points (with the little word "this") to the bread, as the scribblers confess, then his body must of necessity be there. And there is also power in this need, that God may receive His glory, since He boasts that He is true and faithful. In addition, we want to believe that this adversity is not hard on the spiritual God of the devotees: for he might well suffer our fleshly and baked God to be a liar, as he [the devil] has been from the beginning, and not keep or fulfill his words as he does.

The other need is for our faith; for faith in God's word is necessary for us, because it is said that we should believe it, and God demands and wants faith where His word is. Now there are God's words, which in themselves comprehend and grasp the body of Christ, that it is there. Therefore, just as the word and faith are necessary, so also the body, composed in the word, is necessary to us, so that our faith may be right and rhyme with the word, because the two, word and body, cannot be separated; and even if it were separated and without word, it would still be necessary, because life and salvation are in it.

(301) Yes, this may well be done apart from the sacrament. It is true that it may well be done apart from the body of Christ, which is at the right hand of God; should Christ not therefore be at the right hand of God? Item, it might happen without the gospel, for who would want to oppose God, if he had wanted to redeem us by deed, and had neither preached anything about it, nor become man? Just as he created the heavens and the earth, and still makes everything without outward preaching, and does not become man because of it: should the gospel therefore be nothing? But now that he will give it to thee by mankind, by the word, by the bread of the Lord's Supper, who art thou, a trusting and ungrateful devil, to ask why he doth it not otherwise and without manner? Will you set and choose for him ways and measures? You should be glad of joy

He will jump and do it in whatever way he wants, only that you get it.

302 Do you not think, I would well ask, that because one can have the gospel and the memory of Christ in all sermons, what need is there that one must keep a communion and drink bread and wine with it? What need is there for anyone to read the Scriptures with him? What need is there for one to exhort and comfort another in particular, since all this can be done in public, common preaching? Are these not childish, blind thoughts in such great matters? God wants to fill the world and give Himself in many ways to help and strengthen us with His word and works; so we want to be so fed up and weary that we refuse Him, and suffer badly only in the way that pleases us. You are a black, desperate devil. That is enough of that now.

When the enthusiasts think they have won their cause, they go and make the Lord's Supper a symbol, that is, a sign, so that Christians can be recognized outwardly, as beggars and Jews are known by their yellow 1) rings, and should badly be a sign of Christians among themselves, not against God, so that they practice and maintain love among themselves. This must also follow from this spirit. For since they snatch God's word from the bread and wine, and leave nothing but eating and drinking, as in the tabernacles, nothing must of course be served by this for God, nor must our faith be helped, but rather it must become a mere belly service and a grudge. For what does God ask of our eating and drinking, as He says in Jeremiah [Cap. 7:21]? And what does it help our faith that the belly eats and drinks? So it was said in ancient times of church consecrations that they were held so that friends might know and love one another. So Christ's supper has also become a church consecration here.

But if it be asked, wherewith do they prove this? the answer is, Oh, is it not enough that we say it? And indeed, whoever finds the words of God difficult to believe

1) gel--yellow.

in this article, which is discharged by such gossip of a great unwillingness. But if we receive that his words are true, and Christ's body and blood are in it, they should let us keep the Lord's Supper a little more than a church consecration. But if they tear out his word, and make vain bread and wine of it, then I let it happen that they make a church consecration or carnival out of it, it counts the same; if they lust for it, then they may also make a dance or play out of it, we ask nothing of it; only that we do not come into their blasphemous and hostile meal.

But we know that it is the Lord's supper and is called, not the Christians' supper. For the Lord not only instituted it, but also makes it and keeps it himself, and is the cook, waiter, 1) food and drink himself, as we have proved our faith above. Neither saith Christ, when he commandeth and appointeth, Do these things for your sakes, to know and to love one another; but thus, "Do these things in remembrance of me." If we are to do it in his memory, it is appointed for his service, for his honor. But with what do we serve him? With eating and drinking? I think that by strengthening our faith and getting to know him, as we have often taught, there should be no doubt when we receive that his body and blood are there, just as the holy fathers tell us about such fruits of the Lord's Supper.

306. I also hear it said that this error also pleases some of the papacy, and some now hope to preserve the mass first of all, that it is a sacrifice, especially because some of the fathers call the sacrament a sacrifice, as Irenaeus, Cyprianus, Augustine, and because they well feel that it is unchristian to sacrifice Christ daily, who sacrificed himself only once, and can no longer be sacrificed, they now fall on bread and wine, and since in the sacrament there should be only bread and wine, it seems to them to be without danger that they keep the mass for a sacrifice, and may now earn the interest more easily, because they should sacrifice bread and wine badly.

If this were true, it would hardly be right for him, so that God's judgment would remain true, since St. Paul [2 Thess. 2, 11] says: "God sends them strong errors, so that they must believe the lie, because they did not want the love of the truth, so that they would be saved. And Christ John 5:43: "I come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: another shall come in his name, and him will ye receive." So these gentlemen also, persecuting and hating the gospel without end, shall accept for it ravings and lies.

308 But how if the mass were to perish in the first place, so that you think you are preserving it, and thus lose both the gospel and the mass through this assumed fervour, so that you keep neither faith for the soul nor interest for the belly? For if the common man should find out that you are offering bad bread and wine in the mass for their sin, they would soon throw off their hands and withdraw both sacrifice and interest. For who would be so foolish as to give a piece of bread and a drink of wine for his soul, especially in the New Testament, "since we are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, not by gold or silver," not by bread or wine [1 Pet. 1:18, 19]? For even the hopeful are, that by such a doctrine they would cast down the church, with the pope and with all, and establish a great unity and equality among all Christians.

309. Now let him who wills, and as he wills, let it be bread or Christ's body, he will have to answer: It is certain that Christ cannot be sacrificed more than and more than the one time when he sacrificed himself. For such a daily sacrifice and to sell such a sacrifice for our sin, as it has been instituted and held until now, the papists themselves see (praise God) that it is the greatest blasphemy of God and abomination that has ever been on earth, and none of the ancient teachers ever held, taught or wrote such a thing. For Irenaeus calls it a sacrifice, that one offers bread and wine, since the sacrament is made by God's word, solely for thanksgiving, that one thereby confesses how God has made us

as was done in the Old Testament, but not at all for our sin, or to redeem our souls, or to propitiate God, as the papists keep the Mass. Some call it a sacrifice, for the sake of remembering the one sacrifice that Christ once made for us; just as every year Easter Day is called *Resurrectio* or *Resurrectionis diem*, the resurrection, and says: Today Christ is risen; not that Christ rises every year, but that every year the day of his resurrection is remembered. In this way St. Augustine calls the Sacrament a sacrifice. But if anyone does not want to believe, let him always go on sacrificing and blaspheming until he stops; the truth has sufficiently come to light in this piece.

I hereby ask and admonish my enthusiasts to do as much honor to the truth as they can, so that we may soon come to the point and the end, and avoid unnecessary pieces, answer us to the right main pieces of the matter, remain on them and be constant. So that I may state it again: It is not necessary for this matter that they teach us how Christ sits at the right hand of God, has left the world, has ascended to heaven, and our hearts are to hang there, not to give to earthly things, and the like; for we know all these things well by the grace of God; but this is necessary that they make certain and prove how the two parts are opposed to each other: Christ's body sits at the right hand of God, and at the same time is in the Lord's Supper.

How it is that God's power has become so weak that it is not able to do this, and that all this can be overcome with good reason and clear Scripture; now here we are to teach 1) where the need lies, so that we may be sure that the words: "This is my body" are dark and obscure, and are to be understood differently than they read. Do you hear, dear sirs, what I ask? where I lie? where I call? Dearly beloved, pass not by, and despise me not so haughtily, and sing me not another thing for it.

312 Likewise, you must not teach us how flesh is of no use, and how

We already know how without the spirit nothing is of use; we would like to know more, namely, how the saying, "Flesh is of no use," is contrary to the saying, "Christ's body is in the bread. Item, that we may be sure that of Christ's body it is said, "Flesh is of no use." Item, that Christ's body is perishable, useless, corruptible food, when he himself says John 6:51 that it is imperishable food that gives life, and just as in the Lord's Supper it is perishable, useless meat, yet by nature and kind it is eternal food. Here, here, we call, here hear us. So also, as the saying must be understood of the Sacrament: "When they shall tell you, behold, here is Christ, behold, there he is." Such, and what more you consider to be your own conceited reasons, make us certain and clear. For all that ye have wrought hitherto is lost, and nothing is accomplished thereby, because ye have said many things, but have undertaken to prove nothing.

313 The disciples boast that they wanted to press and press the meaning of the words "This is my body": "This is the sign of my body. But someone was standing there watching him press the grapes, and he noticed that someone had put some pebbles into the winepress, but they were painted with grape colors; so the poor man pressed the grapes over the pebbles with great difficulty, but nothing would come out, until the winepress fell on his head, stones and all, and crushed him. Admittedly, Christ's words cannot be much pressed nor pressed; they are pebbles, yea, vain rocks, which the wicked cannot handle without harm, as he saith Matt. 21:44: "Whosoever shall fall on this rock shall be bruised; but on him whom he shall fall, he shall bruise."

314 So also, if you want to keep the fathers on your mind, as you boast, and not deny them freshly, do not leave it there that you gloss over them badly for your liking, but press and press their words well, if they wanted to give it. Do not teach us how the sayings of the fathers may be directed or bent this way or that, but whether it is certain that they should and must be directed this way. For ye have heard that we

1) Erlanger: us. "us" is not expressed in Latin.

Such know your art well, and do not even desire your mastery in the pieces that we already know. Yes, we confess and praise you as the very finest teachers; you teach that which can be well understood and needs no faith. For he who cannot understand that bread is bread, wine is wine, must of course be mad. But there you are lacking, that you should prove that bread is vain.

St. Paul is not such a fine teacher, for he teaches what no one can understand, but his proof is so strong that he forces one to believe it. This you do not do, but meanwhile speak of other things. 1) But if you must point out your art, and think that it helps the cause, do so, and let most of your talk be about the main thing. I mean that herewith I sufficiently admonish what you should do; but what does it matter whether it will help? For I know the fleeting, shy and slippery devil almost well.

But that you praise your holy life and suffering, and judge me that the Spirit of God has abandoned me, we gladly let happen; indeed, we poor sinners wish that you would be much higher than your fame is, because we are sure that it is not only harmless but also beneficial for us where pious, holy people are on earth. Of course, we do not want to reward them, but enjoy them well, and we can truly enjoy them. But if you want to boast more about your life, I ask you to prove it by deed, and to punish and correct yourselves for the sake of their evil, † 2) and not allow them to

1) Thus the Jenaers. Wittenberg and Erlangen: "but of other things dieweil redet."

2) Here, to please the sacramentarians, in the first Wittenberg edition of 1548, a longer section (from this cross to the next following cross) is knowingly omitted, as one assumes, at Melancthon's instigation. Amsdorf wrote a whole book about this, and Röer, in the table of contents to the third volume of the Jena edition under the year 1527, talks about it extensively. See the [appendix](#) to this writing. The title of the book published by Amsdorf in 1549 is- Daß die zu Wittenberg im anderen Theil der Bücher D. Martini im Buch 'dass die Worte, das ist mein Leib 2c. noch fest stehen' mehr als ein Blatt und vier ganze Paragraphos [Absätze] vorsätzlich ausgelassen haben." The same paragraph is also missing in our Latin Wittenberg edition of 1558, Dorn. VII, toi. 417.

Do so much harm and injustice to others that your fame may not be taken for lies, and your holy life not for hypocrisy.

317. Martinus Bucerus is among you one of the most distinguished, and a Christian dear brother and fellow servant of Christ among you, who also sanctifies you already in life, the same one has verlateinet our pastor, He Johann Pommers, Psalter (as he then has great grace to speak of God and to interpret) and has thus corrupted the fine book with the poison of your doctrine of the holy sacrament, that it is difficult to find counsel, because the same book comes among so many people, and under John's name and work is sold among them, the very error, since he constantly refutes it with his hand and mouth. You holy people let such a little piece go as if you were pleased with it, and do not hold it up for retraction and restitution, since you know well what is in it for John and how highly he is offended by such a knavery.

318 Similarly, my very best book, which I have ever made, the postillions, which the papists also like, he has also prepared with prefaces, subliminaries and objections, so that under my name this blasphemous, shameful doctrine is brought and carried further than perhaps through all your books. What shall I do? How can I advise the matter now? I must feel as if a dog had bitten me. I have punished it with prefaces, but what is the use? The devil saw well that this book penetrated everywhere; therefore he seized the same, loaded and smeared his dirt on it. And so I, an innocent man, must be the devil's muckraker, whether I want to be or not. As yet we suffer nothing, but walk on roses, and are scoundrels and biters; but they are vain sanctuary: and yet do such poisonous wiles and murderous stings besides, which cannot be healed. And indeed, if I were a Christian, I would be of a mind that someone would rather cut off my neck, because such treachery proves that I must present the poison of the soul with my book, ignorantly and unwillingly.

319. so gach 3) is the people and their

3) "gach" ---- abrupt, hurried.

Devils with their insanity, that they spread the same also by foreign books, just as if the books were too few, so that they wanted to deceive the world now. 1) What should happen after my death? That is what they do to me during my life, and let me sit here in Wittenberg and watch. Martinus Bucerus should not have taught me his dream and poem of *brabeo et eadem esca*. It is not such a big thing, I would have liked to have seen it, where I would have enjoyed it. In addition, if he had found fault with my interpretation, he would have known how to find me with writings or his own little books, and would have had no need to desecrate my dearest book behind my back and to drive his poison into the hearts with it. Such little pieces all pass among you as holy, moral, Christian works. In spite of us impatient ones, that we rebel against it.

The same Bucerus does not let him be satisfied with this. M. Philippus Melancthon must also serve, from whom he freely writes: Philippus may now believe what he wants, but he certainly also taught that there is only bread in the Lord's Supper. Behold, dear, behold, how the holy people press upon us, and want to have us blind, spiritless carnivores by force into their faith, as if their God could not come to his glory without us Wittenbergers, and preserve their faith. I do not want to delete the little trick now, as it would be well worth it, so that they do not take cause from our impatience to forget the main things and to praise their holiness. We only ask that they first do such things out of their own means and not suffer among themselves before they burn themselves so brightly and wipe their mouths; for it behooves holy people badly to prove such arch-rogues and devilish tricks to their neighbor.

321 Paul says, Rom. 2, that not the perpetrators alone, but also those who consent, are guilty of death. If it were our lives alone, we poor, unholy, impatient sinners would gladly keep silent, and suffer such from the great, sedentary saints; but it concerns our doctrine, which is not the same to other people.

They come before us and insult, poison and mistype it, so that it does more harm through us than through its own books. 2) We must protest against this a little. Against this we must protest a little. Whether one notices what her famous holiness is, I cannot be responsible for; it is Christ's fault who says: "by the fruits one should know the trees".

322 Their mob also carries me with such a judgment that because I have written against the peasants, the spirit has departed from me, that I may not understand the bright truth 2c. I let go of the fact that such and other things are said of me. I do not boast of a high spirit, but of the great gifts and graces of my God and Spirit I boast (I hope) quite justly and not without cause. Nor do I think it a great thing to understand how vain bread and wine may be on a table, which even a child and a fool understands well, I also see it every day before me on my table; but you dear councilors of Basel, Strasbourg, and all those, if you have such sacramental caves with you, may well let such their speech warn you that you do not put your eyes into the bag, but take good care of the game. The coiner is dead, but his spirit is not yet extinguished. † 3)

For what is to be thought of the spirit that still rebelliously comforts and excuses the peasants, 4) and condemns me for writing against it, is easy to notice. The devil is not asleep, but is still spouting. That is why I said above that this spirit is not good, nor does it mean well through these enthusiasts; although I respect that the preachers, against whom I write, still have nothing evil in mind. But, dear God, they have no power of their own; the spirit has blinded and captivated them, therefore they are not to be trusted. For whichever spirit dissolves Christ flesh is not of God, says St. John [1 Ep. 4, 2. 3.], and says to this,

2) dump - poison.

3) Up to this point is omitted in the Wittenberg edition of 1548. In the edition of 1551, vol. II, p. 164 f., this piece is inserted again.

4) The words: "and excused" are missing in the Erlanger.

1) In the old editions: wöllen.

it should be the test. Now this spirit dissolves Christ's flesh, because it makes a useless, perishable and all mean flesh out of it, like beef and veal, as we have heard, therefore it cannot be righteous. I warn, I advise, beware, beware, Satan has come among the children of God.

I will leave it here until they return, for the saying, "This is my body," still stands firm against all their fanaticism. This is what I (praise God) have raised with this writing for this time, God grant that they may convert to the truth. If not, that they should write vain cords, that they might see themselves and come into my hands, amen.

Appendix.*)

Writing Georg Rorarii au the Christian reader, in which he indicates that some of Wittenberg with Untruthfulness to him that he omitted a necessary piece 2c. Folio 423b.

Ps. 35:11, 12: "There are false witnesses who accuse me of not being guilty. They do me evil for good, to bring me into heartache.

Phil. 4, 5. 6.: The Lord is near; do not worry, but cast all your care on Him, for He cares for you.

What is understood between the two little crosses above, is all omitted (few lines excepted) in the other Tomo of the Streitschriften D. M. L. seliger Gedächtniß, issued at Wittenberg Anno 48, as in the same print, who has it, can still see toi. 167, Parag. 4 at the end, except for the words: "is not eradicated."

Now I have Anno 50, since the same Tomus for the second time and then Anno 51 in the fast is completed, just now reported piece, time before my departure from Wittenberg in Denmark, with all diligence and faithfulness from word to word in the said print of the 51st year put, as I refer to the testimony of truth to the same print toi. 164a, Parag. 4 at the end.

In addition to this, I have had several other pieces, especially two that do not appear in the first printing, added at the same time for further proof and indication.

The first with this title: A writing of D. M. L. *de transsubstantia- tione*, fol 265 a. The other: Etliche Sprüche Herrn Niclas von Amsdorf, wider die Wiedertäufer zu Münster; item, Wider die Sacramentirer, toi. 396 d, 398 b.

But all this notwithstanding, some go from Wittenberg to carry me now to the other time.

out of and in order to persuade the people, pious hearts, as if I should have omitted the above-mentioned noticeably necessary part (which the dear Lord and Father D. M[artin] would have been very interested in) for my person, out of my own nobility and thirst, intentionally, to please the devotees of the sacraments. I should not and cannot remain silent about this; for this accusation concerns not only my good reputation among the people, but primarily the confession of faith of pure divine doctrine of this high article of the Lord's Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ; for the wicked Satan wants to make me an enemy of the Sacrament against my thanks, knowledge and will.

Here I say: No, no, because I can stir up a vein; for I have never, that God, the denouncer of all hearts, knows, taken in mind or thought to practice such a blasphemous knavery against this article of our holy faith, to please the Sacramentans, yes, I have always been hostile to this blasphemous mob and raving with right earnestness.

Say further that those who accuse me in this way, crying out from time to time as a devil's liar, thereby profaning and desecrating my Christian name, which Christ, my dear Lord, has purchased and earned for me, do so with untruth against God, who earnestly commands, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

Dear God, how can men be so bold as to speak so publicly against their own conscience, without any need or just cause, in such a high matter, which is not a physical honor, good 2c.,

*)This appendix is found in the Jena edition (1556), vol. III, in the register under the year 1527, and has also passed into the Altenburg, vol. III, p. 740 and into the Leipzig, vol. XIX, p. 439. It is written about the play Col. 888-891. We give it after the above-mentioned first printing of the Jena edition.

but God's word and the soul's bliss! Where is and remains Christian love here?

What however often reported necessary piece, so in the first pressure Anno 48 is omitted, concerns, know two high persons good report beside me, namely, who are those, so initially to it advised, the thing driven, to the other time again stimulated, also finally insisted and received that it is omitted 2c.

For this reason, however, I do not want to tell these people who and where they are. In case of need, however, I will tell in God's name what I know, and also indicate how I have behaved and acted in this matter.

This is enough now in the hurry to answer this piece, so omitted 2c. What concerns the preface of Mr. Niclas von Amsdorf, 1) and the five causes of the same, is none of my business; for I have indeed done nothing about it 2c.

1 Cor. 15:58: "Be ye firm, immovable, my brethren, always increasing in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

1) This refers to Nicolaus von Amsdorf's preface to the first volume of the Jena edition, in which he gives five reasons why it was necessary to produce a new edition of Luther's works.

21. D. Martin Luther's Confession of the Lord's Supper. *)

March 1528.

On the Lord's Supper, Confession.

Bad and right keep me. Psalm 25.

1) Praise and thanks be to God through Jesus Christ, our Lord, forever, that my book, which I have sent out this year against the enthusiasts and enemies of the holy sacrament, has brought forth no small fruit. First of all, many pious hearts, which had been confused and troubled by the useless words of the enthusiasts, have been 2) satisfied and thank God with great joy, as they happily confess with writings to me. On the other hand, that I have just met Satan and have not missed him, so that he has now at first become nonsensical and furious about me; as this also probably indicates the spirit's next answer against such a booklet of mine, which has long since gone out, and at last on this St. Martin's Day [Nov. 11, 1527] will also come to me once in Wittenberg, because perhaps it has so far been afraid of dying.

2) In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlanger: "they are". Does the Erlanger have the "they" from the original or from Walch?

2. help god, how angry are the heroes, that they not only forget their moderation, which they are used to praise highly against me, and would also like to maintain, when no adder is so poisonous as they are in these writings, but also do not see what or to what they should answer because of great anger and wrath. And of Zwingel's spirit in particular, which mixes in a lot of images, purgatory, saints, honor, keys, original sin, and knows not what more of his new great teachings, only that he may spout a lot where there is no need, and skip where answering would be necessary, as I will indicate.

For this reason I have had enough of her, and will write to her no more, lest Satan become even more foolish, and spew forth more lies and foolish works (as he has now done), defiling the paper uselessly, and thus hindering the reader's time to read better things; for if I have not been able to bring forth a correct answer with the book, in which I have so often recorded, even in large letters, what I desire an answer to, then I have no hope, even if I wrote a thousand books,

*This writing, which is usually called "Luther's great confession of the Lord's Supper" in distinction from the "Short Confession" (1844) reported in No. 47 of this volume, was published in March 1528 by Michel Lotther in Wittenberg, then reprinted there in the same year (without indication of the printer) and in 1534 by Hans Weiß in Wittenberg. In the collections: in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 165b; in the Jena <1556), vol. III, p. 476 b; in the Altenburg, vol. III, p. 812; in the Leipzig, vol. XIX, p. 440 and in the Erlanger, vol. 30, p. 151. We give the text according to the latter, since it printed the same after the first original edition, comparing the Wittenberg and the Jena editions.

that I would get an answer. And Satan is not to be blamed either, for the liar is not joking with the truth. May the merciful God convert them and deliver their minds from the snares of the wretched Satan, for that is all I can do. I am worried, unfortunately, that I must be a true prophet, since I have written that no heretic will be converted. So I will let them go according to the teaching of St. Paul, Titus 3:10: "You shall avoid a heretic when he has been admonished once or twice. For they will do no better henceforth: it is out of their power, and I will turn to ours, instructing them further, as much as I can, by Christ's grace, in this article.

4. And although I have done enough by the two little books, one against the celestial prophets, the other against the enthusiasts, for all understanding Christians, so that whoever does not want to err, can well be appalled by it against the seducers, and so far are still unbitten by the enthusiasts' spirit, however nearly they cry out, I still want to let this little book go out for the last in this matter, for the strength of the weak and to explain the article the better; For I see, indeed I must see, that because Satan answers so foolishly and spouts vain useless words, he has in mind to hinder me thereby in other matters, since he is much more interested. Therefore it is no longer fitting for me to deal with his foolish work and to leave the holy scriptures lying around. He feeds from now on as much as he wants.

But I want to take three pieces before me in this booklet. Firstly, to warn our people with an indication of how this spirit of enthusiasm has not responded to my reasons.

On the other hand, the sayings deal with teaching about the Holy Sacrament.

Third, confess all articles of my faith against this and all other new heresies, lest they should boast at some time or other, or after my death, that Luther had kept it with them, as they have already done in some pieces.

First of all, let every devout Christian be warned against the enemies of the sacraments, from the

The reason that this sect has so many factions and heads in the beginning, and are even divided among themselves because of this text: "This is my body, given for you", is that such disunity and disputes cannot and may not be of the Holy Spirit. It is certainly the troublesome Satan, as I have also indicated in the next booklet. For the text must be uniform and simple, and must have a certain understanding, if it is to be clear and based on a certain article. But because they have so many different understandings and texts here, since each is contrary to the other's understanding, and no one is certain of his understanding, no one has ever been able to prove his understanding and to put it aside for others: so it follows that they are all wrong, and none of them has the text in this place until this day, and so they must all keep the Lord's Supper without a text. For an uncertain text is just as no text. Now what kind of supper is this, since there is no text or certain word of Scripture? For Christ's words must be certain and clear, otherwise they are not to be had; but we have certain text and understanding and simple words, as they stand, and we do not disagree about them.

7 "Whom" then they answer that it is no harm that they have many words or understandings, because they are of one main thing, that is, that there is bread and wine of the same kind, and they make such like statements: As in the Gospel Christ shows the sum of the Gospel in many ways, as, John 4:14, 1) by drinking water; item, John 6:51, by eating his flesh and drinking his blood; item, by the father of the house who feeds the laborers in his vineyard, Matt. 20:1 ff. By eating His flesh and drinking His blood; item, by the householder feeding the laborers in his vineyard, Matth. 20,1. ff.; and so on by many and various similitudes the one kingdom of God is shown in the Gospel; therefore it is not unreasonable that also the spirit of enthusiasm has various understanding and word about various things.

What do you think? Doesn't it rhyme well? Who does not see here that the wretched spirit either does not want to answer because of great arrogance, as if he mocks our question, or

1) The Erlangen edition here reprinted from the old edition of Walch's "Joh. 4, 13.", as well as all of Walch's "other" false Bible citations in this writing, in total three and thirty.

is completely blind as a bat that he does not see what is asked or what he should answer? Who has asked this of him? Who has asked him to teach us how one thing may be presented by various interpretations, speeches, likenesses, and forms? We know all this better beforehand than he can always teach us. I know well that Christ, the only Savior, has not only various interpretations, but all the interpretations of Scripture. He is called a lamb, a rock, a cornerstone, a sun, a morning star, a spring, a bridegroom, a householder, a teacher, a father, yes, everything and everything points to him and says about him, each in its own way. Just as if we acted here, as a thing may have many names and signs, or as if there was someone who doubted it.

(9) But here he should answer, because we asked how it was among the enthusiasts, that among them one name, word, and mind were at variance with himself about one thing, one saying yes, the other saying no. When Carlstadt says that Tuto points to the seated body. Zwingel says that the same Tuto points to the bread. Now both cannot be true; one must lie and be the devil's teacher; for in one speech it cannot be that one name or word has at the same time two vile meanings and interpretations. I cannot say, in the one saying, Joh. 1, 29.: "Behold, this is the Lamb of God" 2c., that Lamb here should at the same time interpret a sheep and wolf, or at the same time a sheep and not a sheep, as yet in the one word Tuto Carlstadt, Oecolampad and Zwingel disagree, and one says, it interprets this; the other says no, it interprets another. Item Zwingel speaks: "is" means "interprets"; Oecolampad says no, it means badly "is". Again Oecolampad says: "my body" means "my body's sign"; Zwingel says: No, it means bad my body. Here, here one should answer, and compare this disagreement, so that the devil would not have to stand so coldly and be so publicly seized in his lie. But this will probably remain unanswered by them forever.

10 For though one place of Scripture calls Christ a lamb, and speaks as of a lamb, yet in no place does it speak against it.

Nor does he punish himself, nor say no to it; for the fact that he is called a lamb does not contradict the fact that elsewhere he is called a rock or a stone, and there is no disagreement. But the spirit of enthusiasm skins itself here in the cheeks, and interprets not only many words, but also one word at the same time in one place against itself. The lie would not be so gross, and the disgrace not so great, if they interpreted the same word in different places discordantly and unequally, or interpreted different words in one place unequally; but that they interpret the same word, in the same place, in the same speech, unequally and repugnantly, that is, with leave, well bethan, and the devil beaten naked in the pillory; for no language speaks thus, and a child must say that [it] cannot be. For if I say, Christ is the Lamb of God, it cannot be that one by the Lamb understands a wolf, the other a sheep; one must lie, and is not both of the Holy Spirit. Now the enthusiasts have almost ten different understandings of the words of the Lord's Supper, and no one is the same as the other in interpreting them. There must be lies and devils and no good spirit.

(11) But that the false spirit blames us, because we ourselves do not abide by the words and the same mind, because we say, "This is my body," to be understood thus: "Under the bread is my body;" or, "In the bread is my body," 2c., and thus ourselves also disagree, I answer, "The lying spirit knows well that he does us wrong here, and does so only to disparage us and to adorn his lies with his own. For he knows very well that we argue about it with all seriousness, that these words "this is my body", as they are written and read, should be understood in the most simple way, and do not make various and disparate texts out of one text, 1) as they do.

(12) This I have said in my booklet, that those who say in common speech, Under the bread is Christ's body, or, In the bread is Christ's body, are not to be condemned, because with such words they confess their faith that Christ is in them.

1) The words: "aus Einem Text" are missing in the Erlanger.

Body is truly in the Lord's Supper. But with this they do not make another new text; neither do they want such their words to be the text, but remain on the one text. Paul says: "Christ is God", Rom. 9, 5, but 2 Cor. 5, 19: "God was in Christ", and yet both places are each in their own mind simple and certain, and not contrary to each other. But the enthusiast's text is divided in one place, in one word.

(13) And if we should be sought so carefully, and if there should be so great a power in it, or if it should be proved that the text, "This is my body," could not suffer me to speak otherwise: In the Lord's Supper is Christ's body; then we are ready, and would have it recanted, that it should not be thus spoken, but badly and plainly, "This is my body," as the words are there. Let them also do so, and be agreed in the text. Although no Christian will require us in this way, that in all other sermons and conversations, as often as one speaks of the Lord's Supper, we should be bound to say, "This is my body," provided that in the Lord's Supper we leave the text to itself and to its place. In other places and speeches we may well be allowed to say: Under the bread or in the bread is Christ's body. Item: In the Lord's Supper Christ's body is true; for we would not be granted to speak of our faith.

(14) But the fanciers thus make a joke to mend their holed furs. They well feel that their lies are different in one place and word, and want to defend their disagreement with it and not revoke it; but it does not apply. We grant that they may speak of the sacrament elsewhere as they wish or are able. But we want the text in the Lord's Supper to be one, simple, certain and certain in all words, syllables and letters. Since they do not do this, I freely conclude that the devil, the father of all disunity, is their teacher. For St. Paul says: "God is not a God of disunity" [1 Cor. 14:33]. So also all Christians are of one mind, Eph. 4, 3. and do not make divisions, 1 Cor. 1, 10. So you know this spirit from the first fruit of their disunity.

(15) Concerning this, where the Scriptures give various names or sayings to one thing, these are not only good, and never contrary to one another, but also certain and well founded, that one may stand upon them. As where Christ is preached a lamb, I am sure and certain that he is well and truly called a lamb. But the enthusiast none can make his interpretation certain. For Carlstadt has not made his Tuto certain to this day that he interprets it as he claims, as they themselves confess. Zwingel and Oecolampad, however, have never attempted with a single letter to make it certain, as "is" is so much as "interprets," "body" is so much as "body's sign"; but say it badly, as their own word and opinion, of which they themselves are uncertain, and regard no one as wanting to try whether they want to make it certain.

(16) Therefore the swarming spirit shall not teach us here how in the Scriptures the kingdom of God has various interpretations, but shall prove that such interpretations are contrary to each other and uncertain, as we complain and prove that their erroneous false interpretations are not only various, but also contrary to each other and uncertain. Is it not well answered? When I fight against their disunity and uncertainty, he answers me from diversity, just as if diversity and disunity were one thing. I ask how it is that their interpretation and understanding are not only diverse, but also disunited and contrary to each other, he answers that it is not wrong that they are diverse. Let us be satisfied with this, and confess our error, and give credence to their faith.

(17) But when will the answer be given, how the disunity in such diversity comes from the Holy Spirit? There is no one here at home. If we are to come to them, then they must truly put away such disagreement, and become one and certain of the text and understanding beforehand; otherwise we will quite rightly shy away and say, "The devil is in the hedge. For such aggravation would be more necessary, because the images are storming. Images

1) "and" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

would not hinder us; but disunity of mind and speech, that is the devil.

18 For even if they had won their cause and shut us up, they would not have accomplished anything more and would not have advanced their cause any further than to have taken this text "this is my body" from us according to our understanding. But with this they have not yet proven their understanding, nor can they ever prove it. Now if a right spirit were with them, it would not only take away the false understanding, but also give and prove another and constant true understanding in its place. If St. Paul had taken away the righteousness of the law or works in the most violent way, he would not have achieved anything, but he would have taught another righteousness in its place and made it certain. God did not abolish the Old Testament until He put the New Testament in its place and made it much more certain than the Old.

(19) It is not a fine spirit that teaches and says, This is a lie, and yet there is no certain truth to it. It is not valid to punish a lie, and on the other hand not to know nor to want to denounce the lie, namely the truth. He who wants to overthrow lies violently must put public, certain and constant truth in their place; for lies are not afraid 1) nor do they flinch until the bright, constant truth comes. It is far away in the darkness and absence of truth. Now if our understanding is wrong in these words "this is my body," then Zwingel is guilty of making his understanding and text (namely, this means my body) certain and proving it constantly. Likewise Oecolampad, and all the others, each one his own. But when will they do this?

(20) Yea, I will tell thee more, because they cannot certainly have nor prove their understanding or text, it is certain that they also may not constantly reproach our understanding and text falsely. For, as it is said, who can certainly and constantly punish a lie, who does not know the vile truth?

can muster? Who can reprove wrong who does not prove right? Light must ever punish darkness: one darkness does not punish another; so Beelzebub does not cast out a devil either. The enthusiastic spirit feels this well, therefore it walks around like a cat around a hot pudding, looking at how our text and understanding is not right, and yet it shuns and shuns, like the devil, the word of God, so that it does not have to prove how its text and understanding is right, because it feels well that it cannot do it.

(21) Therefore he thinks that we should leave it there, that he should abolish the text of the Lord's Supper according to our understanding, and not put another certain one in its place; no, that does not apply. If thou wilt break off, build again. If thou wilt warn against error, teach also certain truth in its place, or let thy mastering and teaching stand. 2) You are a false lying spirit, because you reproach falsely that which you cannot make true or certain, nor do you want to. The Holy Spirit, however, knows how to prove the contradiction and make it certain, where he punishes lies or error.

22 Let this be written as a warning to you, my dear lords and brethren, for here you can grasp this spirit, that it shuns the light, and is a useless washer when it is not necessary, and flutters and flutters about when it is necessary to speak. And, as I also said in that book, you must not think that he will go right under your eyes on one argument or rebuttal; but, as he did on this first rebuttal, so he does almost on all the others, as we shall hear.

(23) Therefore beware of them, or attack them freshly with this dissension and uncertainty of their speech and mind, and confidently require of them that they make thee a right, certain, united text in these words, "This is my body." If they do this, come confidently to them, and I will also give myself 3) gained. But because they do not do so, they shall be called false, heretics, seducers, and in addition to these things.

2) "to give oneself won" == to admit that one is defeated.

3) So the Jenaers. Wittenbergers and Erlangers: me too.

1) Thus the Wittenberg. In the Jenaer, with Walch and in the Erlanger "itself" is missing.

lost, even if they were still so stiff and proud. For even if their main thing and insanity were right and true, one would still have to have 'one, unified, correct, certain, unanimous text; because nothing can be built on an unstable, discordant, repugnant text. So my first objection still stands, that this sect has so many disunited heads, as a sign that Satan is master and spirit here.

(24) Secondly, I had requested that we also be shown from Scripture how the little word "is" means "interprets" in the Lord's Supper. For I had proved in my booklet that the Spirit in his previous writings did indeed lead some sayings from Scripture, in which "is" should mean "interprets"; but it would be his own conceit, and had not yet proved it. Therefore I desired that he should still do it, and prove his interpretation. For it is not very necessary for us that he should say sayings; we know such sayings almost as well as without his saying them, as: "Christ is the Rock" 2c. (Rom. 9, 33.) But that there is interpretation in it, we do not see and know, and would like that such would also come forth.

25 He now goes on, and does the same, but again he says such sayings as: "John is Elijah" [Matth. 11, 14], "Christ is a vine" 2c. [When this is done, he 1) clatters long and much with his own words, and smiles without Scripture, saying, "Here is interpretation. For John is not Elias, but interprets Eliam. But there you see that he does not want to prove how "is" should mean "interprets". He says that it means "interprets," but who asks that he says it? We know beforehand that he says so; but he should prove with Scripture that he says right.

26 And even though he himself almost feels that his Klüttern is just gibberish (as he takes great pains to speak bad German, though without such pains he would still be un-German enough), and confesses that his opinion is not to stand on it: whether "is" would be taken for "interprets", that therefore also here in the Lord's Supper should be taken that way;

but that, because other oerters of Scripture and faith compel that the words of the Lord's Supper may not have all our sense, let the "is" be taken for "interprets" with them, quia is sensus sit absurdus etiam fideli intellectui.

Yes, carnali intellectui. Now, how our understanding does not rhyme with Scripture and faith, they have not yet proved, and will see it further afterwards.

(27) But this is not to say that they would thus make the text of the Lord's Supper uncertain, and turn themselves out as thieves in secret; let them stand; and because they have taught that "is" means "signifies," let them prove it continually, and instead of the former certain text, which they would have broken up and made uncertain, let them set before us again a new certain one; as I also said above that they are bound to do. Because they now shy away from this and do not want to do it, they give it to be understood what kind of spirit they have, as one that only wants to break and not to build, to tear and not to heal; that is called the devil. Therefore be warned against this devil, who flutters and flutters so that he does not want to answer properly, and let him go.

28 But to instruct you further, as ours, you should know that it is a pure poem who says that this little word "is" means as much as "interprets. No man can ever prove it in any part of Scripture; indeed, I will say further, that if the enthusiasts in all the languages that are on earth bring a saying in which "is" means as much as "interprets," they shall have won. But they should leave it well alone; the high spirits are lacking in that they do not rightly regard the art of speech, grammatica, or, as they call it, tropus, which is taught in the children's school.

The same art teaches how a boy should make two or three words out of one word, or how he should give one word new usage and more interpretations. As that I prove with some examples, the word "flower", according to its first and old interpretation, means a rose, lily, violet and the like, which grows and blossoms from the earth. If I now want to praise Christ with a fine praise, and see how he is blossoming from the Virgin Mary

1) klüttert == rings.

If such a beautiful child comes, I may take the word "flower" and make a trope, or give a new interpretation and custom and say: Christ is a flower. Here all grammarians or masters of speech say that "flower" has become a new word and has a new interpretation, and is now no longer called the flower of the field, but the child Jesus, and must not here the word "is" become an interpretation, because Christ does not mean a flower, but, he is a flower; but another flower, than the natural.

30 For thus says the poet Horatius: 1) *Dixeris egregie, notum si callida verbum reddiderit junctura novum*; that is, it is finely spoken, if you can well deny a common word. From this it is clear that one word becomes two or many words when it receives a new interpretation over its common meaning. As "flower" is another word when it means Christ, and another when it means the natural rose and the like. Item, another, if it is called a golden, silver or wooden rose. Thus, when one speaks of a meager man: He is a dog; here "dog" means the meager felt, and has become a new word from the old word, according to the doctrine of Horatii; and need not be here "is" an interpretation, for the meager does not mean a dog.

(31) So then they speak in all languages, and change the words; as when we say, Mary is a morning glory, Christ is a fruit of the womb, the devil is a god of the world, the pope is Judas, St. Augustine is Paul, St. Bernard is a dove, David is a little woodworm, and so on, the Scriptures are full of such speech. And in grammar it is called tropus or metaphora when two things are given the same name for the sake that there is a likeness in both of them, and so the same name is one word according to the letter, but potestate ac significatione plura, according to power, custom, interpretation two words, one old and one new, as Horatius says and the children know well.

32 We Germans use to put "right", or "other", or "new" with such negated words and say: You are a right one.

Dog, the monks are right Pharisees, the nuns are right Moabite daughters, Christ is a right Solomon. Item, Luther is another Hus, Zwingel is another Korah, Oecolampad is a new Abiram. In such speeches all Germans will bear witness to me and confess that [they] are new words, and the same is so much when I say: Luther is Hus, Luther is another Hus, Luther is a right Hus, Luther is a "your Hus. So that one feels how in such speeches, according to the doctrine of Horatii, a new word is made from the previous one; for it does not work nor sound when I say: Luther means Hus; but: he is a Hus. In such sayings one speaks of the essence, what one is, and not what he means, and makes over his new essence also a new word. So you will find it in all languages, that I know for sure, and so teach all grammaticali, and know the boys in school, and will never find that "is" may mean "interpret".

33 Therefore, when Christ says: "John is Elias", no one can prove that John means Elias, because it would be ridiculous that John should mean Elias, as much cheaper Elias means John. And according to Zwingel's art Christ would have to turn it around and say: Elias is John, that is, he means Johannem. But Christ wants to say what John is; not what he means, but what kind of being or office he has, and says: he is Elias. Here Elias has become a new word, and does not mean the old Elias, but the new Elias, as we Germans say: John is the right Elias, John is another Elias, John is a new Elias. In the same way it is said: "Christ is a rock", that is, he has a being, and is truly a rock, but still a new rock, another rock, a right rock; item: "Christ is a right vine.

34 Dear, how does it work, if you want to interpret such things according to Zwingel's conceit: Christ means the right vine? Who then is the right vine that Christ signifies? So I hear, Christ should be a sign or interpretation of the wood in the vineyard? Oh, that would be fine! Why would not Christ have said so more cheaply?

The right vine is Christ, that is, the wooden vine means Christ? It is more reasonable that Christ should signify, than that he should signify first of all, since that which signifies is always less than that which is signified, and all signs are less than the thing they signify; as all this is well understood even by fools and children.

But the Zwingel does not look at the word *vera*. in this saying: "Christ is the right vine. If he had looked at it, he could not have made an interpretation of the "is". For no language nor reason suffers it to be said that Christ signifies the right vine. For no one can say that in this place the right vine is the wood in the vineyard. And so the text forces by force that "vine" here is a new word, which means another, new, right vine, and not the vine in the vineyard. Therefore, "is" here cannot be an interpretation, but Christ is real and has the nature of a true, new vine. Even though the text reads, "Christ is a vine," I do not mean to say that Christ means the vine, but rather that the vine should mean Christ.

So also this saying: "Christ is the Lamb of God" [Joh. 1, 29.], cannot be understood that Christ means the Lamb of God, because then Christ would have to be less than a sign than the Lamb of God. But what then is the Lamb of God that signifies Christ? Should it be the paschal lamb? Why did he not turn it around and say more cheaply: The Lamb of God is Christ, that is, "Paschal Lamb" means Christ, as Zwingel interprets? But because the little word "God" is next to the word "lamb", it forces by force that lamb here is another, new word, also means another, new and the right lamb, which is truly Christ, and not the old paschal lamb.

37. and so henceforth, what they lead more for examples, as: "The seed is God's word" [Luc. 8, 11. ff.], "the field is the world" 2c. [Matth. 13, 38.], they cannot make an interpretation out of the "is" with good reason; but the children in school say that seed is the world.

and Acker are Tropi or negated words after the Metaphora. Because Vocabulum Simplex et metaphoricum are not one, but two words. So seed here is not called grain nor wheat, but God's word, and field is called the world; for Christ (says the text itself) speaks in parables, and not of natural grain or wheat. But he that speaketh in parables *maketh* common words into common words, new and different words; otherwise they were not parables, where he used the common words in the former interpretation: That there is a foolish spirit without understanding, which will take the words in parables according to the common interpretation, contrary to the nature and manner of the parables, he must then gain by interpretation and jugglery.

Item, also the saying from the first book of Moses: "Seven oxen are seven years, and seven ears of corn are seven years. [Since the text itself says that it speaks of a dream, and of a likeness or sign of the seven years, the words "seven oxen, seven ears" must here also be *metaphorae* and new words, and mean just the same as these words "seven years"; that therefore these words "seven years" (according to common interpretation), and these words "seven oxen" (according to new interpretation) mean one and the same. For the seven oxen do not mean seven years, but they themselves are essentially and truly the seven years; for they are not natural oxen that eat grass in the pasture, which are called "seven oxen" by old common words. But here it is a new word, and are seven oxen of hunger and plenty, that is, seven years of hunger and plenty. Summa, they may well say, "Here is interpretation," but they will never prove it in any way, just as they have never yet had the courage to prove it; they think it is enough when they say, "Here is interpretation. But it is not enough for us, because we do not believe in a constraint or a few people; we want to have reason and proof.

39 But here the other group will perhaps boast and say: Hereby you will confirm the sign of Oecolampadii, because he, according to such a teaching of Horatii, also has a new word.

and *Tropum* makes of the common one, and says: "my body" here means "my body's sign". To this is soon answered: that the Grammarians, and also all Christian teachers, forbid that one should never depart from the common old interpretation of a word, and adopt a new interpretation, unless the text and the understanding compel, or are proved by force from other places of Scripture; otherwise one would never retain a certain text, understanding, speech, or language. As when Christ says: "John is Elijah"; here the text and faith compel that Elijah must be a new word, because it is certain that John is not nor can be the old Elijah. Item, "Christ is a rock", again the text itself and the faith force that "rock" here is a new word, because Christ is not nor can be a natural rock.

(40) That Oecolampad here makes the word "body" into "sign of the body" is not to be confessed to him, for he does it willfully, and cannot prove that the text or faith so compels. Just as if one would willfully tropisize or deny the words "The gospel is God's power," Rom. 11, 16, so much should apply: the gospel is Roland's sword. So if someone wants to call Christ Belial, Paul Judas or interpret, who wants to prevent him? But one does not accept it, he proves it then, and forces it from the text. So Oecolampad does not argue any further than that he makes vain bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. But if he already contends for the same (as he is not able to do), he still cannot contend nor prove that "body" means sign of the body, as I also indicated in the previous booklet, and thus Oecolampad must remain without certain text and understanding of the Lord's Supper. Now one must have a certain text and understanding here, even if there should be straw and chaff in the Lord's Supper. But who will give the same? They do not, do not want to, and cannot.

(41) Well then, let us stick to 1) ours, and admonish all who wish to be admonished to beware of such uncertain, unstable tropists and dentists;

For it is not enough that they say: bread is bread, and wine is wine, but they must and should prove how the text is to be read and understood, "this is my body", whether it should thus stand: this means my body, or: this is my body's sign; or: this is my body. We do not let ourselves make a child's game or small things (as they like to do) out of this text. They are Christ's words, we must know what they hold and give. Summa, it is as I said, they do not want to answer where they should answer, and in the meantime they chat about their own thoughts.

42. to the third: Although the spirit of the covenants 2) knows well that I understand by God's grace how one must explain one place of the Scriptures by another, as I, before Zwingel's name arose, have stated in so many writings before all the world: nevertheless, he must teach me this through almost many leaves, only so that one should think that he wants to answer once. Now God knows that I have answered all my objections, and have not desired such art from him, nor do I know how to thank him for it. But that is what I would like even today, that he teaches himself and his own, who would be better off than I, such an art, and also shows it in the text of the Last Supper, since 3) it is necessary for him.

(43) He scolded me for doing the part "this is my body" alone, and leaving the following "which is given for you," and washed horribly how that following part explained the previous part. Well, I understand very well that one place explains the other; so I was in the bath the other day, and washed my ears, so that I can hear how in the text of the Last Supper the following piece "which is given for you" should explain the preceding piece "this is my body. But I ask, how such explanation is proved or comes about? There hear once a master, you have never heard one.

44) Christ's body (he says) is visibly given for us on the cross; because in the Lord's Supper it says: "This is my body, which is given for you", it should also be 4) visibly given in the Lord's Supper.

2) i.e. flush.

3) In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlanger: that.

4) So the Jena. Wittenberg and Erlanger: had to.

1) Thus the Erlangen. In the old editions: den.

If the same body, given for us, is to be the Lord's Supper, So the following piece explains the first, 1) that because

Christ is not visible in the Lord's Supper, "is" must be an interpretation. Here tell me, dear brethren, whether this spirit is in earnest to answer us, or whether he does not rather make a mockery of this matter. But I thank thee, Jesus Christ, my Lord, that thou canst so masterfully see thine enemies in their own words, and put them to shame to strengthen our faith in thy simple words. This few pieces should reasonably deter anyone from this sect, when he sees such great gross blindness in such a high learned spirit. The boys in school know the quod refert substantiam, and this spirit says: quod refert qualitatem imo accidens communissimum et mutabilissimum. I have to speak German.

45, If and where I can say of Christ's body: "this is Christ's body, given for us", then it must also be visible: because it is given for us in no other way than visibly; but if it is not visibly there, then it is not there at all 2). Now point with my hand toward heaven, and say these words: There sits at the right hand of God the body that was given for us, so it must truly sit there visibly, or there is nothing at all. For the following words "which is given for you" thus declare, according to the art of this spirit. Item: Since Christ Joh. 8, 59. hid himself and went out to the temple- would like to say: There goes the body, which is given for us, but it is given visibly for us, therefore it certainly goes visibly there, and the evangelist lies when he says that it goes hidden there, or will not be there at all. And summa: Christ's body be where he will, it is the body that is given for us. Because he is visibly given for us, he cannot be anywhere, unless he is visibly there. What do you think? Did you once hear a master? Thou hast scripture and faith which our understanding cannot endure. Now believe this spirit, that he may teach thee rightly in the Lord's Supper. But so the devil must always keep his wisdom....

1) In the old editions: föddexst.

2) Erlanger: nothing.

and leave the stink behind, so that it will be known that it was there.

46 Therefore the poor body of Christ, because it is once visibly given for us, is so imprisoned that either it cannot be anywhere invisible; or, if it is invisible, it is not there. For where this hinders him to be in the Lord's Supper, that he is visibly given for us, and cannot be otherwise than visibly there, because the words are there, "This is my body which is given for you," he must of course be nowhere but visibly; for such declaration these words give, "Which is given for you." What does "He" mean? "The One?" The spirit says: It means as much as, as, or the form, as he hung on the cross. Now he hung there visibly before the eyes of the Jews, under spikes and steeds. If he were in the Lord's Supper, all the Jews, horses, spears, crosses, nails, and everything else would also have to be in the Lord's Supper, yes, also at the right hand of God and in all places where Christ's body is.

(47) Thus shall the scripture be expounded, and one place shall be judged by another. They are angry that I consider the devil to be speaking through them. Dear, how can reason say here that [it] is human error and not the devil's mockery? Especially because the Zwingel makes such great art, spirit, and blather out of it, as if it were one of his best main reasons and masterpieces. Muenzer was a foolhardy spirit; but this one is so foolhardy, spews out what falls into his mouth, does not even think what he says. But God warns us thus.

(48) Is it not to be pitied, then, that for such a trivial false reason one should deny the bright words of Christ, "This is my body," and thus profane the Lord's Supper? If a boy in school made such a syllogism, he would be given a shilling; 3) if a master among the sophists did it, he would have to be called a donkey; and here, in the spirit, it should be called divine Scripture and truth, of which they boast highly against our understanding. So one would also do such spirituality and say: Christ at the right hand of God is the Son, who was born of Mary; but He is

3) This is no doubt ironically spoken instead of: "Schelle" (Maulschelle).

born of Mary mortal, he must also sit mortal at the right hand of God. Herr Hans Ritter does not ride in a cuirass, therefore he is not a knight. Rachel has no veil on, therefore Rachel is no woman, *Juxta regulam novam: accidens est substantia, nec potest abesse suo subjecto.*

In the fourth place he comes to the words of the Lord's Supper, and divides them into two parts. Out of some he makes a command, which tells us what to do or command, as these: "Take, eat. Out of some he makes speech or conversation, which tells us badly what is to be done. But here I must use his filthy, hostile German, which he likes much better than the stork's rattling, although one would sweat before he understood it. He wants to have stammered or coughed (I should say talked) so much: Where God gives, there are hot words, like: "You shall have no other gods" [Deut. 5, 7. 2 Deut. 20, 3.]. But where he does something, there are actually words, as Gen. 1, 14: "Let there be light" 2c. So he would like to say so much, if he could speak: Wherever there are words, even if I speak them, nothing will come of them, as if I speak from Genesis 1: "Let there be sun and moon," nothing will come of it. So even if Christ gave his body in the Lord's Supper when he said, "This is my body," it does not follow, if I repeat it, that Christ's body will also become his body immediately; for Christ has nowhere said that from my word his body will become 2c.

50 O poor wretched spirit, how he wrestles and writhes, and yet has nowhere to turn! Now, we first assume that he admits that Christ gave his body to the disciples in the Lord's Supper; for he confesses that these are the words: "This is my body," which happened that time, and we thank them kindly for letting us keep the first part of the Lord's Supper. But if we have this, let the others also remain with us. We also want to take the same first supper from them with force and by their own words, in this way:

51 Zwingli keeps the words in the Lord's Supper the same as he wants, it may be hot words or lassel words, Thätelworte or Leselworte; since

I have no interest in them. But this is what I ask: whether these words of Christ are lies or true words? If they are lying words, then Christ himself is responsible for them, and they do not concern us. But if they are true words, we cheerfully answer that even the spirit of error must confess that Christ gave his body in the Lord's Supper; for they are words of truth, which Christ speaks for the first time, and does not deny when he says: "Take, eat, this is my body" 2c. Just as the sun and the moon stood there when he spoke Genesis 1:14: "Let there be sun and moon," and was not a lying word: so his word is certainly not an epilogue, but a word of power, which creates what it says, Psalm 33:9: "He speaks, so it is written"; especially because it is spoken here for the first time, and is supposed to be a phalanx word. Thus we have received the first few suppers, which they themselves also give and confess.

Now let us also see how the tender spirit, from the words of the word, 1) wants to make "is" a word of interpretation and take our understanding. Where words are used, it does not follow that this is what happens when we speak them, but remains bad speech about what has happened. If we say in the Lord's Supper: "This is my body," it does not become Christ's body. Therefore, of course, there must be bread of the same kind. If there is vain bread, then "is" must be an interpretation. So our understanding is nothing, and the enthusiast is right. Here he does not dispute further, because in the first supper our understanding is right, but not in the other following 2c. If I now ask here: who has given the Spirit the power, or by what means he wants to prove that the words in the Lord's Supper should thus be separated and separated from one another, some hot words, some pent-up words: then he gives no other answer, but says: he hopes that no one may say that in the Lord's Supper there are hot words, by which one makes Christ's body. Thus his proof is based on his hope, which always boasts that it is based on God's Word and bright Scripture. Whoever now wants to build on the hope of the spirit, may at least believe that there is vain bread in the

1) Thus the Wittenberg and Jena editions. In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlangen edition: "aus dem Thätelworte."

The Lord's Supper: for such faith shall have just cause.

(53) But we say against this, that this spirit teacheth us once which we know, and leaveth that which he ought to teach, and needeth sacrilege to divide and separate the words of the Lord's Supper thus. He should prove that they are to be torn apart from one another in this way, since they all stand in one place after another: "Take, eat, this is my body," 2c., and are not our words at all, but Christ's own words.

54 Although these words, "This is my body," would themselves be words of the baptism, where they would be forced out and set apart in a dungeon from the others, they are nevertheless hot words, because they are embodied in hot words. For I also hope, indeed I know, that all Christians are guilty, from the institution and commandment of Christ, of speaking such words in the Lord's Supper, and do not think the revelers themselves so bold as to leave them outside with a clear conscience. If they must be had and spoken in the Lord's Supper, then they are truly hot words, because they are put into 1) hot words, and it is not valid to separate them from the hot words, as the spirit does. But when the words of the sacraments are thus put into hot words, they are no longer bad words of the sacraments, but also hot words, for everything they say is also done by the power of the divine hot words by which they are spoken.

55. as Matth. 21, 21. there is a word that the disciples should say: "Lift yourself up and throw yourself into the sea", which, if someone speaks badly, certainly follows nothing from it and remains a word. But since Christ puts it into a hot word and says, "If you will say with faith to this mountain, 'Lift yourself up,'" 2c., then it truly no longer has to be a word for the purpose of baptism, but happens as it reads when it is spoken according to his command. Item, when the priest baptizes and says, "I baptize you," 2c., this is certainly a mere word of baptism; but because it is put into the hot word, where Christ says [Matth. 28, 19.], "Go and baptize," it must be

1) Thus the Wittenberg. Jenaer and Erlanger: in.

nevertheless be a baptism before God. And if Peter or Paul said: "Your sins are forgiven you", as Christ said to Mary Magdalene [Luc. 7, 48.], well, that is a loud word; nevertheless, the sins are forgiven, as the words say; therefore, that [it] is commanded in the hot word, since Christ says Joh. 20, 22. 23: "Take the Holy Spirit, to whom you forgive sin" 2c.

And if the word Genesis 1: "Let there be a moon and a sun," would also be put into a hot word and commanded to be spoken, then you should see whether God would lie and not become a sun, where I would speak it to the sterile or sky. But now that there is no hot word, it will certainly not become a sun.

So also, if a hot word were, that I should speak to the water these words, "this is wine," thou shouldst well see whether there should not be wine. Therefore it is a loud division of wills 2) and useless chatter, that this spirit separates the words of the bawd from the words of the beast in one and the same text, since they are taught and commanded to be spoken to the words of the beast, and equates them with other words of the beast, which are without command and are words of the beast. This is called acting sophistically and maliciously in God's words; but with them it is called Scripture and faith, which our understanding does not like.

(58) Since this does not prove an interpretation, nor does it overthrow our understanding, let us now ask whether Christ has called us liars, since he commands and calls us to speak these words: "Take, eat, this is my body," because they are all spoken in his person and as his own words? If he calls us liars, then he watches; but if he calls us truthful speakers, then his body must of course be present in the Lord's Supper, by virtue, not of our speaking, but of his commanding, heating and working. And so we have not only the first and only supper, but all the others, which are kept according to the command and institution of the Lord Christ.

59. if then they ask, Where is the power that makes Christ's body in the Lord's Supper, when

2) Erlanger twice: Tillens.

we say: "This is my body"? I answer: Where is the power for a mountain to rise and throw itself into the sea, when we say: "Lift yourself and throw yourself into the sea"? Certainly, it is not in our speaking, but in God's hotness, who connects His hotness to our speaking. Item, where is the power for water to come out of the rock, because Moses does nothing but strike it? If striking should be enough, then we would also make all the stones water; but there is God's command and Moses has nothing, because he may speak the word: I strike the rock. Which I also could speak well and follows nevertheless only water; because the hot word is with Moses and not with me.

(60) So also here: If I were to say about all the bread, "This is Christ's body," of course nothing would follow from it. But when we say in the Lord's Supper, "This is my body," according to its institution and sanctification, it is his body, not because of what we say or do, but because of its sanctification, that he has thus commanded us to speak and to do, and has bound his sanctification and doing to our speaking. If, however, according to the Spirit's highly praised art, God's command and our speaking were to be torn apart from one another, then he would not be allowed to teach us, as then our speaking would be of no avail, as we would well know. But then he should answer and prove art, where hot and speaking are together, that God would have to lie and deceive, and nothing would come of it. 1) The great spirit must always speak differently than one asks or the matter demands.

But if I had intended to write against the Spirit, I would also do here a strange question, namely, because the Spirit fights so high: *Quod verbum facti non efficiat factum, sed narret factum*, that the word does not create what it reads, but only preaches about the business. So he admittedly confesses that it happened in the first supper of Christ, that Christ's body was given to the table; what else could he torture himself with, as these are words of the word, that is, that speak of history. It would be quite a vain babble, because he puts it all on the fact that words of tidings are the

are those who say of the deed that it happened once (otherwise they would not be words). Well then, the Spirit herewith confesses that in the first supper Christ's body was given to eat, and such a thing happened once; but it has no consequence where it is spoken of afterwards, as he does not deny it above.

62 Now I ask where this spirit has left forehead, reason, discipline and shame? if he says above that his reason and cause that Christ's body is not in the Lord's Supper is that the Scriptures and faith may not suffer such understanding of Christ's words: *Absurditas hujus sensus repugnaret intellectui etiam fidei*. Can the first supper have Christ's body, how can it be contrary to Scripture and faith? If it is contrary to Scripture and faith that Christ's body is in the Lord's Supper, how can he be in the first supper? For I speak not here of unworthy ministers, whether they confect or not, but of the words of Christ, "This is my body," of which they say, cry, and prate, that it is contrary to faith and scripture that Christ's body should be there, as they [the words] are, though there were saints of the same kind.

(63) And yet here again the spirit bites its tongue, and admits that it is not contrary to Scripture nor to faith, that, according to its sound, Christ's body is present in the first supper; but only that it does not follow that therefore it is also in other suppers. So they should not cry out and boast that our understanding is contrary to Scripture and faith (as they so gloriously insist), but contrary to the consequence and other communions. For this is much another question, whether I or thou have Christ's body in the Lord's Supper, and whether the old understanding is contrary to Scripture and faith. If it is not contrary to Scripture and faith, as the first supper proves, even with the confession of the Spirit, then we ask very kindly that they grant us to teach and believe, which they themselves confess contrary to themselves, that it is not contrary to Scripture or faith. But if they have Scripture and faith against it, that they themselves would answer it, as they so nearly strive against such their confession. We are told that they themselves admit that it is not against

contrary to scripture and faith, how they chatter, so that they reveal themselves as the liars, and cannot hide their false sense.

64 Because we here seize the lying spirit, that it lies against itself, and confesses to us that our understanding is not against Scripture nor faith (as it nevertheless denies), that Christ's body is in the Lord's Supper, but only against the consequence: so we will stay with it. For since it is not contrary to Scripture or faith that the words of Christ, according to our understanding, give Christ's body in the first supper, we see no reason why it should be contrary to Scripture and faith in other suppers. What is not contrary to Scripture and faith is not contrary to any consequence.

(65) Is not this a fine, cautious spirit? In the very passage in which he wants to prove that our understanding is contrary to faith, he takes before him and proves that words of the baptism are in the Lord's Supper, and does not see that he thereby proves against himself that our understanding in the first Supper is right and not contrary to faith. For words of the baptism first give what they say, or are not words of the baptism, as he himself confesses. So he smuggles against himself, either that there are no baptismal words in the first supper, or that our understanding is right in the first supper.

(66) But if anyone should say, Christ did not command these words to be spoken in the Lord's Supper, "This is my body," answer, This is true; it is not written in the text, You shall speak: This is my body; nor is there a hand painted pointing to it. But let them be so bold as they will, that they let such words stand without and for unbidden words. For it is not written in the text: Ye shall say: Take and 'eat; item: It does not say: You shall take the bread and bless 2c. But let it be seen who will be so bold as to say, Ye shall not take bread, nor bless it, nor say, Take and eat.

67 So I hear that Christ must put these words by every letter, Thus shall ye speak and do, and shall it not be enough that he should say at the end, Do this in remembrance of me? If we shall do such things as he hath done, verily, then

we must take the bread and bless it, break it and give it, and say: "This is my body", because it is all put into the hot word "Such things do", and we do not have to leave the words outside; because St. Paul also says, "he received it from the Lord, and so gave it to us" 2c. 1 Cor. 11, 23. ff. Which, of course, are also hot words, and do not allow us to tweak or change some of them.

68 So it is true that nowhere did Christ tell us these letters: "You shall make my body out of bread. What need is there? But he has told us to speak these words in his person and name, out of his command and decree, "This is my body," since he says, "Do this." Neither do we make his body of the bread, as the Spirit leans upon us. Neither do we say that his body is made of the bread; but we say that his body, which was made long ago, is here, when we say, "This is my body," for Christ does not say, "This is my body," or, "Make my body," but, "This is my body."

69 And because we have spoken of the hot words, we must do something else to protect our people against the chatter of the spirits. For it is not possible to shut the devil's mouth; he is like the wind, which finds (as they say) very narrow holes. 1) Hot words are of two kinds, some of which involve faith, such as Matt. 21:21, about moving mountains, and Marc. 16:17, about the signs that follow the faithful. Now if someone without faith were to say to the mountain, "Lift yourself up," and say that he was doing it from the word of God, it would not happen, because Christ binds faith into the word of God.

70 The others are not included, since faith is not involved, as these words in the Lord's Supper: "Take, eat," for here also the unworthy and unbelieving eat Christ's body, as also Judas and many of the Corinthians did. Therefore it is not necessary for those who take this supper to have faith, just as those who baptize do not have to believe. Item,

1) Erlanger: "gar enge Löcher, (as they say)."

Those who preach the same, and all those who hold public office: for Christ has put all these things in his word, and not in men's holiness, that we might be assured of the word and of the sacraments 2c. This is why I say that the greatest annoyance is of course the enthusiasts who baptize the unworthy, celebrate mass, preach 2c., and do not consider that they themselves may be worse before God, or that no one can ever know how pious they are, that they must let the sacraments stand and go in God's words and command alone.

71 After this he points my finger, as a blind man, to the word "such", or "that doeth", which St. Paul is supposed to explain thus: "As often as ye eat the bread" 2c. From this he wants to have decided that Christ, by the word "that doeth," points to eating bread, and not to eating Christ's body. Indeed, if St. Paul were to say: "As often as you eat this bread, which is not the body of Christ (which the Spirit adds from his head), do not put your finger on it, I would have seen it long since over five steps. I always hope they should lead scripture; so they lead their own dreams. Therefore I say again: I would also like them to put their fingers on the previous word, since Christ points to the bread, and yet says: "This is my body." There is also a "that" here, and they would gladly let themselves be grasped with the fingers of the enthusiast's spirit, which urges me harder and more powerfully that Christ's body be eaten in the bread, because his "that," by which he wants to make bread vain, since my "that" and his "that" point to the same bread, as they confess, and yet with my "that" it says "it is my body", but with his "that" it does not say "it is not my body", but he himself must put it with it, and jumps over that which is with my "that", the faithful diligent scribe.

Now let all the world be judge between me and this spirit, which bread shall give way to the other. My bread has with it the text: "Eat, this is my body," and declares itself with expressed words that this bread is the body of Christ. The bread of the Spirit has with it the text, "Do this," or "as often as you eat the bread," and does not declare itself to be vain.

The Spirit must amend the text, and say: it is not Christ's body, as he then has commanded to do; yes, from the devil! If then one "that" is to give way to the other, let its "that" give way to mine, as it is bare and naked, without explanation, but mine has its explanation with it, or else it must sweat in another way, if it is to prove that my "that" is to give way to its "that"; with pointing fingers it is lost.

73 And if he were willing and faithful, he should not show us with his fingers how his "this" points to bread; we would probably find this without his spirit, explanation, and art; but he should first reject this text: "Eat, this is my body"; if it were rejected that bread was not preached as Christ's body, then we ourselves would know that his "this" should point to the same bread. But since he does not do this, it is *petitio principii*, and lost chatter, that he should not answer, since one asks and desires, as I always complain. For we say that where the first "this" points to the body of Christ, his "this" afterwards 1) must also point to it; because both "this" points to bread, and yet the first at the same time brings Christ's body, as the words read: "Eat, this is my body.

74 We do not admit him to say that where Christ says, "these things," or "these things do," it is as much as when Paul says, "As often as ye eat this bread. The Spirit says it, but he does not prove it, as is his way. For these words, "as often as ye eat this bread," 2c., speak only of eating and drinking. Now if another spirit were as quarrelsome as this spirit, he would probably want to argue that one should not take, give thanks, break, give, and bless the bread, but only eat it, as the words say, and thus grasp the bread with the mouth from the table, or bite it out of the oven. But if the words "as often as ye eat this bread" can suffer that it must be taken, broken, given thanks and blessed: Dearly beloved, they shall also suffer the other certain piece, which is the blessing, when Christ saith, This is my body. 2c. But if the same some part shall not be suffered in it; then

1) Erlanger: after and.

I also want to argue just as powerfully that, according to the letter, one should eat it alone, not take it, not break it, not bless it, not give it. For St. Paul does not say, "As often as you take this bread, break it, give thanks, or give," but only, "As often as you eat it.

Seest thou how fine a thing it is to patch and burst oneself thus with letters? And such things must then be called the Scriptures, which are contrary to our understanding. Therefore we say that Christ, by the word "these things" or "that doeth," does not command the eating of bread alone, but the whole text of the Lord's Supper, and St. Paul also, though he alone sets the letters of the eating of bread; for he certainly intended to call the eating of bread as Christ set it, and not as the swarming spirit fools, though he could not comprehend such a manner in the letter "eating of bread," but he had taught it before in many words enough.

In the fifth place, he wants to prove that our understanding is contrary to faith, and once again he has much to do to teach us how Christ died for us. For the Spirit must always teach me what I have taught so long and often, and in the meantime leap over when he should answer. For I well know, by the grace of God, that our faith is as Christ redeemed us from sins by his suffering; all this he ought not to teach us. But how our mind is against such faith in the Lord's Supper, as it throbs and boasts, I would very much like to hear; there my dear spirit is silent as a mouse, yes, it leaps over as a deer. But that he says, If one teaches that Christ's body eating bodily forgives sin, 2c. that is against faith, I answer, "I truly think so too; indeed, I have said more, namely, that Christ's body eating bodily, without spirit and faith, is poison and death. To what then does the spirit answer, or against whom does it contend? Do you also think that he is in his right mind, who wants to fight against Luther, and fights against no one?

For let it be understood that Christ's body is not eaten in the Lord's Supper because of our sin, how does it follow that his body is not eaten in the Lord's Supper, or that it is contrary to faith? If Christ therefore

I will also conclude from this art that it is against the faith that Christ is in heaven, and I will lead all the sayings of this spirit thus: St. Paul does not say that Christ went to heaven for our sin, but that he was crucified for our sin; therefore he is not in heaven, nor does he forgive sin there. Item, Paul does not say: Christ was born for our sin, nor did he live; but died: therefore he was not born, nor did he live. All the same as the Spirit here casts, Christ's body is not eaten for our sin, but died for our sin; therefore it is not to be eaten in the Lord's Supper. So let us make of Christ nothing but one who eternally suffers on the cross for our sin, lest we act contrary to faith, believing in other articles that Christ is there and forgives sin, which this Spirit alone wants to have on the cross.

The blind mad spirit does not know that *meritum Christi* and *distributio meriti* are two things, and mixes them together like an impure sow. Christ once earned forgiveness of sins on the cross and purchased it for us; but he distributes it where he is, every hour and in every place, as Lucas writes Cap. 24, 46. f. Thus it is written, that Christ suffered, and rose again the third day (there is his merit), and preached repentance and remission of sins in his name" (there is his merit); therefore we say, that in the Lord's supper there is remission of sins, not because of the food, or that Christ there merits or acquires remission of sins; but because of the word, by which he distributes such acquired remission among us, and says: "This is my body, which is given for you." Here you hear that we eat the body given for us, and hear and believe this in the meal; therefore forgiveness of sins is distributed there, which was nevertheless obtained at the cross.

79 Otherwise, I would also want to deceive, as the Spirit does, and say, "Christ has not redeemed us through our preaching; therefore it is against faith that one should receive forgiveness of sins.

sins in preaching. Where, then, should we seek them, since Christ says that the forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name? For Christ did not redeem us by faith; therefore it is contrary to faith to seek forgiveness of sins by faith. Wherefore then shall we seek it, seeing Christ saith, He that believeth shall be saved [Marc. 16:17]. Item: Christ did not save us through our baptism, therefore it is against faith whoever seeks remission of sins in baptism. Dear, why then does Paul call baptism a washing away of sins? Christ has not redeemed us through the Holy Spirit; therefore it is contrary to faith to seek forgiveness of sins from the Holy Spirit. Dear, where then? But he who is blind must see nothing. The spirit has been misled and blinded by the sacrament, therefore he does not need to know any part of the Christian doctrine. But we know that Christ died for us once, and such a death he passes on 1) through preaching, baptizing, the Spirit, reading, believing, eating, and as he pleases, where he is and what he does.

80 I have so diligently written in the next booklet how our Lord's Supper has two parts, namely, word and food, and how the word demands faith and spiritual food, besides the bodily, and I have asked them to prove how it is contrary to faith. The spirit is still allowed to shout out these lies so often in all books, that I do not teach spiritual food nor faith, but only bodily food. Read my booklet, and you will have to say that this spirit is a false, lying spirit, who blames me for teaching forgiveness of sins only through the bodily eating of the body of Christ, if he knows and has read otherwise. For he alone seeks to chat with such lies, that he only need not answer, as our understanding is contrary to faith. Well, with such tricks they will not take away our understanding, but rather strengthen us, because they attack us with public lies. For we do not believe that Christian faith and public lies are one thing.

1) In the old editions: "he hands out."

(81) In the same way, I have written diligently against the heavenly prophets, how the history and custom of Christ's suffering is not one thing, *factum et applicatio facti, seu factum et usus facti*. For Christ's suffering happened only once on the cross; but to whom would this be useful, if it were not divided up, applied and brought into 2) use? But how should it come into use and be distributed without Word and Sacrament? But why should such high spirits read my little books? They know better. Well then, they also have this to reward them, that they consider *factum et usum* to be one, and make fools and disgraces of themselves about it; they do not see that in the Lord's Supper *usus passionis et non factum passionis* is acted upon. It serves them right who read nothing, or read beyond what is written against them, with great arrogance and certainty.

The impotent spirit should prove that Christ's body is not in the Lord's Supper; he leaves that pending 3) and proves that we are not redeemed by eating his body, but by his suffering. Who would know such a new art if the Spirit did not produce it now? It is the Spirit's way, he must spit out other things, because one asks, and always teach us what we know, so that he does not have to prove what he has done and is guilty of, but so that he always strengthens us the more, as a spirit fleeing from the field, which must not go right under the eyes of its opposite. We know well that Christ did not redeem us by our food, and no one has ever heard it otherwise from us; but that it should follow from this that there is only bread in the Lord's Supper, we would be eager to hear that, and would praise the Spirit if he proved it.

That he is also angry when we warn that one should not ask how it is that Christ's body is in the Lord's Supper, but should believe the words of God, which we have not done to the simple (for they must not), but to the arrogant, and even to the enthusiasts themselves. But as they will, let them search and rise; only that they may do enough for their glory, and prove how our understanding is contrary to faith;

2) The old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: *im*.

3) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jena and Erlangen: *stand*.

Which they will do on the day of the devil's ascension. But "I leave the world and go to the Father"; item, Joh. 17, 11: we can see that they become public liars above their "I am no longer in the world, but they are in the world", and research and dispute what they themselves invent and no what is more of the sayings, since Christ is preached to be one teaches. It is to be noted that they rise too high and in heaven. Well, this we also believe and say, and would get the spirit of deceit, that they finally take quod pro have been no need to teach us. But this would be needless qualiter; item, mix factum unb usum into each other, like to teach, that because Christ is in heaven, his body cannot be in the Lord's Supper. If they were to prove this the right sow cooks, in addition to which they are divided among themselves and become uncertain in all their ways, and always fall from one error into the other without stopping. Such shall be the reward of those who do not believe God's word, but seek it out. were contrary to our understanding. Now we are always taught with much verbiage that we know, and masterfully silent that we demand; therefore we must remain on our understanding.

In the sixth place, he wants to prove how the Scriptures are also against our understanding. The first is this very saying: "This is my body, which was given for you. Now it is not true that his body is as it was given for us, for it is visibly given for us. To this is answered above, how the Spirit makes of quod quale, vitiosissimo syllogismo, in quo quatuor termini, nullum dici de omni, nulla praedicatio in quid aut distributio, and much other *vitia*, as the Logici well know that sub termino substantiali non potest subsumi accidentalis. Such, however, is called Scripture and God's word in this spirit.

In other words, we do not say that in the Lord's Supper Christ's body is given to us in the same form or shape (for who would say that?), but that it is the same body that is given to us, not in the same form or shape, but in the same essence and nature. Now the same being can be visible here and invisible there. Oh, it is the work of fools! They do not want to answer us, but they only want to talk and boast uselessly.

86) Item, it should be against the text: "As often as you eat the bread" 2c.; because here "this" points to bread, so should it there, "this is my body", point to the same bread 2c. Answer: it does not have to do anything everywhere, nor is such a must proven; but above we have proven the contradiction that both "this" points to bread, which is Christ's body, and neither to vain common bread.

Item, Marci 16, 19.: "The Lord is taken up to heaven"; item [Joh. 16, 28.]:

(87) And what is meant by "being in the world" is explained by Christ Himself in Luc. 24:44, when He says: "These are the words that I spoke to you while I was still with you. How? Is he not with them? and yet eats with them after his resurrection? But certainly he is no longer with them, as he was with them before, mortal, and who had to need this life in the world, as Paul 1 Cor. 15, 44. speaks of the natural and spiritual man. But from this it cannot be proved that he therefore should not be there in the flesh. For, as it is said, he sat and ate and talked with them, and yet is not in the world. So also: "You always have the poor with you, but you do not always have me with you. What is meant by "with you" is given by the text itself, and is well to be reckoned, namely, as the poor are with us, so he is not with us. And so henceforth, 1) what they of the Proverbs more bring forward, is soon said: Christ is not with us, as the poor, mortal and worldly.

(88) Therefore, they cannot yet say that our understanding is contrary to Scripture, but it is to use Zwingel's logic, substantiam pro accidente, quod pro qualiter; as if I said, Christ is not in some form in the Lord's Supper, therefore he is not bodily in it. Christ is not with us in some form, therefore he is not with us in all things, fresh a particulari ad universale.

1) In the punctuation, we have followed Zwingli's counter-writing, which there in § 152 crtit this passage. In the editions, the words "und so fortan" are added to the previous one and followed by a period.

The sheriff is not in the bath with red pants, therefore he is not in the bath. The king does not sit crowned over tables, therefore he does not sit over tables. This is children's play and jiggery-pokery, as the schools well know; but with the spirits such must be Scripture and Christian faith.

(89) And if they stand on these sayings, that Christ is no longer with us, they must also conclude that Christ is not with us spiritually either; for the words stand dry: "I am no longer with you" [John 16:4, 12:8, 17:11], which means that he is not with us at all. Yes, they say, we have clear sayings against him being with us spiritually, such as John 14:23: "We will make our abode with him"; and Paul Eph. 3:17: "Christ dwells in your hearts" 2c. Answer: Dear, can they find such sayings against those: how can they not find the text in the Lord's Supper against the same? If Christ can be with them in some ways, so that the text does not hinder them, "I am not with you"; he can also be with us in the Lord's Supper, so that the same text does not hinder us, "I am not with you"; but if such a text does not overthrow their sayings about the spiritual nature of Christ, it does not overthrow our text in the Lord's Supper about the invisible nature either.

90 Thus their objection is as strong against them as it is against us, and by their working themselves loose, they make us loose also, and our mind remains firm, "This is my body. For if they prove many things with their sayings, they prove that Christ in the Lord's Supper is not visible, mortal, and worldly; which is not at all necessary to prove, for we confess all these things. But that which they should prove, namely, that our understanding is false, and that Christ lies when he says, "This is my body," no one wants to come to that, they are vain, fleeting, fluttering spirits; meanwhile they cheat a lot of good paper with useless, futile words, and fool the poor, simple Christian.

91) What he then says about the Passover, since Paul calls 1 Cor. 5, 7 Christ a Passover, and wants to conclude from this: just as Christ in that place is not the natural Passover, but per tropum a new Passover; thus

Even in these words, "This is my body," a tropus, nothing is said. For it is known beforehand from himself that it does not follow whether there is a *tropus* in a place, that therefore there is also a *tropus* here; but one should prove such a consequence, and we have written enough about the *tropis* above. It is all to be done to the mind, that it may only write a book, and court its own, that it may not answer what it ought and owes, and yet have a standing as if it answered. He is to prove that our understanding is contrary to the Scriptures; so he teaches us that Christ is Passover, that is, he is a transgression. Let them speak and do as they will, for this does not answer how our understanding is contrary to the Scriptures.

(92) After this the Spirit is very wroth, because I have mocked their preaching so cheerfully, and reproacheth me evil. But to rebuke and to be angry, or to rage, is not scripture with us, which is against our understanding. But he that cannot answer, rageth and rageth justly, as that mother taught her child: Dear child, if thou canst not win, bear grudges. I have thrown the shillelagh among the dogs, and by the shouting I know which one I have hit.

It reminds me of the spirit, as if a mad man had a crossbow, and took the winds with great shouting and being, and stretched the crossbow, threatened with excellent words to split the iron nail in the blade 1) and did not put an arrow on it because of great haste and joy, and thus pressed it, and when he heard the string click, threw the crossbow around, and said: There it is, the nail is broken. And when the others laughed and said that there was no arrow, he peeled it so that they would not consider it an arrow. This spirit does the same: with great splendor he pretends to answer and to hit, and always forgets the arrows, so that he does not even answer correctly. But nevertheless he likes the rattling of the mouth, and wants to think that it was an arrow, and has shot the nail in the leaf. But we are used to such foolish shots; even if they put an arrow on the crossbow, we still want to be sure that they will be shot before the arrow hits the nail.

1) Leaf - the disc. The "nail" the Centrum.

into the ashes, or shoot three cubits over the rampart before they hit us.

94. as when they say the words of St. Paul, Col. 3:1, 2: "If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God; be mindful of those things which are above, and not of those things which are on earth. There, there, you carnivores and blood drinkers, hear that Christ's body is not to be sought in the Sacrament; for the Sacrament is on earth, so Christ is above at the right hand of God.

Here it is not necessary for the Spirit to show us what St. Paul means by "on earth," since the power lies in this saying; but rushes over, plops down, as their conceited spirit drives them. If I now say, Why then do they go to the preaching and seek the gospel? Item, why do they keep the Lord's Supper? Why do they love and do good to their neighbor? Father, mother, master, servant, and our neighbor are all on earth; so let us not seek them, honor, obey, serve, or love anyone. Is it not fine? Is not all this on earth? And St. Paul says, "Do not seek what is on earth. Truly the apostles did all wrong in following Christ, for he was on earth, and Christ himself comes on earth, even Paul himself preaches and visits Christians now and then on earth. What do you think? Have they not strained the saying?

But now we are used to the devil, that he only mocks us, and out of great arrogance does not esteem us worthy to whom he should answer, as otherwise he can get enough disciples with useless mocking. So we accept his mockery again, and offer him defiance against it, that he overthrows our understanding with mockery, and let it be a strength of our faith, because he can muster nothing against us but his melancholy, impotent mockery.

97 St. Paul calls "on earth" the earthly life, as the world lives, in fornication and all kinds of immorality. For he speaks of the killing of the old Adam, as his words stand there, and brightly read: "Have you died with Christ" [Col. 3, 1]. And afterwards v. 5: "Mortify therefore your members which are of the earth, fornication, uncleanness, unchastity, covetousness" 2c.

There we hear that he is called "on earth" an earthly, old life after the old Adam, as one lives in the world without the Spirit of God. For this is how the old Adam lives; we should not seek this, (says St. Paul), for we, having died to the world and earthly life with Christ, should henceforth live heavenly in Christ.

98 Therefore we cheerfully say that our Sacrament is not on earth, nor do we seek it on earth. But if the devil shall prove that we hold our sacrament and the body of Christ to be fornication, covetousness, hatred, and vain iniquity, let us confess that we do wrong in seeking Christ on earth. But if he does not do this, we say that he is lying in his infernal mouth, and blasphemes St. Paul for this, so that he is called Christ's body on earth when he is in the sacrament. For that is not what St. Paul is called to be on earth, as we have heard. But there you have the enthusiasts, how finely they regard the Scriptures, and who is the Spirit that speaks through them. For the devil knows well what St. Paul means "on earth", and yet he drives his blinded enthusiasts to call Christ's body in the Sacrament "on earth". With such reasons they shall confirm their Lord's Supper, and overthrow ours.

99 The devil also makes such a mockery with the saying of Paul 2 Cor. 5:16, 17: "We no longer know Christ according to the flesh, and in Christ is the new creature. Such sayings must always conclude as much: Christ's body is not in the Lord's Supper. Well, we like to be mocked, let us see what the devil gains from it. The spirit of the swarm should indicate here what St. Paul means by the word: "According to the flesh"; since the whole power also lies with him. Yes, says the devil, I do not look at you, it is enough how my disciples lead, one must accept it. Well then, let us be so humble as to denounce the same.

St. Paul also speaks there of the death of the old Adam and wants to say that we should no longer live according to the flesh, but a new creature in Christ. Hear for yourself his words: "We consider," he says, "that if one died for all, they all died." 2c. [2 Cor. 5, 14.] What can

How can this be otherwise, for as he says in the next verse, Col. 3, 3: "We died with Christ"; and Rom. 6, 6: "Our old man was crucified with Christ"? And here it follows, "And therefore died for all, that they which live should not live 1) unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again" [2 Cor. 5:15]. What is this but that we should live anew in Christ?

101. follows v. 16: "Therefore from now on we know no one according to the flesh." Here let Paulum and the enthusiast speak to each other. The enthusiast says: "To know according to the flesh" is to respect something bodily present, or to be present for someone with his body, as Christ is in the sacrament; and such is wrong, and Paul denies it. Dear, why does Paul know his Corinthians live bodily before him? Why does he know his own body? Item: Why do the swarms know their companions bodily before them? Why do they know their bodily supper? Is it not all a bodily thing, and present according to the flesh? Now here St. Paul forbids to know after the flesh. But can they know their things according to the flesh, so that St. Paul must not be against them? Dear, why then should he be against us, that we know Christ bodily in the sacrament? But let the scoffer mock: he that mocketh another best, let him be master.

In this place St. Paul means "according to the flesh", which is carnal or fleshly, and not according to the spirit or spiritual, as he says in 2 Cor. 10, 3: "Though we walk in the flesh, we do not contend according to the flesh", that is, not in a carnal way. *Secundum carnem non significat in carne, sicut somniant; sed more adverbii significat: camaliter, vel studio et affectu carnis, vel quomodo caro facit.* "In the flesh" and "according to the flesh" is far from each other. Paul, Gal. 2, 20, lived "in the flesh", but not according to the flesh, but "in the faith of Christ". For Rom. 8, 6. 13. he calls "living according to the flesh" death, since he says: "If you live according to the flesh, you will die."

Therefore the text forcibly compels St. Paul that this is his opinion: "Because we have all died to the world and the flesh with Christ, we should no longer live or think according to the flesh, and thus know no one carnally, but only spiritually. For to know another carnally is to know him no further than flesh can; now flesh can do no more than seek its own in everyone, hating, envying, and doing all evil to the enemy, but seeking pleasure, favor, enjoyment, and friendship in everyone, for its profit 2c. In this way the world knows one another. But we Christians know no one in this way, for "we are one new creature in Christ" [2 Cor. 5:17] and know one another according to the Spirit, that is, each seeks not his own, but what is another's, for his own good; as he also teaches in Rom. 14 and Phil. 2:4.

104. "And though we had known Christ in the flesh, (saith he [2 Cor. 5:16]) yet now know we him no more." It is well to understand that he does not mean Christ personally in the flesh (as the spirit deceives); for Christ remains in the flesh forever, and all the angels in it must know him forever. But as we know our brethren spiritually, and no more carnally; so we know Christ much less carnally. But before, when we were holy in Judaism and in the works of the law (to which the false apostles are now drifting again), we knew nothing of Christ spiritually, but sought vainly carnally: "For we hoped that he should redeem Israel," Luc. 24:21, and look upon our holiness, and make us glorious according to the flesh. This, of course, was knowing Christ according to the flesh, and a right carnal mind. But all this has now passed away and died with him, and we no longer know him in this way, for all these things have passed away, and we are like new creatures in Christ. Paul himself will give you this understanding, just read and look at the text properly.

All who look at Christ in the flesh and know Him must be offended at Him, as happened to the Jews. For since flesh and blood thinks no further than to see and feel, and to see that Christ is a mortal man, it is not possible for them to know him.

1) "Hinsort" is missing in the Erlanger.

When a man is crucified, he must say: This is finished, there is neither life nor salvation, he is gone, no one can help him, he himself is lost. But he that shall not be offended in him must pass over the flesh, and be raised up by the word, that he may know in the spirit how Christ is made alive and glorious by his very suffering and death. And whoever does and can do this rightly is a new creature in Christ, endowed with new spiritual knowledge. Just as even now all are offended at Christ, when they look upon his supper in the flesh, as the devotees know it, and they themselves are (which they owe to us), who know Christ according to the flesh; for the flesh can neither say nor know any more than, here is bread and wine, therefore it must be offended at Christ, when he says, "This is my body," for it is an old creature in Adam. If it is not to be offended, it must go over such flesh and believe the words, "This is my body," and then it will understand that such bread is not bad bread, but the true body of Christ.

I am disturbed that the devil makes such a mockery of God's words, but it grieves me that the poor people should not see how they lay such loose thoughts at the foundation of their arrogance. They boast about how they have learned nothing from us, but they really should not, their writings show it all too much, if they were silent about the boasting, and we would be sorry that they should learn such things from us. And this is their way of interpreting the Scriptures and preaching in Zurich, Basel and Strasbourg, and where they teach, it would be desirable that they were still papal; for the same are now almost convinced throughout the world that they teach wrongly. Lord God, whom such public error and wrong understanding of St. Paul does not frighten nor move against these enthusiasts, what shall move him?

107 And as for the rest of the proverbs which they introduce, where Christ is preached that he has left the world, gone to the Father, ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of God, 2c., they do not answer anything, except that they teach us what we have long known, so that we may not notice how they leap over when they are to answer. But that

they should teach and prove that therefore our mind is wrong and these words of Christ "this is my body" are false. They say that it is contrary to one another that Christ is the body in heaven and in the Lord's Supper, but they do not prove it. Therefore we say it is not contrary to one another, because Scripture says it both ways, and our no is as strong as their yes; for we cannot deny the bright clear words for the sake of their bare, naked, bad yes. It has been known longer than a thousand years ago that Christ ascended into heaven, without all the teaching of this new spirit; nor has it therefore been denied that Christ's body in the Lord's Supper or Christ's word are true. Now if this Spirit were lacking, he ought to show us and teach us; but this will not come out.

(108) But I will tell you the truth, dear friends: If the Spirit is in earnest, and does not wilfully deny that our understanding is contrary to the Scriptures, then I will have lost all my things. I will prove it thus: First, the Spirit allowed Christ to give his body to be eaten in the first supper, since he makes the word of the cup in the supper, as has been sufficiently heard. Tell me, then, how can he seriously say here that it is contrary to Scripture and false, when he himself confesses above that it is right and was done once? For if he were in earnest, he would also attack it in the first supper with scriptures, and not make a word in it, which he does not do, but lets our understanding remain. If then our understanding remains in the first supper, there can be neither interpretation nor signification in the words, but as they stand and read, so they interpret, and so all their tempest and raving is in vain, that they seek interpretation.

109 Secondly, no one can deny that Christ took the first supper while he was in the world, before he went to the Father. Tell me, then, how can the Spirit seriously say that the sayings which speak of Christ's going to the Father contradict the text of the Lord's Supper? For he must confess that none of these sayings has yet been fulfilled, and that Christ did not sit up in heaven. When Christ comes down from heaven after the Ascension

If the Lord's Supper had been instituted, then the false prophets would have their appearance; but now Christ acts as if he should say: "There will be false prophets who pretend that my Lord's Supper is contrary to the sayings, who say of me how I am going to the Father and am no longer in the world. For this reason I will come before them and institute my supper, because I am still in the world and on earth, so that before they know it they will be taken as public liars in their own words, and you, little children, will be strengthened in the right faith.

How will they stand here? They must abandon all such sayings as they have hitherto so valiantly defied, and as public liars confess that because Christ is not in heaven when he takes supper, such sayings may not have moved them in earnest to deny that Christ's body is in supper, but are deceived by the devil into thinking that they saw what they did not see; for sayings do nothing to prove that Christ's body is in supper or not, any more than these sayings do: Jesus was born in Bethlehem, and fled into Egypt.

But I will give them good advice, they must now think of other scriptures, namely this one: In the evening Jesus sat down at table with the twelve, and what is more of those who speak of sitting at table. From which they must conclude: The Scripture says: Christ sits above tables, therefore he cannot be in bread. If they say this, then it is enough, and it is not necessary that they also prove to us how it is against such Scripture, as they also do with the previous sayings. For what the Spirit saith is right, wheresoever he listeth. But we will answer, Too slow, dear spirit, too slow; for these writings of sitting over tables have not moved thee hitherto to thy error, neither hast thou ever thought, hold thy peace, that they should move thee. Since these have never moved you, and those have not been able to move you in earnest, tell me what has moved you? Dear spirit, seize us also so on public lies, so we want to have lost.

112 But whether they speak: If equal the

If the first supper is not contrary to the scriptures we have heard, then the other suppers after the ascension are. I answer, I do not inquire now; it is enough for me this time that I have received the first supper, which cannot be contrary to the sayings of the ascension of Christ, and the Spirit has been publicly absent. For now that I have this, that the sayings of the ascension of Christ cannot induce anyone to deny the first supper according to our understanding, let us also receive the other suppers. For who will believe the enthusiasts that the sayings of the ascension of Christ seriously move them against the Lord's Supper after the ascension, if they are overcome, that they are not moved by them against the Lord's Supper before the ascension? If Christ's body can sit over tables and still be in the bread, he can also be in heaven and where he wants to be, and still be in the bread; there is no difference between being far or near the table and being in the bread at the same time. Well, that is publicly found to be lying; but they will not yet give way, or confess their error, that they honor the truth for God's sake.

Let this be enough, that our understanding is not contrary to Scripture or to faith, as the mad spirit is in control of itself. Then he comes to the two main points which I have attacked most severely, namely: that Christ is at the right hand of God, and flesh is of no use 2c. There he should prove how the two pieces could not suffer Christ's body to be in the Lord's Supper, as I had drawn it with large letters, so that they would not jump over it. So the dear spirit comes here, and brings his figure Allöosis, by which he wants to make everything bad, teaches us how in the Scriptures one nature is taken for the other in Christ, until he falls into the abyss, and smuggles that this saying, "the Word became flesh", John 1:14, must not be understood as it reads, but thus: the flesh became Word, or man became God 2c. This is how one should take the scripture in the mouth.

I cannot attack all the errors of the spirit this time. But this I say, whoever wants to be warned, let him beware.

from the Zwingel, and avoid his books, as the infernal Satan's poison, because man is completely wrong, and has lost Christ purely from. The other sacramentals remain on one error; this one does not produce a book, it pours out new errors, the longer the more. But he who will not be warned, let him go so far as to know that I have warned him, and he is excused.

(115) Thou shalt not believe nor suppose that the trope of allosis is in such sayings, or that one nature is taken for another in Christ. The nonsensical spirit invents such things, that he may also rob us of Christ; for he proves it not to thee, neither can he prove it to thee. And even if such an error of his were true and right, it still does not prove that Christ's body cannot be in the Lord's Supper. For I have insisted that they should show reason why these words would be false, "this is my body," as they read, even though Christ is in heaven, because God's image is not conscious to us, and he may well find a way that both are true, namely, Christ in heaven and his body in the Lord's Supper. That was the most noble question, I demanded, so I wrote big letters to show how the two were against each other. Then he is silent, 1) he does not remember it with a letter, as if it did not concern him, and in the meantime he is talking about his allöosi.

For the reason that I have shown how Christ's body is everywhere, because God's right hand is everywhere, I have done this (as I have publicly stated there), so that I might indicate a certain way in which God might enable Christ to be in heaven and his body in the Lord's Supper at the same time, reserving to his divine wisdom and power more ways by which he might accomplish these things, since we do not know the end or the measure of his power.

(117) Now if they would or could have answered, they should have proved to us constantly how God neither knows nor is able to know any way that Christ is in heaven and at-

like his body in the Lord's Supper; there lies the knot, there they jump, the good fellows. For they should not teach us the visible way, that heaven is high above according to the eyes, and that the Lord's Supper is here on earth; we know it well ourselves, that to reckon according to the eyes cannot be here above what is here, and again; for that is a human, visible way. But God's word and works are not according to the sight of our eyes, but are incomprehensible to all reason, even to the angels. So also Christ is neither in heaven nor in the Lord's Supper in a visible way, and as the eyes of flesh judge something to be here and there.

118 And of course it is an impotent spirit that judges God's word and work according to the eyes, for in such a way even God Himself is not, wherever He is, be He at all ends, or at some ends. Dear, why then does the spirit attach itself to the certain way indicated by me? First, because he was afraid that his belly would burst with great art. Secondly, so that he would deceive the simple, so that they would not see how he would jump over when he was supposed to answer, and so start another game, so that he would pull us off course, so that we would forget the thing that frightens him. If I now argue with them about the same of my indicated way, then they would have won game. Why? Because that would give them cause not to answer the right knot that presses them, and at the same time to write book after book, spouting their useless chatter into the world; for they think that spouting a lot and writing useless books is right answering, and they deceive the poor people.

119) Therefore you should protect yourself against them, if they constantly prove to you that divine power and wisdom is no further than our eyes are, and no more capable than we can see and judge bodily with our eyes, and grope with our fingers, then you should keep it with them; so I also want to believe that God no longer knows a way like Christ in heaven at the same time,

1) Thus the Jena; "still" is missing in the Wittenberg and Erlangen.

2) "den" is missing in the Wittenberg and Erlanger.

and that his body be in the Lord's Supper. Urge and demand this of them; they are obliged to do it, and their doctrine may not stand before they have made this clear and certain, for their doctrine stands on it.

The devil feels well that he cannot do it, therefore he rumbles with useless chatter that we should not push him there, and in the meantime he spends art that no one desires. For if he could overthrow the way I have indicated (which he cannot do), he would still have accomplished nothing, because it would still not prove that the two are opposed to each other: Christ in heaven and his body in bread. He must prove that not only the same way is impossible, but also that God Himself no longer knows or is able to do any other way, as I also demanded in the previous book. Since he does not do this, we say: God is almighty, able to do more than we see; therefore I believe his words as they read. Behold, then, the spirit stands, and has entrusted himself with all his art.

121 For to all his useless spouting, which he does against my indicated way, I answer with a single word, that is, no. For he brings his all-eosiness, which no one confesses to him in the article; and it needs to be proven just as much as his entire doctrine of lies. But if he proved it, then one could answer him further. So my indicated way (for the sake of his Allöosi) still stands out from all the others; for that he says it is Allöosis, one does not give a damn, he would like to say that it is Ironia or another trope. It does not apply so Troppens or Troppeln in the scripture, one must prove the Tropos first that they are there, before one argues with it. Ah, it is as I said, the devil is struck that he cannot answer, therefore he wanders about with vain words. Praise and thanks be to God, who knows how to equip us so well against the devil.

But you, dear brother, should keep this instead of the allöosi: because JEsus Christ is truly God and man, in One Person, let no nature be taken for another in any place of Scripture; for

that is called Allöosin, when something is said of the deity of Christ, which nevertheless belongs to mankind, or again; as, Luc. 24, 26.: "Did not Christ have to suffer, and thus go to 1) his glory?" Here he gules that Christ is taken for human nature. Beware, beware, I say, of the Allöosi, it is the devil's larva; for it finally brings about such a Christ, after which I would not gladly be a Christian, namely, that Christ henceforth be no more, nor do with his suffering and life, than another bad saint. For if I believe that human nature alone has suffered for me, then Christ is a bad savior to me, so he himself needs a savior. Summa, it is unspeakable what the devil seeks with the Allöosi.

This piece is a higher article, and should be in a special book, and does not belong in this matter. But recently, let a simple Christian be satisfied with the fact that the Holy Spirit knows how to teach us how we should speak, and must not be a fool or a foolish man. 2) And thus says the Holy Spirit Jn. 3:16: "God so loves the world, that He gave His only Son"; Rom. 8:32: "He did not spare His own Son, but gave Him for us all." And so henceforth, all works, words, sufferings, and what Christ does, does, works, speaks, suffers, the true Son of God, and is rightly spoken: Son of God died for us, Son of God preaches on earth, Son of God 4) washes the disciples' feet, as the epistle, Heb. 6, 6. says: "They crucify to them even the Son of God." 1 Cor. 2, 8. "If they had known, they would never have crucified the LORD of glory."

124) If the old weather-maker, Mrs. Reason, the grandmother of Allöosis, would say: Yes, the Godhead cannot suffer nor die, you shall answer: That is true; but nevertheless, because Godhead and mankind in Christ are not the same, you shall say: Yes, the Godhead cannot suffer nor die.

1) Erlanger: in.

2) Toppeler - cheating dice players.

3) Wittenberger: "has loved" and "gave".

4) Here the words are missing in the Erlanger edition: "died for us, GOD's Son preaches on earth, GOD's Son".

One person is, so the scripture, for the sake of such personal unity, also gives to the Godhead everything that happens to mankind, and again. And is also thus in truth. For this you must say, the person (show 1) Christ) suffers, dies; now the person is truly God; therefore it is rightly said: The Son of God suffers; for although the one part (that I speak thus), as the Godhead, does not suffer, nevertheless the person, who is God, suffers in the other part, as in humanity.

(125) Just as one says, "The king's son is sore," yet his leg alone is sore. Solomon is wise, yet his soul alone is wise. Absalom is beautiful, yet his body alone is beautiful. Peter is gray, yet his head alone is gray. Because body and soul are one person, everything that happens to the body or soul, even to the smallest member of the body, is rightly and well done to the whole person. This is the way of speaking in all the world, not only in the Scriptures, and is also the truth; for in truth the Son of God is crucified for us, that is, the person who is God, for he is, he (I say), the person, crucified according to mankind.

(126) Thus, what happens to the other part of the person is to be appropriated to the whole person, for the sake of both being one person. Thus speak all the old teachers, all the new theologians, all language and all Scripture. But the cursed allosis turns such things upside down, and wants to change, and to appropriate to the pieces, that which is assigned to the whole person in the Scriptures, makes its own tropos, to turn the Scriptures upside down, and to separate the person of Christ, as it also does with the "is", only that it teaches something new and brings its foolish thoughts also to the sun.

And because he likes to trope so much, why doesn't he stick to the old trope, which the 2) Scripture and all teachers have used here so far? Namely, synecdoche, as, Christ died, after mankind 2c., but that would have been nothing new, and was no glory to hunt in it, would not have liked either.

bring new error. That is why Allöosis had to come forth and teach us that one nature would be taken for the other. As if the apostles had been mad and foolish, that they could not have spoken of the Godhead, they had to call it mankind, and again. If John had wanted to consider 3) Allöosin, he could also have said: The flesh became word, since he said: 4) "The word became flesh."

But is this not a sacrilegious spirit, which so foolhardily goes forth, and makes us allöosin at these oerterns? Who ordered him to do it? How does he prove that Allöosis is here? No, that is not necessary, but is enough when he says: I Zwingel say that here is Allöosis; therefore it is so; because I was yesterday in the bosom of the Godhead, and now I come from heaven, therefore one must believe me. He should prove beforehand that here is Allöosis; he leaves that and accepts it as if he had fought for it a thousand years ago, and there is no one who may doubt it; but it is much more necessary to prove that here is Allöosis than that which he wants to confirm with it. That is from the Zwingelian Logica, incertum per incertius, ignotum per ignotius probare; O beautiful art, which even children should throw out with dirt.

If this is true, that he may troll and play with figures of his will, and what he says must be right, what wonder is it if he makes a Belial out of Christ in the end? Who may say everything he likes (and does not have to show reason), dear, what shall he not conclude? It is not different, because as I lament, the spirit boasts scripture to smear the people's mouth, and yet leads vain own dreams and his great conceit against the scripture. But we condemn and curse the Allöosin in this place to hell, as the devil's own input, and want to see how he wants to confirm it; because Scripture and good reason we want to have, not his own snot and slobber.

130. they cry out over us, that we mix the two natures into one being; that is

3) Erlanger: Had.

4) Here the words are missing in the Erlanger: "The flesh became word, when he said:"

1) Wittenberger: shows.

2) "the" is missing in the Erlanger.

not true. We do not say that Godhead is humanity, or a way that it can be and therefore is, until the enthusiasts divine nature is human nature, which would be nature prove otherwise.

mixed into one being. But we mix the two different natures For if the allosis existed, that one nature should be into one person, and say: God is man, and man is God. taken for another, this would only concern the works or But we cry out again against them, that they divide the transactions of the natures, and not the essence of the person of Christ, as if it were two persons. For where the natures. For although in the works, when one says: "Christ allosis is to exist, as it leads Zwingel, Christ will have to preach, drinks, prays, dies" [Christ] may be taken for the be two persons, one divine and one human, because he human nature, it cannot be so in the essence, when one shows the sayings of suffering to the human nature alone says: God is man, or man is God. Here there can be no and turns all things from the Godhead; For where the allöosis, yes, also no synecdoche or some trope; for there works are divided and separated, the person must also God must be taken for God, man for man. Now, when I be divided, because all works or sufferings are not wrote that Christ's body was everywhere, I did not speak assigned to natures, but to persons; for it is the person of the works of natures, but of the essence of natures. who does and suffers all things, one according to this Therefore, neither alloesis nor synecdoche can overthrow such things for me; for essence is essence, each for itself, nature, the other according to that nature, as all this is well known to the learned. Therefore we hold our Lord none for the other; and whoever wants to overthrow it for Christ to be God and man in one person, non me must not bring alloesis, synecdoche or tröpos, they confundendo naturas, nec dividendo personam, so that accomplish nothing here, but he must overthrow my we do not mix the natures, nor separate the person. reasons, on which I stand in the piece.

Now this is enough of an accidental thing, for it serves a piece, are these. The first is this article of our faith: Jesus Christ is essentially, naturally, truly, completely God and man in One Person, undivided and undivided. The other, that God's right hand is everywhere. The third, that God's word is not false or lies. The fourth, that God has and knows many ways of being in one place, and not only the few that the philosophers call localem. For the nothing here without the spirit being so full of error that it seeks cause everywhere to abuse the simple, and in the meantime drives the right thing out of its place. We stand on this, because the righteous spirit will not nor can prove that the two are against each other: Christ is in heaven, and his body is in the Lord's Supper, so let the words "this is my body" remain to us as they are; for one letter in it is more certain and better to us than all the books of all the Sophists speak of this rightly, since they say: There are gossips, even if they wrote the world full of books. three ways to be in one place, localiter or circumscriptive,

132 Item, because they do not prove that God's right definitive, reple- tive, which I will thus translate for the hand is a special place in heaven, my indicated way also sake of easier understanding.

still remains firm that Christ's body is everywhere, First, a thing in a place is circumscriptive or localiter, because he is at the right hand of God, which is apprehensible, that is, when the place and the body within everywhere, although we do not know how that happens; rhyme, meet and measure with each other evenly, just as because we also do not know how it happens that God's in the barrel is the wine or the water, since the wine no right hand is everywhere. Of course, it is not the way we longer takes up space, nor does it take up room. see a thing with our eyes, as the devotees look at the sacrament; but God has certainly

the barrel gives more space than so much of the wine is; thus a wood or tree in the water does not take more space, nor does the water give more than so much of the tree is inside. So a man, walking in the air, does not take more space from the air around him, nor does the air give more, than so great the man is. In this way, place and body measure themselves off against each other from piece to piece, just as a pitcher measures, feels and grasps the pots in his form.

Secondly, a thing in a place is definite, incomprehensible, if the thing or body is not tangible in a place, and does not measure itself according to the space of the place where it is, but can occupy about much space, about little space. So, they say, the angels and spirits are in places or locations; for thus an angel or devil can be in a whole house or city; again, he can be in a chamber, chest or box, yes, in a nutshell. The place is corporeal and comprehensible and has its dimensions, according to length, width and thickness; but that which is inside does not have the same length, width or thickness as the place in which it is, indeed, it has no length or width at all. Thus we read in the Gospel that the devil possesses men and drives into them, and also drives into the swine. Yes, 1) Marci 5. says that a whole legion was in one man, that was about six thousand devils. This I call incomprehensible in one place; for we cannot comprehend it nor measure it, as we measure the bodies, and yet it is nevertheless in the place.

137) In this way was the body of Christ, when it came out of the closed tomb and came to the disciples through the closed door, as the Gospels show; for there is no measuring nor understanding in which place its head or feet were, when it passed through the stones, and yet had to pass through; it took no space, so the stone gave it no space, but the stone remained stone, whole and solid, as before, and its body also remained as large and thick as it was before. Besides, it could also be seen in places, as it wanted, because it took space from the place and could be measured.

In the same way, Christ is and can be in the bread, although he can also show himself understandably and visibly wherever he wants. For as the sealed stone and the closed door remained unchanged and unchanged, and yet his body was at the same time in the place where the stone and the wood were: so also he is in the sacrament at the same time, where there is bread and wine, and yet bread and wine for themselves remain unchanged and unchanged.

Thirdly, a thing in places is *repletive*, supernatural, that is, when something is at the same time completely in all places and fills all places, and yet is not measured and comprehended from any place, according to the space of the place where it is. This way is attributed to God alone, as he says in the prophet Jeremiah 23:23: "I am a God from near, and not from far; for heaven and earth I fill" 2c. This way is beyond all measure, beyond our reason incomprehensible, and must be kept in the Word by faith alone.

139) I have told all these things for this reason, that it may be seen that there are more ways of being a thing 2) than the one, comprehensible, bodily way, on which the scribblers stand, and it is enforced by the Scriptures, that Christ's body must not be solely comprehensible or bodily in a place, where it takes up and gives place according to its greatness; for it was in the stone of the tomb without such a comprehensible way, likewise in a closed door, as they cannot deny. If then he could be there without room and place according to his greatness, why should he not also be in bread without room and place according to his greatness? But if he is in this incomprehensible way, then he is outside the bodily creature, and is not grasped nor measured in it. But who can know how this happens? Who can prove that it is wrong for a man to say and hold that, because he is apart from the creature, he is indeed where he wants all creatures to be, as continuous and present to him as another body is to its bodily place or location?

2) etwo == somewhere. The Wittenbergers and the Jenaers offer: about.

1) "Yes" is missing in the Jena.

See our bodily eyes and faces. When we open our eyes, our vision is present in an instant for five or six miles, and at the same time in all the places that are within those six miles, and yet it is only one vision, one eye. Can a bodily vision do this, don't you think that God's power can also find a way that all creatures are also present and pass through Christ's body? Yes, you say, so you do not prove that it is so? Thanks be to you, but I prove so much with it, that the scribes also cannot overthrow nor prove that such a thing is impossible to divine power, which they nevertheless must and should prove. They should prove that God knows no way in which Christ's body can be other than bodily and comprehensible. If they do not do this, their teachings are disgraced; now they can never do it.

Since we prove from Scripture that Christ's body can be in more ways than this bodily way, we have thus sufficiently established that the words "this is my body" should be believed, because it is not contrary to any article of faith, and is also in accordance with Scripture, as when Christ's body was led through a sealed stone and a closed door. For since we can indicate a way above the bodily, comprehensible way, who would be so bold as to measure and encompass God's power, as not to know other more ways? And yet, the enthusiasts' argument cannot stand, for they prove that God's power is to be measured and encompassed in this way, because all their reasoning is based on the fact that Christ's body alone must be in one place, in a bodily and comprehensible way. But here it is not a matter of answering, but of jumping, and meanwhile chatting about Mrs. Allöosi.

And that I come to my things, because our faith holds that Christ is God and man, and the two natures are one person, so that the same person cannot be separated, he can certainly show himself according to the bodily, comprehensible way, in which place he wants; as he did after the resurrection, and will do on the last day. But in this way he can also be

The first is the need for a different, incomprehensible way, as we have seen from the Gospel in the tomb and the closed door.

But now that such a man is supernaturally one person with God, and apart from this man there is no God, it must follow that he also is and may be according to the third, supernatural way, wherever God is, and that everything is fully Christ through and through, also according to humanity; not according to the first, bodily, comprehensible way, but according to the supernatural, divine way. For here you must stand and say: Christ according to the Godhead, where he is, there he is a natural divine person, and is also naturally and personally there, as this well proves his conception in the womb. For if he was to be the Son of God, he had to be natural and personal in the womb and become man. If he is now natural and personal where he is, then he must also be man there. For there are not two separate persons, but one single person. Where it is, there it is the one undivided person. And where you can say: Here is God, you must also say: so is Christ the man also there.

144. And if you were to show a place where God is and not man, then the person would already be separated, because then I could say with truth: Here is God, who is not man and has never been man. But not to me of God! For from this it would follow that space and place separated the two natures from each other and divided the person, when death and all devils could not separate them nor tear them apart. And there should remain for me a bad Christ, who would no longer be a divine and human person at the same time, and in all other places he would have to be a mere separated God and divine person without humanity: No, journeyman, where you put God for me, there you must put humanity with me; they cannot be separated from each other, it has become one person, and does not separate humanity from itself, as Master Hans unzips his skirt and puts it away when he goes to sleep.

1) Thus the Jena. Wittenberg and Erlangen: had to.

For that I may give the simple a rough similitude, Godhead with it, which words speak clearly of the bodily, mankind is more closely united with God than our skin comprehensible way in which a peasant is in doublet and with our flesh, yes, 1) more closely than body and soul. pants, since doublet and pants are stretched out so that Now, as long as man lives and is healthy, skin and flesh, they surround the body and thighs. body and soul are one thing and person, so that they Lift thyself up, thou coarse spirit of enthusiasm, with cannot be separated, but where the soul is, there the body such idle thoughts; if thou canst not think higher nor must also be; where the flesh is, there the skin must also otherwise here, then stay behind the stove and roast be; and you cannot give a special place or space to the pears and apples in the meantime; leave this matter in peace. Christ passed through a closed door with his body, or to the flesh without the skin, as an inheritance without and yet the door was not extended, nor was his body a shell; but where one is, there the other must also be. So drawn in; how then should mankind be extended here, or you cannot peel off the divinity from the humanity and put the Godhead fenced in, since much is another and higher it there, since the humanity is not with it; for in doing so way? you would separate the person and make the humanity a shell, even a skirt, which the divinity would take off and Yes, I also complain that these carnal spirits, who can put on, after which the place or space would be, and hardly crawl on earth, untried in faith, inexperienced in should the bodily space here be capable of so much that spiritual matters, want to fly high above the clouds, and it would separate the divine person, which neither angels measure and judge such high, secret, incomprehensible nor all creatures can separate. things, not according to God's words, but according to their crawling and walking on earth. So it is with them, as the poets say of the Jcaro; for they have also stolen

146. here you will speak with Nicodemo [Joh.3, 9.]: foreign feathers (that is, sayings of the Scriptures), and "How can this happen?" Shall now all places and space glued them on with wax (that is, made even with reason to their sense), and thus fly aloft. But the wax melts, and become One space and place, or (as the foolish spirit dreams according to his coarse carnal sense) shall the they fall into the sea and are drowned in all kinds of error humanity of Christ spread out and stretch like a coat as 2c. far as all creatures are? Answer I, you must take off the old shoes with Moses here and be born anew with 149. Christ says: "If I have told you of earthly things, Nicodemo. According to your old conceit, which and ye believe not; how would ye believe me 4) if I told understands nothing but the first, bodily, comprehensible you of heavenly things?" Behold, this is still all an earthly way, you will not understand this; as the enthusiasts do, and bodily thing, when Christ's body passes through the who do not think otherwise than as if the Godhead were stone and door: for his body is a body that can be bodily, comprehensible way everywhere, as if God were grasped, as well as the stone and the door; yet no reason such a great spreading thing, which reached through and can comprehend how his body and the stone are at the over 3) all creatures. Notice that, because they blame us same time in one place, when he passes through, and for spreading and expanding mankind, and fencing in the here the stone is not enlarged nor extended further, and Christ's body is not drawn in smaller nor narrower. Here, faith must blind reason, and it must be removed from the bodily, comprehensible, and the spiritual world.

1) In Walch's old edition and in Erlangen's: each. 2) d. i. pea.

3) Erlanger: "through and over from". In the Wittenberg and in the Jena, the last two words are drawn together: "exceedingly." That the reading we have given is correct follows from § 169 of this writing. The opinion is: that reached through all creatures and towered above all creatures.

4) So the Wittenberg: "mir" fehlt in the Jena and in the Erlanger. Erlanger: "wollt" instead of: "würdet".

Way lift in the other, incomprehensible way, which it does not understand, and, nevertheless, cannot deny.

If then the other way must be understood by faith, and reason must perish with its first, comprehensible way; how much more must faith alone stand here, and reason perish in the heavenly, supernatural way, since Christ's body in the Godhead is One Person with God! For everyone will admit to me that there is a much different, higher way, since Christ's body is in the sealed stone and closed door, than since he sits or stands in the first way in his clothes or in the air around him. For here the air and the garments are stretched and spread out according to the greatness of his body, so that the eyes may see it and the hands may grasp it. But in the stone and door there is none.

151 Further, everyone must also admit to me that there is still a much higher being and way, since Christ's body is One Person with God, than since he is in the stone or door; for God is not a bodily thing, but a spirit, above all things. So Christ is not One Person with the stone or door, as He is with God; therefore He must be more and deeper in the Godhead than He is in the stone or door; just as He is deeper and closer in the stone or door than in the clothing or air. And so the stone or door must not have expanded or spread, nor fenced in the body of Christ; much less will here, in the most supreme way, mankind expand, spread, or fence in or draw in the Godhead, as the carnal mind dreams.

For the spirit must stand here and confess to me that Christ's body has a much higher, supernatural essence, since it is One Person with God, than it had when it was in the sealed stone and door; since this is the highest manner and essence, and nothing higher can be, than that a man is One Person with God. For the other way, as Christ's body was in the stone, will also become common to all the saints in heaven, that they pass with their body through all creatures, just as it is already common to angels and devils; for the angel came to Petro in the dungeon, Acts 12:7. 12, 7, so the poltergeists come.

The stone is the only thing that has been in the body of Christ. 1) So he must also confess to me that the stone has not expanded, nor has Christ's body been fenced in.

What then does he pretend about the supreme being and manner, since Christ is One Person with God, that there mankind had to expand and surround God, where it should be with God everywhere? Without indicating his coarse, fat, thick thoughts, that he never thought of God and Christ in any other way than in the first, bodily, comprehensible way. Rather, if mankind is in one place or in all places, it does not enclose the Godhead, much less as the stone, which was in one place, enclosed its body, but it is one person with God, so that where God is, there man is also; what God does, that is also done by man; what man suffers, that is also suffered by God.

So Christ of some body has three kinds of being, or all three ways of being. First, the comprehensible, bodily way, as he walked bodily on earth, taking space and giving according to his greatness; such way he can still use, if he wants, as he did after the resurrection, and will need at the last day, as Paul says 1 Tim. 6, 15: "Which will reveal in his time 2) the blessed God" 2c. and Col. 3-4: "When Christ, your life, will reveal himself" 2c., in such a way he is not in GOD or with the Father, nor in heaven, as the mad spirit dreams; for GOD is not a bodily space or place. And this is what the sayings lead the spiritualists to, how Christ leaves the world and goes to the Father 2c.

(155) Secondly, the incomprehensible spiritual way, since he neither takes nor gives space, but passes through all creatures where he wills, as my vision (that I may give a rough likeness) passes and is through air, light, or water, and neither takes nor gives space; as a sound or tone passes and is through air and water, or board and wall, and also neither takes nor gives space; item, as light and heat pass through air, water, glass, crystal, and so on.

1) "Kemnoten" synonymous with chambers.
2) "In his time" is missing in the Erlanger. The Wittenberg has the text of the Bible: "Which will show" etc. w.

and such like goes and is, and neither gives place nor takes place, and such like much more. He used such a way when he came out of a closed tomb, and came through a closed door, and in the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and, as it is believed, when he was born of his mother 2c.

156. Thirdly, the divine, heavenly way, since he is one person with God, according to which, of course, all creatures must be much more pervasive and present to him, because they are according to the other way; For if, according to the same other way, he can thus be in and with the creatures, that they do not feel, touch, measure or comprehend him; how much more will he be in all creatures according to this high, third way, that they do not measure or comprehend him, but rather that he has them present before him, measuring and comprehending! For you must understand this being. Christ, if he is one person with God, far, far apart from the creatures, as far as God is outside. Again, place him as deep and close to all creatures as God is within; for he is One inseparable Person with God. Where God is, He must also be, or our faith is false.

But who wants to say or think how this happens? We know that it is so, that he is in God apart from all creatures and with God One Person; but how it happens, we do not know, it is above nature and reason, even of all angels in heaven, only God is aware and known. Because it is unknown to us, and yet true, we should not deny his words beforehand, because we know to prove for certain that Christ's body of all things cannot be where God is, and that such a way of being is false, which the fanciers should prove, but they will leave it alone.

(158) Whether God has and knows even more ways of how Christ's body is, I do not want to deny herewith, but to show how coarse happens our enthusiasts are, that they do not admit Christ's body more than the first, comprehensible way. Even though they cannot prove that this 1) is contrary to our understanding; for I have said it in

I do not want to deny any way that God's power should not be capable of so much that one body may be in many places at the same time, even in a bodily, understandable way. For who will prove that God is not able to do this? Who has seen an end to his power? The enthusiasts think that God is not able to do it, but who will believe their thinking? With what do they make such thinking certain?

If thinking is enough, I will also think better than them, and thus say: If Christ's body would be in one place (as they say) in heaven, still all creatures before him and around him may be like a bright, transparent air. For, as has been said, a spirit sees, travels and hears through an iron wall as brightly and easily as I see or hear through the air or glass, and what is thick or dark to our face, as wood, stone and ore, is to a spirit as glass, yes, as bright air. As the poltergeists and angels prove, and Christ also proved in the sealed stone and locked door.

Now I have seen crystals or precious stones, where inside there is a little spark or flame, as in the *opal*, or a little cloud 2) or otherwise a little bubble, and yet that same little bubble 3) or little cloud appears as if it were at all ends of the stone; for wherever one turns or turns the stone, one sees the little bubble as if it were in the front of the stone, when it is in the middle. I do not speak now from the Scriptures, it applies to thinking, or let equal swarming apply. If Christ were to sit in the middle of all creatures, in one place, like the little bubble or sparkle in the crystal, and a place of creatures were presented to me, as if bread and wine were presented to me through the word, as if a place of the crystal were presented to my eyes, I should not be able to say: Behold, there is Christ's body truly in the bread; even as I say, Behold, there is the little spark just ahead in the crystal? Do you not think that God could much more wonderfully and truly present Christ's body in the bread (even if it were in one place in heaven),

2) Wittenberger: wöcklin.

3) In the old Walch edition and in the Erlanger: Blöslein.

1) In the editions: the same.

because the sparkle in the crystal is presented to me?

I do not think that this is certainly so, but that it is not impossible for God, so that I may give the enthusiasts something to mock and falsely interpret, as is their way, but nevertheless also show that they cannot preserve their thing, nor condemn our understanding, if it were true, since they say that Christ is in heaven in a different place. Although they neither know nor prove the same, so far are they from the certain truth, that even if their thinking were right (as it is not), yet they cannot thereby prove their supper, that there is vain bread, nor overthrow ours.

162 Further, that they may see how it is no art at all to think anything without Scripture, I take before me the similitude of Laurentii Vallensis. There stands a preacher and preaches, his voice is a single voice that comes out of his mouth and is made and is in his mouth; Nor does this same one voice, which is in one place, that is, in his mouth, come into four, five thousand, or ten thousand ears in one moment, and yet is no other voice in the same many thousand ears than that which is in the preacher's mouth, and is at the same time, in one moment, one voice in the preacher's mouth and in all the ears of the people, as if his mouth and their ears, without any means, were one place where the voice was.

Dear one, can God do this with a bodily voice; why should he not be able to do it much more with the body of Christ, even if he were in one place (as they say), and yet be true in bread and wine in many places at the same time, than in two ears? Because his body is much swifter and lighter than any voice, and all creatures pass through it more easily than the air of the voice, as he proved in the tombstone, since no voice can pass through a stone as easily as Christ's body did.

164 But I say and think no more of these things, forasmuch as the enthusiasts' thinking is true, that Christ is bodily and comprehensible in one place, that thou mayest see to the abundance, though they have obtained the same,

that nevertheless his body can be in the Lord's Supper by divine power, because such things are not only possible to lesser creatures than voice and sound or reverberation, but also natural and ordinary, tangible and sensitive; therefore their dreams do not exist that there must be vain bread in the Lord's Supper, because Christ's body is in heaven.

One more thing. In the same way, it was taught among the pontiffs that if a mirror were broken into a thousand pieces, there would still remain in each piece the same whole image that had previously appeared in the whole mirror alone. Here is a single face standing before it and looking at it, and yet in all the pieces it is the same face, whole and complete in an instant. How if Christ were also like this in bread and wine and everywhere? For God can do this with the face and mirror, so that his face is instantly in a thousand pieces or mirrors; why should he not also make Christ's body in such a way that not only his image, but he himself would be in many places at the same time, even though he is in heaven in one place, because his body is much easier to enter into bread and wine than a face into the mirror, as he also enters through stone and iron, through which no image or face enters?

166) O desperate 1) pope! they will shout here. Well! shout, whoever shouts, with shouting one will not answer for a long time, nor will one 2) overthrow anything; otherwise the geese or donkeys or full peasants would probably also be theologians. So I have not yet seen a single piece that the enthusiasts, the great Rolands and giants, would have knocked off the pope, so that they could boast so highly or cheaply against the papists. The poor woods and stones, the images, they have mewed a little, but not bitten. They are now attacking baptism and the Lord's Supper, but it has not yet been done.

I also know almost well that they may say hereupon: The images in the mirror are not the face itself, but its likeness, as bread and wine are signs of the Lord's body;

1) So the Wittenberg and the Jena. The latter gives the reading: "zwiefältiger" in the margin as Conjectur. The Erlanger has this, just like Walch, in the text.

2) ichts - something. Erlanger: "nothing".

Therefore such a likeness is more for them than against them. But I also know that bread and wine are not equal to the body of the Lord, as the image in the mirror is to the face. Therefore, my equation is: If God can make so many images of a face in a mirror in a moment, and such a wonderful thing happens naturally and visibly; then it should be much more believable that he can make Christ's body truly in many places in bread and wine, even if he were in a bodily place, as they dream. 1) That I may show how nothing is their conceit, but that they think no more of Christ than in some intelligible way. And even if this were true, it still does not follow from it what they want to conclude from it. But now it follows much less, because Christ's body is not in heaven in such a bodily, comprehensible way, nor can they also prove that he is thus in heaven.

168) Now that the spirit swarms against me, if Christ's body should be everywhere where God is, then I would become a Marcionist and make a preached Christ, because his body could not be so large or extended that it would surround the Godhead, which is everywhere, 2c., 2) I answer first that the spirit perhaps speaks such things with great tickling and courage, because he does not prove that such follows from my speech; therefore I do not respect such washing.

On the other hand, he knows well that *allegare inconveniens non. est solvere argumenta*. If it were enough for one to say that it does not rhyme, then no article of faith, indeed no law, could exist in the world. But the proud, haughty spirit lets himself think, because he merely says that it does not rhyme, such and such would follow from it, so it must be and must not prove it. Thirdly, with this he reveals his crude foolish thoughts, that he thinks no differently of God's being in all places, than as if God were a great, vast being that filled the world and towered over it by all means. 3) Just as if a straw bag were full of straw, and yet protruded above and below, just after the first,

bodily, comprehensible way. Of course, Christ's body would be a mere poem and ghost, as a big straw bag, since God would be inside with heaven and earth; wouldn't that be speaking and thinking of God roughly enough?

But we do not speak thus, but say that God is not such an extended, long, wide, thick, high, deep being, but a supernatural, inscrutable being, who is at the same time in every grain completely, and yet in all and above all, and apart from all creatures; therefore there must be no enclosure, as the spirit dreams. For one body is much, much too wide for the Godhead, and many thousands of Godheads could be in it. Again, also much, much too narrow, that not one deity can be inside. Nothing is so small, God is still smaller; nothing is so big, God is still bigger; nothing is so short, God is still shorter; nothing is so long, God is still longer; nothing is so wide, God is still wider; nothing is so narrow, God is still narrower, and so on, it is an ineffable being above and apart from everything that can be named or thought.

But to this the Spirit should answer, first, where the Scripture or reason is that Christ's body has no more way of being than the bodily, understandable way, like straw in sackcloth or like bread in a basket and meat in pots, especially because I have proved that he has other ways than in the tombstone 2c. Item, that God's right hand is a special place in heaven. How is it that the Spirit is so silent here, when the greatest need is to speak? For because he is silent here, he has lost; since his faith stands on this piece, that Christ's body must have no other way of being in heaven than *localem*, like straw in sackcloth; which, however, is publicly wrongly convinced by me. Here he should be wise and prove such. Yes, how can he? He has gone too far into mud, and cannot get out.

On the other hand, the spirit should answer: Because Christ is God and man, and his humanity has become One Person with God, and thus is completely drawn into God over all creatures, so that he sticks to him in the same way: how it is possible for God to be sth.

1) Walch and the Erlangeners: Aufs.

2) "u. s. w." is missing in the Erlanger.

3) Compare the note to § 146.

is not man? And how can it happen without separation of the person that God is here without mankind and there with mankind? Since we do not have two Gods, but only one God, and he is completely man according to the One Person, namely the Son. What is it that he otherwise chats a lot, and here, when it is necessary, jumps and is silent?

If God and man are one person, and the two natures are united with each other in such a way that they belong closer together than body and soul, then Christ must also be man where he is God. If he is God and man in one place, why should he not also be man and God in another place? If in another place he is also man and God, why not in the third, fourth, fifth, and so on in all places? But if the third, fourth, fifth place does not let him be man and God at the same time, then also the first place does not let him be man and God at the same time. For if a place or a place can separate a person, the first place does so as well as all the others. Here one should have answered; I urged this, since I indicated how God and man would be One Person, and Christ would thereby have received a supernatural being or way of being in all places.

If we want to be Christians and think and speak rightly of Christ, then we must think of him in this way, that the Godhead is apart from and above all creatures. Secondly, we must think that humanity (although it is also a creature), but because it alone, and none else, is so attached to God that it is one person with the Godhead, it must also be higher, above and apart from all other creatures, but under God alone. 1) Well, this is our faith. Now here we come with Christ apart from all creatures, both after mankind and Godhead; there we are in a different land with mankind, because when they walked on earth, that is, apart from and above

1) The construction in this sentence is broken. The sentence should probably read like this: Secondly, we must think that mankind (although it is also a creature, but because it alone, and none else, is so attached to God that it is one person with the Godhead) must also be higher, above and apart from all other creatures, but under God alone.

all creatures, only in the Godhead. Now let faith judge and conclude here. Apart from the creatures there is nothing but God, and this humanity is therefore also apart from the creatures, so it must be, since God is, that is never missing; but essentially it cannot be God. But because it reaches above, out of, above all creatures, to the essential God and sticks to it, and is, since God is, it must be God at the least personally, and thus also be in all places, since God is.

It is true that our reason is foolish to think here, because it is used to understand the word "in" in no other way than in a physical, comprehensible way, as straw is in the sack and bread in the basket. Therefore, where it hears that God is in this or in these, it always thinks of the straw sack and the bread basket. But faith hears that "in" is as much in this matter as over, out, under, through, and again through and everywhere. Oh, what do I say about such high things, which are unspeakable, and unnecessary for the simple, but for nothing at all for the enthusiasts, and also harmful! For they understand it as little as a donkey understands the psalter, unless they can pinch out a little piece that they blaspheme and desecrate, so that they go idly about the main things and skip over them, as the oppressor is fooling here, and from my discourse he is saying that if Christ is everywhere, then he cannot be received with the mouth, or the mouth must also be everywhere. This is called a real wilful wickedness, because the devil shows himself with it.

For this reason I will also stop speaking of this piece: whoever can be advised has had enough of this; but whoever does not want to, let him always go. The simple have enough of the simple words of Christ, which he says in the Lord's Supper, "This is my body," because the foolish have nothing certain or lasting to say against it, nor do they answer correctly to some of it. For whoever is found on some foul ground in this great matter, he is to be held reasonably suspect and shunned. Certainly because they arrogantly and confidently boast that they have Scripture and that everything is certain; how much more should they be considered as the erroneous, pompous, red-baiting spirits?

because they are not found on one alone, but for vain loose reasons, that they also lie so much publicly and answer no piece correctly.

177 And especially the heretic is henceforth not worthy of any more answer than to recant his blasphemous allies. For as it is said: A public lie is not worthy of an answer; so also he is to be shunned as a public heretic who denies a public article of faith. Now the Zwingel not only denies this highest, most necessary article, "that God's Son died for us," but also blasphemes it and says that it is the most outrageous heresy that has ever existed. This is where his arrogance and damned alliosis lead him, that he dissects the person of Christ, and leaves us with no other Christ than a sincere man who died for us and redeemed us. What Christian heart can hear or suffer such a thing? Surely the whole Christian faith and all the blessedness of the world is taken away and condemned. For he who is redeemed by mankind alone is not yet redeemed, of course, nor will he ever be redeemed.

But there is neither time nor space to go on about this now. I confess for myself that I consider Zwingel to be an unchristian with all his teachings; for he holds and teaches no part of the Christian faith rightly, and has become worse seven times than when he was a pope, according to the judgment of Christ, Matth. 12, 45: "It will be worse with such a man hereafter than it was before. I make this confession so that I may be excused before God and the world, as I am not in agreement with Zwingel's teachings, nor do I want to be for eternity.

Summa Summarum, we do not allow allöosin nor heterosin, nor Jthipöian 1), nor some gankelwerk, which Zwingel brings out of his gaukelsack. We want to have reason from Scripture, and not art from his poem. Ask nothing about the fact that he rages and foams so cruelly here, as if he were possessed with great anger. With anger and wrath one will not take our mind. That does not want to the angry spirit

1) xxxxxxxx.

that we might be made sure how Christ's body might not be in heaven and the Lord's Supper at the same time, as the words read: "This is my body. Perhaps from great anger or from great moderation, he leaves the piece and rushes past, and in the meantime teaches us new *tropos*, without all distress.

180 For that he is slandering and therefore concludes: If my doctrine should exist, that Christ is body everywhere, per God, then Christ body would be alterum *infinitem*, an infinite thing, like God Himself 2c. He could well see for himself, where anger does not blind him, that such a consequence is nothing. If the world itself is not *infinitem* or infinite, how should it follow that Christ's body would be infinite if it were everywhere? To this end, the blind mind infers such a consequence in the crude, comprehensible way, and yet we know that God is able to hold something in place in more than one way, as has been proven above. An angel can be in heaven and on earth at the same time, as Christ testifies, Matth. 18, 10.: "Their angels always see the Father's face in heaven." If they serve us, they are with us on earth, and yet they always see the Father's face in heaven; yet they are not *infinitem* or infinite in nature.

The coarse spirit does not yet know what it means to be in heaven, and wants to make inferences about it. For since I said how Christ was in heaven while he was still on earth, as John 3:13 says, "the Son of Man who is in heaven," 2c., help God, how does he infer and juggle? How could (he says) Christ be in heaven at that time? Does one eat and drink also in heaven? Does one die and suffer in heaven? Do you sleep and rest in heaven? See, where you come, you mad Luther, fie your 2) times. How do you think about this victory of the spirit? Constantinople he has won herewith, and the Turk eaten, there goes his gaukelsack in jumping with vain Allöosin and Ithipöien.

182. but go, you beautiful devil; a pious christ) tell me if it's not higher

2) Wittenberger: you.

3) In the old editions: one from Christians.

and greater is that mankind is in GOD, yes, with GOD One Person, than that it is in Heaven? Is not God higher and more glorious than Heaven? Now Christ humanity has been higher and deeper in God and before God from the womb than any angel; so, of course, it has also been higher in heaven than any angel. For what is in God and before God is in heaven; just as the angels are when they are on earth, as is said in Matth. 18, 10. Unless God Himself is not yet in heaven. So I would also like to conclude and juggle from the Zwinglian art: Does one also eat and drink in the Godhead? Does one also die and suffer in the Godhead? Behold, whither comest thou, thou mad John the Evangelist, who wilt teach us that Christ is GOD and in the Godhead? For if with God there is no dying, nor suffering, nor eating, nor drinking, then Christ's humanity cannot be with God, much less be One Person with God. That is where I wanted to go (says the devil) with my jugglery; but you, hostile Luther, are here to ruin my jugglery.

If Christ can suffer and die on earth at the same time, even though he is one person in the Godhead and with God, why should he not be able to suffer much more on earth if he is already in heaven at the same time? If heaven should hinder it, much more would the Godhead hinder it. How can I say that not only Christ was in heaven when he walked on earth, but also the apostles and all of us who are mortal on earth, if we believe in Christ? First of all, there should be a rumble in Zwingel's bag of tricks. There he would conclude: Does one sin also in heaven? Does one also err in heaven? Does the devil also attack in heaven? Does the world persecute us even in heaven? Does flesh and blood also tempt us in heaven? and so on. For we sin and err without ceasing, as the Lord's Prayer teaches, "Forgive us our trespasses," and are always challenged by the devil, world and flesh. With this manner you should put the devil and the world, flesh and blood in heaven. Look where you are going, you mad Luther. Fie, will you not yet

Grab hold of the fact that our spirit is not a juggler, there you have it once.

How shall I do to him? St. Paul deceived me when he said Eph. 1, 3: "God has blessed us with all kinds of spiritual blessings in the heavenly realm." And again Cap. 2, 5, 6: "He has made us alive together with Christ, and has raised us up together with Him, and has seated us together with Him in the heavenly realm," and Col. 3, 3: "Our life is hidden with Christ in God. This, of course, must be in heaven; but the spirit can certainly call upon his magic bag here, that it may give him out an alloiosis or ithiopoeia, which teaches us to change here and to take one for the other, that heaven here should be called earth, as he also says in Joh. 6, 55, that Christ must be called flesh his Godhead. For the allosis is master in the Scriptures, and where we do not want to believe it, he will force it on us with inferences and say: "We did not go to heaven on Mount Oel, and from there to heaven, but here in German lands; therefore St. Paul must call heaven as much as earth. For this spirit is called heaven no more than that 1) he may show with fingers and eyes above him, where the sun and moon stand; and because they never stand still, I hold that they give Christ such a place in heaven, where he can never sit still. For I cannot think, nor bring out of them, what place they give Christ in heaven. But let what goes there go.

185: So to my saying from Col. 2, 9: "All the fullness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily" 2c., he must not say more than: bodily means essential, just as if Christ had not also been essential God before he [God] dwelt bodily in Christ. It is fine that the spirit may interpret what it wants, and must not prove it. Just like the saying Eph. 4, 10: "Christ descended and ascended into all the heavens, that he might fill all things. 2) Here he calls "fulfill" the holy Scriptures, and again shouts against the mad Luther, as if he had broken hell. But that he should prove it, that is not necessary, it is enough, that the

1) Walch and the Erlangeners: that.

2) Erlanger: "füllt" and immediately following: "fill".

Spirit says so, then enough is answered, and our mind is wrong.

But there he meets Luther right at first, since he proves his inference about the saying of Christ: "Where I am, there you shall be also. Behold, he says, if Christ is everywhere, we must also be everywhere. I am surprised that he does not also conclude: because we are where Christ is, we must also all be God and man; for Christ is, since he is God and man. Item, Christ passed through sealed stone and closed door, therefore we must also pass through it. Item, Christ is spiritually in us, so we also must be spiritually in us 2c.

(187) Yes, again he might well conclude, Where Christ is, there we cannot be. For it is no more true that many bodies are in one place than that one body is in many places; but since Christ has a place in heaven (as they say), each one must also have his own place. Since this saying, "Where I am, there ye shall be also," is contrary to Scripture and faith, where it should be understood, according to which it reads, Mrs. Allöosis or Heterosis, or perhaps the common *figura* Narrosis, must become godfather here, and help us to the right understanding. Can I not also finely drive her consequence?

Now a sow shall not be a dove, and the cuckoo must not be a nightingale. The proud devil acts as he pleases in the world, and indicates with such jugglery that, because he cannot answer, he wants to practice his flush on us. But we know that the Scriptures set this one man and no other at the right hand of God. Whether we will be the same where he is, according to the first or the second way, as shown above, we will not be the third way where he is, that is, at the right hand of God, one person with God, according to which way he is where God is. Yes, because he is everywhere, we are certainly where he is; for he must also be with us, if he is to be everywhere. If the inferential spirit has overturned this, it mixes it up and does not want to know more than the one, understandable way. He must know nothing about it everywhere and understand nothing himself, what he raves about.

That is enough of this first part; for from these sayings and answers of the spirit everyone can see that all their art is much chattering and shouting, but they can neither answer nor understand anything; and the more writing they have, the more they show their foolishness. Let us now consider the other saying, "Flesh is of no use," and hear whether the devil will answer or mock. 1)

First, since I had written that Christ flesh does not belong under the saying John 3:6, "That which is born of flesh is flesh," but under this, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit," and had proved this very powerfully from our faith and gospel, since the angel says to Joseph, Matt. 1:20, "That which is born in Mary is of the Holy Spirit," and Luc. 1:35, "That which is born in you is holy," 2c. Against such thunderbolts of Scripture he does no more, but sets his bare and naked jealousy, and says: Christ flesh is also born of flesh, and I do wrong to make it spirit. This is not different (as I understand it), as if the hopeful devil wanted to say so much: You impotent, mad Luther, shall I answer you and lay your sayings? I do into thee. I say that Christ's flesh is born of flesh; let it remain so, and do not murmur a word against it.

191 Now I should say: Mercy-²⁾ Junker, what you say is right and must not be proven. If I were so little interested in the matter as the spirit, which, where it feels that it is struck by me, either jumps or is angry, or meows One word or two half, 3) and is then called an answer!

But we know that Christ's flesh cannot belong to the saying (that which is of the flesh is flesh), if it were ten times a zoom 4) or if it had fifteen allöoses vain change banks. It does

1) Erlanger: wool.

2) Grace == gracious. Also well written: Gnadjunker.

3) two the neck and a half.

4) i.e. a saying, a generally accepted aphorism.

nothing to the matter that a gnome is; because Christ speaks there of the new birth and condemns "the" fleshly old birth, that it can not see the kingdom of God 2c. Therefore be anathema and cursed, where it is said that Christ is born of flesh, since Christ flesh is not condemned, nor had to be born elsewhere to the kingdom of God, but is holy and has brought us the new birth.

Who brought the spirit to school, and taught him what flesh and spirit mean! For he calls the creature flesh, if it is not spirit, as it was created by God, as Christ says Luc. 24, 39: "that a spirit has neither flesh nor bone. How is it possible that he should understand with such a sense the sayings of John 3 and the like, where flesh and blood are condemned? Since we know that "all creatures of God are good", Genesis 1, and God does not condemn His creatures. After such a manner Christ's flesh and blood came from Mary's flesh and blood; but since flesh and blood, John 3:6, is condemned, since it cannot know the kingdom of God, it must certainly not be called the creature of God, since it is flesh, bone, skin and hair; for all these are good creatures of God.

194 For this reason flesh must be called here, not only blood, bone and marrow, as it is God's creature, but as it is without spirit and in its own power, work, custom, wit, will and ability. Therefore Christ would not be born of man's seed, that he might not be born of flesh, that is, of fleshly work, desire, will, or activity, but only of the power and activity of the Holy Spirit, and thus his flesh is spiritless, holy, pure; for what can holiness, purity, innocence be but spirit and spiritless?

But our enthusiasts call the spirit nothing more than a being that has neither flesh nor bone; therefore holiness, purity, innocence are not spirit with them. They are grossly unlearned humps in these matters, they want to teach a lot, and they understand the

Words they do not speak. Christ, Joh. 3,6, 1) is also called all those spirit, who are born of the spirit, who must have flesh, bone, marrow, skin and hair. I have written enough of this in that book, for even if I write it a thousand times, my dear Junker enthusiasts do not read it or respect it, so I let them go.

The Spirit lays three great vices upon me over these words, "Flesh is of no use," so let us hear and see how the angry devil writes such poisonous lies through his deluded, wretched enthusiasts. The first is that I should be against myself, because I have taught from time to time that eating Christ's body in the flesh is of no use, and I teach here and there that eating Christ's flesh is of use. My little books are in the day, by which one can convince this lying spirit that he acts on me as befits such a disciple. Dear, what is the use if I write against this spirit forever, because he is busy acting with public insolent lies; let the devil go.

I have thus taught and still teach that Christ's flesh is not only of no use, but also poison and death, if it is eaten without faith and word. I have said more that God, and the Holy Spirit Himself, are poison, death, and no good, if they are received without faith; for there is written, "To the unclean nothing is clean," Titus 1:15. Item, Psalm 18:27: "With the perverse thou art perverse." For indeed the Jews did not become holy when they attacked and killed Christ. But again, the eating of Christ's flesh is blessed, necessary and useful, if it is eaten bodily together with the word and faith. For there it is written, "To the pure all things are pure." Read my booklet, and you will see that the lying spirit does not know how to answer, and therefore wants to make my booklet suspect with crude, impolite lies.

A child of seven years can well understand that these two are not contrary to each other: To eat Christ's flesh without faith is not useful, and to eat Christ's flesh in the flesh is not useful.

1) Here the Erlanger has improved Walch's wrong Bible quotation: Joh. 3, 16.

eating with faith is useful. Just as the two are not contrary to each other: Christ's flesh is of no use to the ungodly, and Christ's flesh is of use to the pious, as I have almost abundantly set forth in the next booklet, that in faith even death and all evil are found useful, except the flesh of Christ, which in itself is holy and useful, full of divinity 2c. Nor may the lying spirit lie publicly that I should have said that Christ's flesh is useful, enjoyed without faith, as he rages with his examples. For the touching was not useless, since the bloody woman touched Christ's hem; or we would also have to say that she did not touch Christ's hem, because touching is not useful; just as they are lying here: Eating Christ's flesh is not useful, therefore his flesh is not there; it is the devil's trickery.

199 The other bad thing, so he interprets me, is that I should not have translated the text correctly "meat is not useful", because in the Greek it says: the meat is not useful, and I have omitted the little word "that". Why the spirit makes such fools, I cannot know, without methinks he wants to twist himself on the place, and charm the people, that they should wonder at great 1) art of the Greek language in his head, when he has not forgotten much of the same. If he knows that such chatter does not matter at all, then it is a knavery; if he does not know, then it is an indication that he still needs a schoolmaster for a while; for both Latin, German, and Greek speakers must confess to me that this text, *σαρξ οὐκ ωφελεί ουδέν*, in the

Thus, the following must be interpreted into Latin: *Caro non prodest quicquam*, that is, "flesh is not useful", and cannot stand for "that" in Latin; as Erasmus and all the others interpret it.

The Germans must also testify to the fact that, according to our language, it is a very common custom and manner to add "that" or "a", or to let it stand. As when we say: man and woman is one body, it is just as much as, a man and a woman is one body; yes, it is more finely spoken:

1) Walch and the Erlangeners: larger.

Husband and wife is one body, for a husband and wife is one body. Item, Peter has house and yard, wife and child in Bethsaida, is as much as, Peter has house and yard, wife and child in Bethsaida. Item, master and servant is one cake, is equal to, the master and the servant is one cake; item, he gave me dog for dog, horse for horse 2), is equal to, he gave me a dog for a dog, horse for a horse; item, woman shall not be master in the house, is equal to, a woman or the woman shall not be the master or a master in the house.

201 Henceforth, there will be a lot of talking in the German tongue. And such words, which may be left out or added, are called "articles" by scholars. In the Latin language, there are none, and no one can set certain measures or rules as to when they are to be omitted or added, but one must set and leave them according to the common usage of the language. For it sometimes happens that it reads more delicately when they are omitted than when I speak of two equals: It is man against man, which is finer than when I say, It is one man against one man. Item, so one speaks: piece for piece, eye for eye, fist for fist, money for money, body for body. In which speeches the articles are better left out, than that they stand by.

Again, sometimes they are much more subtle than if they were left outside, as when I say, "A man is stronger than a woman," or, "A man is stronger than a woman. Although it would be just as much if I said, "Man is stronger than woman," it is not quite so true. The Zwingel is worse than the Oecolampad, is better, because so, Zwingel is worse than Oecolampad. An apostle is higher than a prophet, so it is better: Apostle is higher than prophet.

203 Yes, it happens that we Germans often have to put such articles, since they are not in the Greek, as Matth. 1, 1. is *Βιβλος γενέσεως*, that is, book birth of Jesus.

Christ, that is nothing at all 3) therefore must be

2) Gorre - bad horse.

3) Wittenberger and Erlanger: "ja" instead of: gar.

I translate it thus: the book of the birth, or even better: "This is the book of the birth of Jesus Christ. Item, Joseph did as the angel of the Lord commanded him. There is no article "of" in the Greek, but schlechts, the angel of the Lord, and must nevertheless stand in the German. Item, Matth. 3, 3. and Marc. 1, 3. Luc. 3, 4. we must say, "a voice or the voice of one calling in the wilderness", although in the Greek it stands badly xxxx xxxxxx, that is, voice calling.

Again, we must not put an article, since it must be in the Greek, as Matth. 1, 2. 23: "Abraham begat Isaac", there it is written in the Greek, Abraham begat Isaac. Item, "Emanuel, that is interpreted, God with us", here it is written in Greek: God with us. Take the Greek Testament before you and hold it up against the German language, and you will find, as I say, that articles are often written there, since they do not have to be written in German, and again, they are not written in Greek, since they have to be written in German.

I say this so that one may see how the oppressor deals with jugglery and bases his error on such loose talk; for where the article should be so necessary and give that something special or dependent on the forerunner would be spoken, as he drools, then it should also be right in Marc. 1, 3, since Marcus says: "Voice calling", since it is probably such a special voice and caller as has never come on earth. Item, should also stand Jn. 1, 6, since he writes: "There was a man sent from God. Now in the Greek it does not say: there was a man sent, but: there was a man sent. And so from now on, Zwingel will have to study Greek for five years before he can prove his dream of the articles, or before he will indicate where and when they are to be removed or added. I know of no other proof, for it may well be spoken in one way (as has been said) without articles and with articles, and this also gives one meaning; but one is more completely or finely spoken than the other, which must be recognized from the custom and usage of the languages.

206: So here also: "Meat is no good", is probably in the Greek: the meat is no good.

But because one is as valid as the other, as I have proved above with examples, and everyone may find plenty of the same in the Greek, I have also used both, and will also use both henceforth, because they are both right, and the belly of the spirit shall burst; although it reads more finely in German: Fleisch ist kein nütze, denn, das Fleisch ist kein nütze. It is as much the opinion of Christ as if I said, "Meat is of no use," or, "It is a useless thing about the flesh. You may speak such an opinion as follows: Flesh is of no use, or as follows: Flesh is of no use; one and the other are equally valid. Otherwise the Latin would never have to have this text, nor could they get it, because they would have to say without all articles that meat is not useful, and yet they would have the right interpretation. But the fact that Zwingel refers to some teachers who teach such things from the articles does not help him; for they do not teach like Zwingel in the play; so their proofs do not dispute anything either; nor is he serious, for he does not consider them so learned that they should advise or help him in this matter.

Now he does not let him suffice with such jugglery of the articles, but continues and interprets the article "that" in this place, "the flesh is no good" thus: just the flesh is no good, and "that" and "just that" shall apply equally. Will the opinion of Christ thus master/ just the flesh (hear, of which I said above, "my flesh is the right food"). Now the whole world knows that in German "eben das" is not an article, but a pronoun of good strength, which is relativum and demonstrativum at the same time, as the idem. Here the scholars understand well, what a gross ass piece this is, ex articulo pronomen demonstrativum et relativum facere. So Luther should be taught to interpret the text. What shall one do with such sacrilegious spirits, who take quod pro qualiter, articulum pro pronomine, carnem pro divinitate, and put everything they may think into the Scriptures? If he has learned such things from Cyrillo, Chrysostom and Erasmo of the articles, he has truly learned them in a dream or smoke-.

For no one teaches them in this way, he teaches them falsely.

There is a great difference between "the flesh is of no use" and "this flesh is of no use," or "the very flesh," or "the same flesh. 2c. For "the same" or "this" or "that" may not be omitted, like the articles, without change of mind. If I say: The man shall be lord of the house and not the woman, here it does not show me a certain present man or woman, but speaks freely in general of all women and men. But if I say: this man or this very man shall be master, and not this woman or this very woman, then it shows me a particular man and woman, excluded from all, as present; for this is what a pronoun is called, when it points to a particular, immediately as present, and separates the same from all others.

But the article does not indicate anything special or present, separated from others, but speaks freely, without signs or interpretations. As when one says: This man is pious, this woman is chaste, this bread is beautiful; here the speech points to special persons as present, and if one were to take away such pronouns or little words and say: Man is pious, woman is chaste, there would be neither sense nor understanding left of the previous. But if I say: The man shall be a man, the woman shall be a woman, I can well take off the articles and still have the sense as: Man shall be man, woman shall be woman, for the article shows nothing present or as present, as the pronoun does.

Because this spirit must confess that there is no pronoun, but an article: "the flesh is of no use," and yet he makes a pronoun out of it, not only with the interpretation, since he says that "this" is as much as "that," but also with the interpretation, since he says that in that place the same flesh should be called, of which Christ spoke above, Joh. 6, 55: "My flesh is the right food", he himself testifies that he falsifies God's word and deals evil with the simple. For an article is never from the former or the latter.

The word "flesh" does not speak of things as a pronoun, but speaks of them freely in general, so that it can be understood just as well when it is spoken of without an article, even though it does not read as well or as finely. Therefore it is impossible, according to grammar, that flesh here should be called Christ's flesh in particular, of which he speaks above; but must be called flesh in general, so that one could also speak of it without the article, namely, "Flesh is of no use.

We Germans also have such a difference of pronouns and articles in the sound or tone, which the Latin call accent. For there is many other "that" where Christ says Matth. 26, 26: "This is my body", and many other where he says Joh. 6, 63: "The flesh is of no use. The first "that" is a pronoun, and the letter a inside is strong and long, as if it were written dahas, as a Swabian or Algauian daas reads, and whoever hears it, it is as if there is a finger pointing to it.

212) But the other "that" is short, so that one hardly hears the letter a or does not know whether it sounds a, e or i, and there is no finger to show that it reads; just as the Bohemians short their letters and say: Przikasani, there you cannot notice whether he says Parzikasani or Perzikasani or Pirzikasani, so it reads nimbly. So, when a German speaks correctly: Wie ist das Korn so theuer, you can't tell whether he says das, des or dies Korn; for it reads as if the words were without middle letters: wie ist dsKorn so theuer, or thus: wie istds Korn so theuer, so briefly and nimbly it reads. As I now say of the "that," so one should also think of the other articles, as: this, the, the, the, the; if they stretch the middle letter long, as if it were in between, then they are pronouns; if they read nimbly, as if the middle letter disappeared, then they are articles; as if you speak: Dfrau, Drherr, Dskind, Dshaus, verhaufen auf kürzeste, there they are articles and do not point with fingers to something.

1) Wittenberger and Jenaer: "kündet"; Erlanger: "kunntet".

From this, every German can understand this quarrelsome thing, and notice the mischievousness of this spirit. For Joh. 6, 51: "That is my flesh", he makes a long Swabian dahas, or a pronoun, when it is an article and short "that", and in the proper German it reads: *Das Fleisch ist kein nütze*, or thus: *Sfleisch ist kein nütz*, as if only the single letter *s* stood in front of it. There you have actually and clearly the text Joh. 6. and what the articles are or are able to do. Now be the judge, who knows German, between me and Zwingel. Zwingel says that the text should apply as follows: the flesh is of no use, or the same flesh is of no use. Who is falsifying the text here? Who is so coarse that does not feel a great difference when one says: the flesh is no good, and the same flesh is no good? Do you understand what the evil spirit is dealing with? Further, if I now say in one place: "Meat is no good", and in another: Meat or flesh is no good, dear, what is the difference between them? One is spoken differently from the other, but the meaning is the same. It is as I say, the spirit must do a lot of useless talking, so that it smears people's mouths, as if it wanted to answer, so that one does not notice its jumping and flapping.

214. after that he takes up the matter with seriousness and wants to prove from the text Joh. 6, 63. that Christ speaks of his flesh when he says: "Flesh is of no use. Here let us hear art. First of all, he says, the disciples grumbled because Christ taught that they had to eat his flesh. Now they did not grumble against the spiritual mind, but against the bodily food; there it is. Tell me, dear one, does this prove that Christ's flesh is of no use? Or that such a saying is to be understood of Christ's flesh? Certainly, for in Zwinglian logic everything follows in all sorts of ways. Ah, it is a vexatious thing to deal with such boys in God's words.

215 We say that the disciples both murmured against the mind of the Spirit, and against the bodily eating of the flesh of Christ; for they understood none of them aright, thinking that they must tear his flesh with their teeth, as

other perishable flesh. But from this it does not yet follow that Christ's flesh, as incorruptible, spiritual flesh, may not be eaten bodily with faith in the Lord's Supper. The Spirit should overthrow this; so he teaches us how the disciples understood to eat Christ's flesh bodily, just as if we did not know this without his mastery; he answers where he can.

216 Secondly, he teaches us that the disciples were offended at such talk of Christ eating his flesh in the flesh; from this it must follow that Christ, in his answer, speaks for and of his flesh. Dear, why does it follow? Because it says Zwingel; that is enough. Just as if Christ 1) could not speak of other flesh, when he wants to teach the spiritual mind to eat of his flesh, if he could not teach more subtly than to indicate two kinds of flesh and teach two kinds of eating, and thus say: Flesh and blood does not let you understand such eating of my flesh, because such flesh is not useful; but this flesh is life, *quia unicum et optimum genus docendi est, bene dividere et definire*. Therefore it follows rather that this saying, "Flesh is of no use," must be understood of other flesh, which Christ separates and sets against his flesh, as all right teachers are wont to do where they teach best.

217 To the third/Christ speaks: "If you now see the Son of Man going up, where he was before. What he means by this, I cannot think up, without everything that he speaks must serve the spirit for his lie. Perhaps he wants to sing a mean little song to her: Christ is going to heaven, therefore his body cannot be eaten in the Lord's Supper. What such talk is capable of, is said enough above. But that he thereby wants to prove that the saying, "Flesh is of no use," speaks of Christ's flesh, that is a pretty logic and a very beautiful consequence. As if I said: Christ went to heaven, therefore the saying of his body is to be understood: "All men are liars" [Rom. 3, 4. Ps. 116, 11.]. Doesn't it rhyme and follow well? That means in Swiss the Luther beaten, that

1) Erlanger: could.

not one footman remains, as Kleist boasts.

218. fourth, "the Spirit is that quickeneth," John 6:63. There, there, that is short and good (he says), the saying shall conclude, if the Spirit alone quickeneth, then is Christ's flesh no good, because it is not the Spirit. So then we must say, Since Christ's flesh is not the Spirit, and therefore is not useful, since the Spirit alone is useful, how can it be useful if it is given for us? How can it be of use if it is in heaven and we believe in it? For if the reason is right and sufficient, that because Christ's flesh is not spirit it can be of no use, so it can be of no use either in the cross or in heaven; for there is no spirit either in the cross or in heaven, or in the Lord's Supper. Therefore, since there is no Spirit crucified for us, Christ's flesh is crucified uselessly for us; and since there is no Spirit, but Christ's flesh ascended into heaven, we believe in a useless flesh in heaven. For Christ's flesh, be it where it may, is not a spirit. If it is not a spirit, it is not useful and does not give life, as the devil is smuggling here. Behold, where the devil goeth forth, that is, to remove the mist from the eyes.

219. fifth, "the words that I speak are spirit and life" 2c. From this he concludes that Christ speaks of his flesh since he says, "Flesh is of no use." Awe yes, beautiful consequence, like the next one above! I fear that the wise man with great arrogance thinks that there is no man on earth, or considers all men to be vain geese and jackdaws, how else would it be possible that he should be so impudent and thirsty as to display such gross foolishness?

We know that Christ's words are spirit and life, but that it should follow that Christ's flesh is useless, no one will say, because he is mad and foolish, or because he despises the mind and thoughts of the world. The Spirit says it follows, but when does he prove such a consequence? Of course, these very words of Christ "Flesh is of no use," are spirit and life, for with them he enlightens us, and points us from the flesh to the Spirit which is a wholesome spiritual teaching that gives life. Now it would be a public blasphemy if someone wanted to say that Chri

stus should reject his flesh, to which he nevertheless points us, and says: "My flesh is the right food", v. 55. It would be that Mrs. Allöosis here once again made God out of flesh for us; but we do not listen to the sinful.

221. sixth, Christ says: "But there are some of you who do not believe. V. 64. Item, Peter speaks there v. 68: "To whom shall we go? Thou hast words of eternal life." From these two sayings, he concludes and gags again that because such sayings speak of faith and the living Word, Christ's flesh must be understood in the saying, "Flesh is of no use," and he must not start a new one to speak of other flesh 2c. I have also heard many a foolish consequence or consequence all my life; but I have never heard a more foolish and sacrilegious consequence than this spirit makes, that because Christ speaks of faith and word, it must follow that the saying, "Flesh is no good," is spoken of his flesh. I truly believe that this spirit does not think differently in his heart, but thus: We Zwingel by the grace of God, giant and Roland, hero and victor in French and German lands, apostle of all apostles, prophet of all prophets, teacher of all teachers, master of all masters, scholar of all scholars, lord of all lords, spirit of all spirits 2c., say thus and thus, let it remain so; that and no other. For how could it be possible that he should walk so proudly, and infer and act in the Scriptures and God's Word everywhere, where he was not possessed with inhuman pride and iniquity?

222. we poor sinners and carnivores have nowhere and never said that Christ began a new thing when he said, "flesh is of no use," as the Spirit owes us, but confess even to this day that Christ, when he began from his flesh, spoke through and through, for and for, to the end of the chapter, John 6:51. of the spiritual eating of his flesh; but so we say: Because out of such a speech of his two disciples were made, some being offended at it, and murmuring, and running away from him, and some believing, and praising, and abiding with him, he hath at such a discord

without all new beginnings, may say: "Spirit gives life, flesh is of no use. Which we have not understood otherwise, but thus: My doctrine is spiritual; he that will understand it carnally lacks, and such understanding is of no use; but he that understands it spiritually lives. Here is nothing new spoken of his flesh eating, but difference of the disciples, who heard such, indicated, and have always been ready to learn differently, where someone would do it with good reason.

223. as if I preached, Good works are not profitable for righteousness; here I get two kinds of disciples; some are angry, murmuring, running away, and saying, How? does this man forsake all good works? but others believe, praise, and remain. Here I also want to say: My doctrine of good works is spiritual, and spoken differently, namely, good works for righteousness, and good works for God's praise. He who understands them to be necessary for righteousness is lacking; but he who understands them to be necessary for God's praise meets the mark. Here I mean that this is not a new sermon, but is preached through and through, for and for, of good works, although I am preaching from two different disciples.

224 Christ does the same in John 6:51: He teaches about the eating of his flesh, and then deals with the difference between the disciples who hear this teaching. He finds some carnal, some spiritual, and pronounces the judgment on them in v. 63: "the flesh is of no use, the spirit gives life. He declares himself and says: "My words are spirit and life. Which can be nothing 1) but this: I must have spiritual disciples for my words; carnal disciples will not do, for they are disciples of the flesh, and not of my words; "But the flesh is of no use," and deceives them. For as the Spirit 2) is his word and doctrine, so must flesh also be the word and doctrine of the flesh. So the "Spirit", that is, his word and teaching, gives life, and "flesh", that is, the word and teaching of the flesh, "is of no use", of which I have written enough elsewhere.

225. the third virtue, so I have to

1) "nothing" put by us instead of: "not" in the issues.

2) In the Jena: so.

The reason for this is that my rule was wrong when I wrote: Where spirit and flesh are set against each other in the Scriptures, the flesh must not be called Christ flesh, but must be called the old Adam. Oh, here the great Christophel of Zurich tears down vain trees, and throws mountain and valley into one another. If I understand his filzicht, zötticht German correctly (which is truly difficult for me), then he makes a distinction between God's spirit and our spirit, which is as necessary to the matter as the fifth wheel to the wagon, without it serving to make the poor rabble think that the great giant of Zurich wants to answer, and is hidden in him vain art.

226 But we do not care whether it is God's Spirit or our spirit, so my rule still stands, that where in Scripture spirit and flesh are set against each other or in opposition to each other, flesh cannot be called Christ's flesh, for his flesh is not against the Spirit, but rather born of the Holy Spirit, and full of the Holy Spirit to boot. But since here Christ says: "Spirit makes alive" and "flesh is of no use", it is clear enough that he means such flesh, which is not spirit, nor has spirit, but is contrary to the spirit: for "to make alive" and "to be of no use" are contrary to each other as death and life, as I have explained further in that book 3).

227 But that the disciples teach me afterwards how the spirit and the flesh rhyme together, as John 1:14: "The Word became flesh", and 1 Peter 3:18: "Christ died according to the flesh, but was made alive according to the spirit", the dear God thanks him; for who could have found this without his help? So my rule holds: Where spirit and flesh are opposed to each other in Scripture 2c. In order that I may confess clearly enough that the spirit and the flesh are not opposed to each other at all ends. For even here the question is not whether flesh and spirit are compatible with one another in Scripture; but this is the question: Where spirit and flesh are not compatible with one another, as here happens: "Flesh is of no use, spirit makes alive," there (I say) flesh cannot be called Christ's flesh.

Here the defiant hero should answer; so he flutters by, and in the meantime another, and teaches us that spirit and flesh are not contrary to each other in some places of the Scriptures; nor is all this called answered; as the one asks: Where does the way go out, and this one answers: I cut out young woodpeckers 2c. Satan is hastening master to chat, where he cannot well answer.

I also urged the little word *mea*, that Christ should not say here, *My* flesh is not profitable, as he saith above, My flesh is meat. Then he gives me this notice: "Just as Christ does not say, 'My spirit gives life,' and yet it is his spirit, so he does not say, 'My flesh,' even though it is his flesh. Distort yourself once, little spirit, but Christ does not speak here of his own spirit, which he has personally, but, as the text reads, of the spirit that makes alive, that is, of the common spirit, which is in all believers. Although Christ gives the same, and is Christ's Spirit, yet here he is a common Spirit everywhere where he gives life, for he does not give life to Christ alone. So here flesh must also be the common flesh, which is without spirit and is of no use.

229 Therefore the oppressor needs a real sophistry and deception in the word "my", which is called *fallacia figurae dictionis*. For above, when Christ speaks Joh. 6, 55: "My flesh is the right food", "my" means his own personal flesh, which is not common to anyone. But when here the Spirit is called his Spirit, it is 1) not his own personal Spirit alone, but the common Spirit in all, which he gives. Therefore "flesh" here cannot be called his flesh, as the spirit is called his spirit; for his flesh is not the common flesh in all. But he who knows nothing to answer must thus make do.

(230) That is enough of the other main thing, in which everyone can see that the swarming spirit cannot bring this saying, "Flesh is of no use," upon Christ's flesh, and how he stands over it with shame, and so can answer nothing at all. For he leaves all the examples in place and remains silent,

Since I had so abundantly proven how Abraham, Sarah, Isaac and the rest of the holy flesh would have been of use for faith, and was thus powerfully convinced that much more of Christ's flesh would have to be of use, 2c., I must give him credit for this; it is better that he remain silent and pass by, than that he should suffocate over it and lie down in public; he well feels that it would not help to be angry and blasphemous.

231 So also that he does not answer to the fathers' sayings, but says badly, you Luther do not understand them right, so he does not care much if they do not stand with him 2c. is also well done. What should such a high 2) spirit answer to such ragwork? Well, he may go and be taught, but he shall never become my master nor helper, if God wills that he turn from his blasphemous teaching, not only in this matter, but in all others, since he deceives himself and the people so miserably. May he and all be helped by Christ our Lord, amen.

232 Let us now also hear Oekolampad, how he answers, which I still hope he will not hold with constraint in all things, but only in the sacrament and baptism. God help him out, amen. I have proved above that Oekolampad's trope cannot be in the Lord's Supper, nor should it be; for he cannot prove it. Above that, it is also a perverse and naughty trope against all the tropes of Scripture, so that one must take it to be a deliberate poem; I must make that clear.

233) Wherever a trope or a new word is used in the Scriptures, there are also two interpretations; a new one, over the first 3) old or previous one, as said above. As, the word "vine" in the Scripture has two interpretations, an old and new one. According to the old or first one, it badly means the shrub or plant in the vineyard; according to the new one, it means Christ, Jn. 15:5: "I am a vine," or a child's mother, Ps. 128:3: "Your wife will be like a vine," or what is similar, so that it has a likeness to the vine in fruit, as the orators teach, *quae transferun-*

1) Wittenberg and Jena: is.

2) Erlanger: higher.

3) In the issues: first.

tur, secundum similitudinem transferuntur, that is, all renewal or tropi happen an equation halden.

234 Now these same tropes in Scripture are done in such a way that the words, according to the old or first interpretation, show the thing that is like the new thing, and according to the new interpretation they show the new right thing or being itself, and not back again. As in this saying, "I am the right vine." Here the word "vine" has become a trope or new word, which cannot interpret back the old vine, which is of the new likeness, but interprets for itself the right new vine itself, which is not a likeness. For Christ is not a likeness of the vine, but again, the vine is a likeness of Christ 2c. Item, "the seed is God's word" (Luc. 8, 11.); here seed does not indicate the grain, which is a likeness of the gospel, but (as a negated word or trope should) it indicates the gospel, the right new seed itself, which is not the likeness. And so henceforth, all tropi in Scripture interpret the right new essence, and not the likeness of that same new essence.

But Oecolampad reverses this, and makes such a trope, or negated word, that interprets back the likeness of the new being, and says that "body" should be called the sign or likeness of the body in the saying, "This is my body," when, if he would follow the Scripture, he should rather negate the word "body" so that it would be called the true new body, to which the natural body of Christ would be a likeness. For the Scripture does not trop back in this way, nor does it read, if I were to trop back in this way: "Christ is a vine" [John 15:5], that is, a sign of the vine. Gospel is a seed, that is, a sign of the seed. "Christ is a lamb" [John 1:29], that is, a sign of the lamb. "Christ is a rock" [Matth. 16, 18.], that is, a sign of the rock. Christ is our Passover, that is, a sign of our Passover. "John is Elijah" [Matth. 11, 14.], that is, a sign of Elijah. Summa Summarum, such a trope is not in the Scriptures, nor is it suitable. Therefore also Oecolampad's trope cannot be valid, since he says: Bread...

is my body, that is, my body's sign; for it is a backward, inverted trope, makes of the right being a likeness or sign, which is not of the Holy Scripture kind, therefore it is a mere poem.

236 But if the text stood thus: Take, eat, this is my righteous bread; then one could make a nice trope, and say very delicately, "Bread is here a new word, which according to the first interpretation means: bad bread, which is a likeness of the body of Christ; and according to the new interpretation it is called the righteous new bread itself, which is the body of Christ. But now the text says: "This is my body", and he wants to make a trope there, he must say according to Scripture: The word "body", according to the old interpretation, means the natural body of Christ, but according to the new interpretation it must mean another, new body of Christ, to which 1) his natural body is a likeness. This would be according to the scriptural way the word right and well negated, that the new text would stand thus: This is my right new body, which is not a likeness; just as I say of Christ: This is our vine, that is, a new right vine, which likeness is the old vine in the vineyard.

237 Whether someone wants to pretend here that one nevertheless finds such an oecolampadstropum in common speech, as when one says of the images: This is St. Peter, this is St. Paul, this is Pope Julius, this is Emperor Nero, and so on. In which speeches the words Peter, Paul, Julius, Nero, are taken for images. First of all, I answer: I do not inquire into this; Oecolampad did not intend to use common speech, but the Scriptures, and he must remain in them and follow the same manner. But if he could show me an example of his tropes in Scripture, then he shall have won, and I will fall to him in all things. But if he does not produce an example, he has lost, and his trope is nothing, and a mere poem.

For the Holy Scripture holds itself with speech, as God holds Himself with action. Now God creates in all ways that the interpretation or

1) In Walch's old edition and in the Erlanger: welchen.

The first likeness was made before, and after that the right essence followed, and the fulfillment of the likenesses. For thus the old testament, as a likeness, goes before, and the new testament follows after, as the right essence. In the same way, when it makes tropes or new words, it takes the old word, which is the likeness, and gives it a new interpretation, which is the right essence.

For what would it be if I said, The gospel is a new testament, that is, a likeness of the new testament? That would be saying so much: The gospel is the old testament. Item, "Christ is the Lamb of God", that is, an image or likeness of the Lamb of God, that would be said as much: Christ is the old paschal lamb of Moses. Likewise does Oecolampad with his backward Trope, since he makes an old word out of the new word "body", and says: It shall be called: This is my body's sign, which is so much said: This is bread. Now here 1) bread shall be the old word, and the body the new, and the word "bread" shall mean the body, not the word "body" the bread. Thus its trope becomes water, and cannot stand in Scripture.

240 Secondly, it is also not true that such a trope of Oecolampad is in some common speech or language in the whole world, and whoever brings me a constant example of it, I will give him my neck. They say that such a trope is in this speech: Here is St. Peter, this is an image of St. Peter; but I say no to it, and they cannot prove it, it is their own false poem. For this is a certain rule in all languages: Where the little word "is" is used in a speech, one certainly speaks of the essence of the same thing, and not of its interpretation. Notice this: I take a wooden or silver rose in front of me and ask: What is this? I am answered: It is a rose. Here I do not ask what it means, but about the essence of what it is; so I am also answered what it is, and not what it means. For it is much a different question when I say: What does it mean? and when I say: What is it? "Is" always refers to the essence itself, which is never missing.

1) Erlanger: je.

(241) Yea, saith thou, it is not a rose, but a wood? Answer: That is good, but it is still a rose; even if it is not a natural rose that has grown in the garden, it is still essentially a rose in its own way; for there are many kinds of roses, as silver, gold, cloth, paper, stone, wood; nevertheless, each one is essentially a rose in its essence, and cannot be a mere interpretation. Yes, how could there be an interpretation that did not have a being first? That which is nothing interprets nothing; but that which interprets must first have a being and a likeness of the other being.

242 Therefore, in the case of a wooden rose, both the essence and the interpretation are to be separated from each other, sicut actum primum et secundum, sicut verbum substantivum et activum; according to the essence, it is truly a rose, namely a wooden rose; after that, if the essence thus stands, one may then say: this rose means or is made after another rose. For these are two different sayings or propositions: This is a rose, and: This means a rose; and he who made a speech out of it would be doing as much as if he took propositionem hypotheticam and categoricam for one proposition; quod est impossibile. How clumsy this thing is, the scholars know well.

Just as the essence of roses is various, wooden, silver, golden, 2c., and yet each one is truly a rose in itself and is called so; so also the word rose often becomes another new word (although it remains the same letter) according to the interpretation, as often as the essence of the roses becomes different and different. So that one may nowhere use Oecolampad's tropes, or say: This is the image of a rose. For it is also not true that whoever says, "This is a rose," wants to say or understand, "This is the likeness of a rose;" but he wants to say what it is in essence. And when he further wants to say what it means, he makes two different speeches and says: This is a rose, and means a rose. And everyone must confess that these two sayings are not equally valid, nor do they speak of the same rose, but each one says something different from the other. I truly know that this is true of all, and no one can deny it.

244 Therefore Oecolampad cannot stand with his Trope, that he wants to let these two speeches count equally, "this is my body", and "this is my body's likeness"; because neither tongue nor language suffers this. Equal as not can apply equally, if I say of the image of St. Paul: This is St. Paul, and: This means St. Paul. For the first speech wants to say what the image is, that it is St. Paul, namely a wooden St. Paul, a silver St. Paul, a gold St. Paul, a painted St. Paul. In short, the little word "is" speaks of the essence, be it whatever essence it is, and here St. Paul has become a new word, which is not called the living St. Paul. After that, when I further ask: What does it mean? There is immediately another speech, which now does not speak of the essence, but of the interpretation. So that, just as essence and interpretation are not the same, neither can they be expressed with the same words or speeches; each must have its own special speech.

If now Oecolampad is to stand with his trope, then he must also make two speeches in the Lord's Supper; one of the essence, thus: "This is my body", because there is an "is", which wants and must speak of the essence. Since in the Lord's Supper there is no more than the one speech that speaks of the essence, namely, "This is my body," it must be spoken of an essential body of Christ, God granting that the same body be wooden, silver, or whatever He wills; for there is an "is" that wants to have a body of Christ, which is and is called Christ's body; just as it is common language that there must be a Paul when one says of the image: This is Paul. So Oecolampad must have a body of Christ in the Lord's Supper, he may think whether he wants to make it of bread, wood, clay or stone; the trope must have a body of Christ, because the other speech is not included: This means, or: This is my body's sign, but thus: "This is my body".

246 Summa Summarum, as I have said about the rose, where in a speech the word rose is to become a new word or trope, there must come two roses, both of which bear the name rose with truth;

one that signifies, the other that is signified, and each of the two roses must truly be and be called a rose, though each in its own way, one wooden, the other natural. So also, if the word "my body" is to become a new word or trope in the Lord's Supper discourse, two bodies of Christ must also be added, both of which bear the name "my body" with truth; one which signifies, the other which is signified. So that each of the two bodies of Christ is truly and rightly called one body of Christ, and be it essential that it be like wood, silver, or brass.

If Oecolampad can prove that bread is truly the body of Christ, and may say that it is the body of Christ, which is a likeness of the natural body of Christ, as the wooden rose is truly a rose, and a likeness of the natural rose, he has thus accomplished so much that his trope may be found to be an example, and his trope to be like that which is commonly spoken of in images: This is St. Peter, this is St. Paul 2c., whether it is not yet a trope according to the Scriptures. But if it is not, then its trope is nothing apart from Scripture. How then will he prove that bread is and is called the body of Christ, or that Christ has a body of bread, as St. Paul has a body of wood 1)? Now he must do it, or it is lurking; 2) and if he were to find it, what good would it do? if, nevertheless, such a trope is not valid in Scripture. Because his trope has no exemplars either in Scripture or outside of Scripture, indeed, it is contrary to Scripture and all languages, one can well conclude that it is a purely useless poem.

248 Oecolampad has deceived himself in the saying Tertulliani: Äoo ost *figura* corporis msi, that is my body's shape, there he has considered IlZura or shape for a tropum. For it is good to note that Oecolampad has not invented such a trope from himself, nor taken from the Scriptures, because neither Scripture nor no

1) Thus Walch has already changed instead of: "as St. Paul has a wooden St. Paul" what the editions offer.

2) In the Jena: Lürtzsch. We assume that this is an *Onomatopoeia*, after the manner of "futsch" - lost.

Language thus speaks; but at Tertulliani saying he has run on, and stumbled at it, that he has been misled. Tertullianus, however, does not make a tropum there, but gives an exposition or explanation, 1) how bread is the body of Christ, namely, that it is the figure, under which the body of Christ is, and does not speak of vocabulis, sed de rebus, since he says: Hoc est figura corporis mei, quia panis non est figura sermonis in Grammatica, sed figura rei in natura. And Tertullianus cannot be so great gewesep that he wanted to say that Christ made of the bread a vocabulum in Grammatica, as it MUST follow from Oecolampad's opinion. Sic, panem fecit corpus suum, id est, figuram corporis sui, hoc est, figuram grammaticam; quia talis figura nec in re, nec in usu Scripturae est, quod panis sit figura Corporis Christi.

Hereby, I think, Oecolampad should be deprived of his trope and sign, just as Zwingel is deprived of his interpretation, and Carlstadt is deprived of his xxxxx, that none of them has nor can have his text, and thus all of them sit naked and bare in the Lord's Supper without text. Now if they have no text, they can have neither sense nor understanding. If they have no understanding, they cannot know whether they have vain bread and wine or not. For they must first come to know what they have in the Lord's Supper. But they cannot get there unless they get certain text and understanding. But they can never get that, as we have proved. So we conclude: The enthusiasts themselves do not know what they have in the Lord's Supper. O of the fine spirit! O of the beautiful supper! That is truly sitting and eating in darkness, since one does not know what one is eating or where one is sitting. O dear one, for God's sake give a penny for the light to the poor spirit.

(250) Not that I scoff at the visionaries and their God, but I do so in words; for I am not Elijah, who may scoff at the most holy prophets of Baal, especially because they themselves testify, and though they sit in darkness, yet they have seen that Luther has lost his spirit, and has become a Saul.

1) Erlanger: Transfiguration or Exposure.

and cannot understand that bread is bread, which dogs and sows understand. For if I wanted to mock them, I wanted to advise them in such misery and distress that they followed one of their disciples, who asked one another about the sacrament, and at last, when he had nothing left, he said: Oh, my dear brother, it is truly said in the Greek: hoc est tropus²) meus, unb ἡρίφί, hoc est corpus meum. So they would like to get nevertheless a certain text, and so long tropus, until they hit it once.

But if they disdain this, let them do as that priest did, who came to about two other priests, and found them high, grieved, in this very matter of the sacrament, above the text, hoc est corpus meum; one of them argued, 3) it should be called hoc est corpus, meus, the other, it should be called hoc est corpus meum, so that it would rhyme. When they then put the matter to the third to judge, he said: Truly, it has also often troubled me; but I do to him so, when I come to the same text, I pray a Hail Mary for it. Now here is a big question, which one did I consecrate? We will leave that aside now. For since our enthusiasts do not consecrate or perform, 4) and yet sit over the text in such doubt, error, disagreement and gloom, it would be good for them, according to the example, to pray a Hail Mary instead of the uncertain text; or, since they are afraid to be old or new papists, and are too afraid of Mary and the saints or images, they might sing for it: Christ is risen, or, Christ ascended to heaven; because such singing and words especially conflict with the text in the Lord's Supper, and make the same so uncertain. For it should pity a stone that such high enlightened spirits, who otherwise have as many suns in their heads as hair on their heads, should sit in darkness in this piece alone, so that they do not see even a little star.

2) Thus the Erlanger and Walch in a note. The Wittenberg and the Jena edition: corpus. We have given preference to the former reading because corxus M6U8 is repeated in the next paragraph in the example that follows immediately.

3) In the Wittenberg and Jena editions: "sacht". In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlangen: "says."

4) "dannen" - dirmen or tirmen, i.e. to consecrate.

252. If anyone thinks that I am too harsh in my attack on the devotees and too contemptuous of them, I beg him to think that, although I am a lesser Christian, I am not unreasonably displeased with Satan, who makes nothing else out of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ but a reckless fool, and mocks him as if he had been a mule or a drunkard in the Lord's Supper. First of all, because they interpret Christ in his words and works in such a way that there is nothing more in the Lord's Supper than merely to receive bread and wine and to commemorate the death of the Lord, they may not use this text "this is my body" 2c., "this is my blood" 2c. anywhere, and it is entirely a vain, unnecessary, useless text, without which the Lord's Supper can well and completely be held. For they have enough text left, when they read thus: "Take, eat; take, drink; these things do in remembrance of me." In these words they have their supper wholly and completely. Therefore Christ must be a real fool, who at his end is such a useless washer, and puts such unnecessary text "this is my body" 2c., "this is my blood" 2c., which such high spirits can well guess, and in addition are also hostile to him, and would gladly have out. For, let them say, what use is such a text, if they can well commemorate the death of the Lord with bread and wine (which is to be the main part and some cause of the Lord's Supper) without such a text?

Secondly, if the bread and wine of the Lord signify the body and blood, what need is there that Christ should teach us such an interpretation just this once? For, although one should not ask why God does something; but since he must be a fool here, I do not ask this unreasonably. Or what use is it if I know that the bread means the body of the Lord? What good is such an allegory to faith, which even the devils and the ungodly can invent? Again, what good and harm would it be if I never knew that bread means Christ's body, but kept bread badly? Did Christ have nothing to teach, because that is not useful at all, and even we may invent of ourselves afterwards without his teaching, and that the devil and the wicked may invent it?

Devil and his own can? And especially because there is no *analogia fidei*; for all the words of Christ must drive faith and love and "be similar to faith," Rom. 12:7. No, he had to prove his foolishness and not only burden us with vain, useless text, but also teach useless, useless art, which one can well have without his teaching and over all the tables of the wicked.

254 Above this, he teaches such useless art in such obscure words that the apostles at that time did not understand it; as we read that they never or rarely understood his speech when he spoke in unison, and he always had to tell them the interpretation. How then did he become so envious in the supreme work of his love, and give no interpretation to the foolish, simple-minded disciples, and let them remain in such obscure words, which they could not understand without interpretation otherwise than as they read, and yet is so mild in other places with his interpretation? The short answer is that Christ, as a fool, before the rest of his leisure, wanted to fool and ape the disciples with useless and obscure words, without which they might well have taken the Lord's Supper with him.

Thirdly, this is the greatest foolishness of all, that he says the bread means, or is, a likeness of his body, given for us, and the cup, or because, is a likeness of his blood, poured out for us. Dear, where is such likeness in the bread and cup of wine? For where there is to be a figure, symbol or likeness, since one is to signify the other, there must be something the same in both, so that the likeness stands, as John 15:4. The vine is a likeness or figure of Christ, in which, as he himself says, that "just as the branch cannot bear fruit, but withers unless it abides in the vine"; item, Elijah is a figure or likeness of John, in which, as the angel Gabriel says, Luc. 1, 17. that he has the same spirit and power with Elijah; the paschal lamb is a likeness of Christ, in which, as Apocalypse 1) [Cap. 5, 6, 13, 8.] says,

1) In Walch's old edition and in the Erlanger: "Apostg."

that he was slain and sacrificed for us; and so henceforth in all figures and likenesses there must be something in which the likeness stands, and rhymes with both. But here in the bread and wine cup there is nothing in which Christ's body and blood should be like them.

When Christ therefore says, the bread is of my body, given for you, the same, the cup of wine is of my blood, poured out for you, the same, it is just as if he said, the bread, which has no likeness at all of my body, given for you, is nevertheless of my body, given for you, the same; just as if I spoke from St. Paul [2 Cor. Paul [2 Cor. 6, 15, 14.]: Belial, who has no likeness at all to Christ, is nevertheless a likeness of Christ; the light, which rhymes nothing with darkness, rhymes nevertheless well with darkness 2c. What kind of people are those who talk like this, everyone knows well, namely, mad, nonsensical fools, or lottery boys, who talk about tables of iron birds flying over the lake, or of black snow falling in summer, so that they cause laughter among the guests. The same foolish fools or fools make of Christ, when they accuse him of saying that the bread is my body, given for you, likeness, when there is nothing of this likeness anywhere in the bread.

257 But whether they would pretend that the likeness is that as the bread is eaten and the cup of wine drunk, so Christ's body is eaten spiritually and his blood drunk spiritually 2c. Dear, this is not speaking. For the enthusiasts do not put the trope on these words: "Take, eat", or give thanks 2c., but on these words: "This is my body, given for you", therefore here one does not ask about the likeness in eating, taking, giving thanks. Here, here, I say, a likeness must be shown in the bread, how it is given, killed, martyred, and sacrificed for us, for the remission of sins, that it may be a figure or likeness, and be called the body of Christ, given for us, for the remission of sins, as the words are; or Christ is a fool to call the bread a likeness, when it is not, nor can be, such a likeness. So also in the cup

In the same way as the wine is poured out for us for salvation, Christ's blood is also poured out for the forgiveness of sins.

For so does Moses with his parables, showing how the oxen and calves are slain and sacrificed, and their blood poured out on the floor of the altar, and sprinkled for the remission of sins, and to cleanse the people and the tabernacles, and all the vessels, as the epistle to the Hebrews masterfully shows us such a likeness [Cap. 9:12]. And especially the paschal lamb has a very fine likeness to the body of Christ, given for us for the remission of sins, in that it is slain and sacrificed, its blood poured out, sprinkled and sprinkled at the door, for redemption from the destroyer. Such likeness must also be shown in the bread and wine; or we must say that it is a fool who likens them to the body and blood of Christ, given and shed for us for the remission of sins, when nothing of such likeness is to be found anywhere in them. For if it be likeness, there must be something like it in it; or if it be called likeness, it is a lie and a falsehood.

If Christ would have instituted a supper, in which not his body and blood, but the likeness of his body and blood would have been inside, he would have left us the old supper of Moses with the paschal lamb, which out of measure and all around, through and through, most finely signifies his body, given for us, and his blood, shed for us for the remission of sins, and is a figure or likeness, as all the world well knows. Why then does he fool, and abolish such a fine supper of the Old Testament, and set up against it such a supper, which after all is nothing at all compared with that, neither with interpretation nor with essence?

(260) So you might say to him that the New Testament is to be a fulfillment and light compared to the Old Testament, but you turn it around and say that the New Testament is an emptying and darkness compared to the Old Testament. For there is a lamb, a living body, sacrificed for the people, which signifies the body of Christ much more brightly and clearly than bad bread, which is the same.

is a dark likeness to the Lamb. And there is blood of the lamb, which interprets Christ's blood much more brightly and clearly than bad wine. In sum, this supper is in no way comparable to it in interpretation and likeness. Therefore, if everything in the New Testament is to be more complete than in the Old, even the likeness, then Christ should have left us with that supper; or it will not be true that bad bread and wine are in our supper; for it must truly surpass that supper of Moses by far, otherwise Christ would not have raised that one.

261) Here, however, the enthusiasts will seek an evasion and pretend that St. Paul 1 Cor. 11, 24. says in his text: "This is my body, which is broken for you. There is the similitude and interpretation in the breaking, that as the bread is broken over the table, so also Christ was martyred for us on the cross 2c. O who then would not have forbidden to honor the saints and to have images, would now fall down before St. Paul's image and call out: O holy St. Paul, help us poor, miserable, forsaken enthusiasts against the raging Luther; see how he drives us are revengeful until we can no longer, you alone can help us when you say that Christ's body is broken. But briefly. St. Paul cannot and will not help-because the images of the saints have ears and do not hear [Ps. 115, 6].

262 First, that "broken" here means as much as crucified, they say from their head, but they can prove it just as little as they can prove the likeness in the bread to the body of Christ, and is vain uncertain gossip, *ignotum per ignotum*. But we demand certain proof of such likeness. For since they boast so certainly of their thing, let them also make it certain, or let them stand sure. 1)

263 Secondly, I have said above that the fanciers do not place the tropum or similitude in the words, "Take, eat, give thanks," nor in these words, "Christ took bread, broke it, and gave it to the disciples. Here they leave these words "take-

1) "Gack stehen" - to stand at the pillory. Gack - kaak, pillory.

The words "men," "break," "give," "bread," "disciples," all remain without a trope, bad, as they read. Therefore they may not afterwards make "breaking" a trope, since Paul says, "This is my body broken for you"; for it is of the same breaking that he says above, "He took bread and broke it," until they prove conclusively that there is another breaking. But we say that the breaking is the same in both places, and may not Christ's crucifixion or suffering be understood by it. For Christ did not catch Himself, crucify Himself, nor kill Himself, as He ought to have done, when breaking should have meant killing, for He Himself took the bread and broke it with His own hands.

264 Third, let us stick to the Scriptures, that "breaking bread" means giving out bread, as I have proved "against the heavenly prophets," and St. Paul says: "The bread we break is the giving out of the body of Christ," 1 Cor. 10:16. And it is quite sacrilegious for anyone to call breaking as much as crucifying or killing without Scripture; for even breaking is nowhere as much as strangling or killing. Therefore it is a pure poem, that the enthusiasts wanted to mend their ways with it. But it is meant to indicate a certain likeness that the bread has with the body of Christ, given for us. Even if the breaking were the likeness (as it is not), there is not yet the main part of the likeness, namely, that the bread is broken for us and the wine is poured out. For the bread and wine should and must be a likeness of the body and blood of Christ, given and poured out for us, so that we are redeemed by it, as the text reads: "This is my body and blood, given and poured out for you for the forgiveness of sins. Such a likeness, however, cannot be broken; but the paschal lamb and the old supper can from the covenants.

265 Therefore, wine and bread cannot be the same here, nor can they be called the body and blood of Christ, as the words in the Lord's Supper indicate.

2) In the Wittenberg and the Jena: "losunge", that is, solution.

talk about it. I will keep silent that John completely denies the word "break" from the suffering of Christ, since he writes that in. He writes that not even one of Christ's legs was broken, "so that the Scripture might be fulfilled: You shall not break his leg" 2c. Therefore the Scripture does not suffer that one rhymes breaking with Christ's suffering or death.

266 Fourthly, I now say that by the breaking of the bread it is like the crucified body of Christ, as it is not; but how will it be in the other part with the cup or chalice of wine? How will the wine here be a likeness of the shed blood of Christ for our sin? For drinking is a likeness, not of the shed blood of Christ, but of spiritual drinking, that is, of faith, as they themselves teach. Here the poor cup of wine stands so bare in all shame, that it could not stand more shamefully; for it has not a likeness in itself, and yet it is to be a likeness, and to be called the blood of Christ poured out for us.

Where are you now, St. Paul? If you had said about the cup, how Christ's hands would have trembled and spilled the cup, we poor enthusiasts could have lived for a while with the same spilling, as we now live for an hour with the breaking. If St. John, sitting in Christ's arms, had bumped Christ's elbow with his head when he took the cup and gave it to the disciples, we would have enough and could say, "Behold, the wine is like the shed blood of Christ, in that it was spilled. Whether then such spilling is not done for our salvation or benefit, and so is not like the blood of Christ in the main part of the likeness, as the words in the Lord's Supper demand, let it nevertheless be done for the salvation of us poor enthusiasts from this great misery and shame, that otherwise we can show no likeness, and yet have cried out so long ago, so far and wide, and with so many books, that the wine is like the blood of Christ.

1) So the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers: Am". Walch and the Erlanger: "one a large" 2c. "Amen" are the little fuses or points into which the ears of grain run out. In § 421 of this writing, Luther says: "Can they not indicate a little Gleichniß."

Be like and a figure of the blood of Christ, shed for us for the remission of sins, and now is not found one jar of such likeness.

268 See what the mockers of our Lord Christ gain, and who best makes a fool of the other. For their figura nec grammatica, nec theologica, nec naturalis esse potest, that is, their likeness consists of nothing; for there is no such likeness to be found either in words, or in sacred Scripture, or in nature. If it were in words, the word "body" would have to become two words, and yet remain one letter, and be called two bodies of Christ, just as the word "vine" becomes two words, and yet remains one letter, and is called two vines. Now bread cannot be Christ's body, nor can it be called Christ's body. If it were in the Scriptures, the bread would have to have such likenesses in itself, which Christ's body, given for us, would show, as all other likenesses do in the Scriptures. But if it is a natural likeness, then the bread would have to be as similar to the body as a wooden rose is to the natural rose. For this is called a natural likeness, when every one perceives by nature, without all teaching, what it shows, as the pictures show. For whoever knows a rose, no one may say that a painted rose is equal to a natural rose. But so bread is never like the body of Christ, let it be said that it should be like him, as he was given for us.

So, where one turns to the arrogance of the enthusiasts, he is lazy and nothing. For we have proved above that they have no certain text at all. But now, even if we would like to accept their text as certain, the prankster does not want to keep it, and becomes nothing to us under our hands. For who can remain with such a text, which thus reads: The bread is the likeness of Christ's body; and yet cannot be the likeness of Christ's body? Who can say "no" and "yes" at the same time in one speech and about one thing? They are like that fool who built a water mill on a mountain; when the mill was ready, he was asked where he would take water. Then said he, Behold, I never thought of that.

(270) So also the enthusiasts are so eager for interpretation and likeness that they cannot think of anything before it. If, then, one would like to give them the benefit of the doubt and accept such a likeness, and would like them to teach that such a likeness of the bread to the body of Christ exists, they must also say, "Behold, we have never thought of this; we thought that if we called it a likeness, it would be there; for our spirit wanted to be God from the beginning, so that everything he said would be true. Behold, that is to say, it is called itself with its own words.

271 Although the Tropus of the devils has been pushed hard enough, they will not be able to give way, nor will they be able to keep quiet; for who can shut the devil's mouth? Such devils do not go out without fasting and praying, they want and must have won for a while. They will say how the parables do not 1) apply in all things, and may bread be Christ's body's likeness in other things, but in that "Christ's body is given for us" as in eating, take 2c. To this it has been answered enough above, that they themselves have not sought nor placed the likeness of such words or pieces in the Lord's Supper, but on the body given for us. If they now find likenesses in other pieces, they do not approach the Lord's Supper and do not help their conceit; they must remain on this piece: This is a likeness of my body given for you. If they do not denounce it, and come in with it, they stand as the fur on their sleeves. Let this be said enough of the tropes for the present, so that our people, and those who wish to remain true, may well protect themselves against the devil's gossip.

272 Further, since Oecolampad complains about me, how I blaspheme, item, my writing of the devil anfahe, as the Zwingel also fools, and some say, at seven and seventy times I have called the devil, is a laudable, honest thing, but highly necessary to write, because one can answer nothing. Why don't they also count how many times I call God and Christ, and how I fight for Christ against the devil? Yes, that

The viper breed wants to boast of love, peace and moderation, and is as full of poison as a colorful newt.

I have made it clear to myself that I am not writing against flesh and blood (as St. Paul teaches), but against the devil and his members; therefore I am doing the right thing when I mention the other word devil. Should I then become so shy for the sake of the tender, highly spiritual, deeply holy enthusiasts that I should not even name my enemy? I will also gladly let it be called blasphemed and raged, where I attack the devil so freshly and cheerfully in his messengers, because my free, public, simple biting against the devil shall be dearer to me than their poisonous murderous stabbing, which they practice under the appearance of peace and love against the sincere, as the Psalter says of such vipers 2c.

274 Thirdly, he writes that this text "this is my body" is not clear, as I claim, because Christ's body is not visibly there; I also do not prove such my affirmatives; the reason is that I do not bring up a scripture that Christ's invisible body is there; so it does not rhyme either, because Christ's body is visibly given for us, and the text speaks of such Christ's body as is given for us, that it should be invisibly there. I answer, "For the scribblers, of course, I have not proved anything, nor can I ever do so, for they neither want to read nor know nor understand how the Psalter saws, so that they plug their ears like a snake, so that they do not hear the wise magician's voice [Ps. 58:5, 6]. For our people I have made this text clear enough (I know that), and given such a rule: Let the words of Scripture be taken for what they are according to their nature, and let no other interpretation be given, except by a public article of faith. Such rule is in my book. Nor does the Oecolampad say that I have given no rule. Since these words: "This is my body", according to the manner and sound of all languages, are not called bread or a sign of the body, but Christ's body, they should be left as they are, and nothing else should be interpreted, except by the Scriptures.

1) In the Erlanger is missing: "Not".

275 Where mau now has such words, which have certain interpretation, known to everyone, and no other interpretation is proven, these are called clear, dry, bright words and text. For no man on earth has ever heard that "body" should be called a likeness of the body, and is a new, dark, unknown interpretation in all the world, so it must be proved quite strongly. But the first interpretation is clear and certain in itself, as everyone is aware of it. Is it not a fine thing that Oecolampad brings up a new, unknown, dark, uncertain interpretation, and thereby wants to create that the old interpretation should be dark and uncertain? In this way, no word in Scripture would remain clear if any spirit were given the space to bring a new interpretation to it, and then say: The old interpretation is dark and uncertain. But what this lazy consequence, which here Oecolampad makes, namely, the text says: "This is my body, given for you"; now he is visibly given for us, therefore his body cannot be there invisibly, I have shown enough above to the Zwingel; but it is the sheriff once without red pants in the bath, and not in the bath.

I did not know that Oecolampad was such a wicked, poor logician or dialectician that he would also take quod pro qualiter and syllogize ab accidente ad substantiam. In Zwingel it is no wonder, he is a self-grown doctor, they are used to guessing like that. Truly, he who wants to dispute, and does not yet know his puerilia in Logica, what good should he do? Hereby Oecolampad annoys me so much that I can henceforth have no special understanding for him. For even if he is not allowed to know the useless sophistry and sophistry of the sophists, he should know the puerilia, that is, common dialectica, as regulas consequentiae, formas syllogismorum, species argumentationis, etc., well. Unless I have pushed him with the truth in such a way (as I think) that he cannot well see what he is talking about.

277 For, tell me, who can think that a prudent man can say what Oecolampad says here, namely that this text "this is my body" is therefore not

clear, because the body of Christ is not visible in the sacrament, and only the faithful understand such words, as Augustine should say? Should a text therefore be unclear, if the thing is invisible, and only the believer grasps such? Which part then wants to remain clear in Scripture? If everything that faith teaches is invisible, then this text should not be clear: "God created the heavens and the heirs" [Gen. 1:1], because God and his creation are invisible. How can it be made clear that in the Lord's Supper there is only bread and wine? For whether there is anything more is invisible. What does such illusion help the spirit, if they disgrace themselves? Truly, with such loose theidings they will not bring us to themselves and confirm their thing for a long time.

But we know that these words, "This is my body," 2c. are clear and bright. For if any Christian or Gentile, Jew or Turk, hear them, he must confess that they speak of the body of Christ which is in the bread. Otherwise, how could the Gentiles and Jews mock us and say that the Christians devour their God, if they did not understand this text brightly and clearly? But that what is said is grasped by the believer and despised by the unbeliever is not the fault of darkness or clarity in words, but of the hearts that hear it.

Poets are able to speak in the most subtle of words, not only about invisible things, but also about trivial things. How is many a man deceived by liars with beautiful words, which he so heartily understands what they mean? How are people now deceived by liars, who speak of invisible things, precisely because they understand the words clearly? Yes, the words are sometimes brighter and clearer, so that people are deceived, and talk of nothing, than those who speak of the truth. For if the words were not understood brightly and clearly, what they mean, they would remain unconvinced. But (as I said) Oecolampad and this spirit lack the puerili dialectica, bab er ex difficultate vel obscuritate intelligendi in re infert obscuritatem significandi in vocabulis; hoc est, maler

dividere, tertiam partem scilicet Dialecticae or figure, unless you need dry, simple, common words to
ignorare. do so.

280 It is the same cleverness that he pretends that because the Lord's Supper is a sacrament, the words "this is my body," that is, a sign of my body, must also be understood sacramentally; what is the use of such jugglery? I heartily admit that the Lord's Supper is a sacrament, though it is not so called in Scripture, but how does it follow that the words should be sacramental, tropical, or (as they say) figurative? Is it not a pretty consequence: there is a sacrament; therefore the words in it must be taken figuratively? Dear, why are not the other words also taken figuratively, and does the trope only go over the word "is" or "body"?

281 Or where is there a rule that tells us last which ones must be taken figuratively and which ones must not? For on this teaching I will also make the words: "Take, eat, do these things in remembrance of me," tropes, and say: "Take" means to hear, "eat" means to believe, "do these things" means to think in the heart, "remembrance" means a crucifix or some other sign of thought. The cause should be this: Here is a sacrament, therefore the words inside must be taken sacramentally or figuratively; for I know of no reason why these, as well as those, should not be taken figuratively. God himself should not be able to use a sacrament in this way; for how can he speak of sacraments, if all his words are understood differently than they are? If he speaks plainly of the manner of words, it is not a sacrament; for they are not tropes or figurative words. If he speaks figurative words, one does not know what he says. It is a fool's work.

Since Moses installs the paschal lamb, which was an image and figure of Christ, he does not need a figurative word at all, but dry, clear, simple words, as they were in common usage, and all the figures of the Old Testament are spoken with dry, simple, clear words, and there is not one in all of them that is spoken figuratively. That one must reverse Oecolampad's rule, and say: One cannot speak of any sacrament.

Otherwise, who would understand it if Moses said, Exodus 12:3, 5: "You shall take a lamb of the year and eat it," 2c. if he did not mean to indicate a natural lamb and eating, but should be the opinion: You shall take a sign of the lamb of the year, and eat spiritually? Also, who would understand John when he said John 1:26, "I baptize with water," if he was not speaking of natural water and baptizing, but should have the opinion: I baptize with a sign of water? Ah, what shall I say? If Oecolampad does not write this out of malice (as I hope), then I have not heard a sillier, more simple, more thoughtless man to the learned man all my days; but it is all straight against himself, what he only wants to say for himself.

But I worry that the devil is looking for something else in this (for who is safe from the devil among us?), namely, because he knows that Christ is called a sacrament in Scripture, as 1 Tim. 3, he wants to go out there, that figurative words should also be, when one says: Christ is God and man 2c. For he must have something in mind, he does not say this for nothing. Summa, the Oecolampad here lacks the puerili dialectica, which teaches bene dividere, that is, to speak differently. For the sacrament or history, 1) and the words spoken of the sacrament, are two different things. The sacrament or history is supposed to be a sign or likeness of another thing, but the words are not supposed to mean anything else, because they are. 2) But the words with which Moses speaks of the paschal lamb should simply teach that same paschal lamb and nothing else. Item, the circumcision is to model the killing of Adam, but the words that Moses speaks about the circumcision are to teach about the physical circumcision. So baptism is to mean the drowning of sins; but the words of baptism are simply to teach immersion in water.

1) History - what happens, event, occurrence.

2) sign - designate. Erlanger: show.

So also the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is to model and signify something, 1) namely, the unity of Christians in one spiritual body of Christ, through one spirit, faith, love and cross 2c. But the words of such sacrament should and must give simply what they ring. But my dear Oecolampad meets here blinzing 2) a right Zwingelische Allöösön, and therefore changes in the dark, and makes *Res est figurativa, ergo verba de rebus figurativis sunt figurativa*. That must be a good silly Father to me, who comes into this matter truly innocent, and would probably have remained outside.

Because I consider that he does it out of pure simplicity, I will grant him this, since he is much concerned about the saying Gen. 17:10 ff. that circumcision is a covenant, when it should be a sign of the covenant. For my Genesis does not say that circumcision is a covenant and a sign, as I wanted to prove, that it should hurt the devil. But since it does not help the matter, even if he would be right there, I let it go; for this would not yet prove that therefore in the Lord's Supper the body must also be the body's sign. I will also give him the same thing, since he makes a spiritual rock out of the natural one in Paul's saying [1 Cor. 10:4, 2 Mos. 17:6]: "The rock was Christ," since he thus speaks from his head and proves nothing; and even if he could still prove it tomorrow, it still does not follow that therefore the body must also be the sign of the body here. So also the saying 2 Mos. 12, 11: "It is the Lord's Passover", because enough is said about such sayings and about the tropes above. To the main thing we want to come, how the scripture should be against our mind, perhaps the jokes will be found here.

The Scripture urges that Christ is not in the Lord's Supper. Which? Since Christ says: "You have the poor with you always, but you will not have me" [Matth. 26, 11]. Item, Christ will not be sought here and there 2c. [Matth. 24, 26.] Because

Now "being there" and "not being there" are contrary to each other, so there must be vain bread in the Lord's Supper. Enough has been said about these sayings. In my next booklets, however, I had requested that they should not tell us that such sayings are contrary to one another, for we had now heard such things from them long enough, and knew almost well that they say so; but they should prove it. Oecolampad is just as silent about this as Zwingel; therefore, what they say is nothing. For it can both be true that Christ is there at the same time, in another and in another form; he has more than one way of being sth. 3) as is said above.

Since I said of the right hand of God that Christ's body must be where God is, Oecolampad also concludes, like Zwingel, that Christ must not have a right hand, and spins the same yarn that Zwingel spins, namely, that Christ's body must be as great as heaven and earth, and yet incomprehensible. He should prove this consequence, but he is silent again. In short, the spirit does not want to answer, since one asks. We say no to it, Christ's body should not be as wide as heaven and earth. God himself is not so great and wide, who is everywhere. Although I have said much about this above, I must also admit a little against Oecolampad. Because God can do more than we understand, we do not have to say that the two are contrary to each other, Christ's body in heaven and in bread, just according to our conceit and reasoning, because they are both God's word; but we must prove with Scripture that they are contrary to each other. As long as this is not done, faith says: God can keep Christ's body in heaven in one way and in bread in another way. If there is another way and another way on both sides, then it is not contrary to one another.

289) Just as it is not contrary to one another that Christ sat with the disciples after His resurrection, Luc. 24, 36. ff, and yet at the same time was not with them, as He says there, "These things I said while I was still with you.

3) "etwo" (i.e. somewhere) will, as before in this writing many times, probably also be read here instead of "about", because Luther refers to the above comparisons §§ 139. 154 2c. In the editions it says: "about".

1) sign - designate. Erlanger: show.
2) i.e. blindly.

Here it says "with you" and "not with you," yet they are not contrary to each other. For the *Kinderdialectica* teaches that *contradictoria debent fieri ad idem, secundum idem, circa idem*, etc., that is, such spirits should be led to school, and *Petrus Hispanus* 1) teaches, that they may well.

290. But I must give a rough simile: Behold, the sun shines into a large lake or pond, there must of course be no more than one image of the sun in the water, because there is only One sun; How is it, then, that if a hundred and a hundred stood around the lake, each would have the image of the sun before him in his own place, and none in the other's place; and if he went around the lake, the image would go with him, and be in all the places where he went; and if a thousand eyes looked in, each would see the image before him, and not before the other?

291 Well, this is one creature, and can be in all places in the lake. Dear, who would have us deny that God knows no more than one way, and is able to make Christ's whole body be what it will, wherever it will, or where it will? Here, here, I say, one must first answer and prove that God's power is not able to do this. If this is not proven, it is 2) a terrible sacrilege to reproach the two against each other, Christ's body in heaven and the Lord's Supper, because they cannot be sure of it, and yet the certain words of God stand there: "This is my body."

But here the wise spirits do not hear, yes, they should laugh at us with such parables. Therefore I speak to ours thus: Let them laugh, *quod, pro qualiter, carnem pro divinitate, et contra, accipere et, ignorantia tota Logicae, vitiosissime disputare*, it is enough for us that they prove nothing. I want to set another simile: If a pillar stands in the square, if a thousand and a thousand eyes were around it and looked at it, then every eye grasps the same pillar completely in its face, and none hinders the other; and if the pillar is also completely in every eye and before every eye, as

If they were all one eye and one face, for none sees less or more of the column than the other, and such a likeness could be shown much more, especially from mathematics; but because we are used to it, no one considers it a miracle. That is why it is such a miracle to the mad mind that one body should be in many places at the same time, because it does not see it.

Of course, it would be a great and incredible miracle if there were no eye, and we had only the four senses of touch, smell, taste, and hearing, which must feel not far away, but close by, and so it was preached how God could create a member that could reach and feel through and over eight, nine, ten miles in an instant, namely an eye. Even a born blind man should be surprised and say: "My dear, how is it possible? My hand does not feel a cubit away, my tongue does not taste a finger's breadth, my nose does not smell a span away, my ear, if it hears afar, hears it a street away, and you tell me about a limb that feels ten miles away?"

But we, who see, no longer consider it a miracle, for we feel further with our eyes, namely, up to the sun and the stars, even from the beginning to the end. Now the eye is a bodily, carnal thing, and in addition one eye should grasp half the world in an instant, and at the same time be in all the places of half the world with its face. Why then should we measure and measure God's power, as if He could not do more with the body of Christ than He does with our mortal eye, when our eyes are so much less against God's power and work than the blind man's sense and taste against our sight?

295 Because the bright, dry words of God are written here, "This is my body," so that neither in Scripture nor in any language has it ever been heard that this word "my body" is spoken or understood in any other way than it is slurred, and divine power is unconscious to us, and is nowhere contrary to Scripture, and is much the same in natural works, even though the enthusiasts are caught up in so many false lies and groundless reasons about it, it is only fair that God should be heard in the Scriptures.

1) The first textbook of logic in that time.

2) Erlanger; is.

more than our own conceit. If the enthusiasts were to be falsely invented in one piece, then we would be sufficiently warned by God not to believe them, and to remain with the words of God. For the Holy Spirit does not deny, nor lack, nor doubt. Now, by God's grace, we have found them false and lying in almost all things. In the others, however, we have found them to be least uncertain and doubtful, so that even if I were uncertain of my mind and would gladly fall for them, I cannot do so, because I so publicly see either lies or doubts, and not one sound or certain reason.

296 Since I had proved that two bodies could be in one place at the same time, as when Christ came through a closed door, which is as great a miracle as that one body should be in two places, he says it is nothing. For there are other ways in which Christ came in through a closed door, namely, by the subtilty of the body he put himself in, so that there should not be two bodies in one place. If I now ask, what are these ways, and how did the subtilty come in? then silence applies. I consider that one way is to the church, that Oecolampad, since he should answer, had to go preach; the other way is a bad memory, that he forgot to answer it afterwards.

So does this spirit, muttering a word or two, so that no one knows what he says, and that is answered. Can he find the subtilty of the body of Christ, that Christ goes in at the door, and that there are not two bodies in one place, dear, how can he not also find the subtilty that he is in the bread at the same time, and does not have to go down from heaven like a stone from the roof? But they do not escape me with the subtilty, it is nevertheless the same Christ's body, and the door is also closed, and Christ is not closed in between the cracks or nail holes; he had bone and flesh, as he himself confesses, Luc. 24, 39.

298) To the appearance of Christ to St. Stephen, Acts 7:55, and to other saints. 7:55 and other saints, and that the Father's voice came from the clouds, Matth. 17:5,

which examples I introduced to prove that Christ should not be in one place but in heaven, he nevertheless proves his jokes just fine and says: "Does this prove that there is one body in two places? what kind of speeches are these from a learned man? I confess my guilt, for such examples do not prove that the wolf likes to eat sheep, or what he might introduce. I add such examples to the fact that Christ is near, and does not sit in heaven in one place. So he interprets it as he pleases, and doubts whether St. Stephen saw Christ spiritually or bodily, and wants Christ to be seen in an image and not Christ himself. And all this is true, but because Oecolampad says it from his head, such bright words of Scripture must give way to his conceit. That is all answer to Luther's book. If I did, I would be called a guide to the Scriptures.

But this is not wrong, and certainly better, because the Zwingel does, from the saying Joh. 3, 13. spoken, "the Son of Man is in heaven", since Oecolampad confesses that [it] is rightly spoken for the sake of the person: God was born of Mary, and descended from heaven; without directing me to the blasphemous exegesis of Zwingel, in which, among other abominations, Allöosis teaches us, *carnem pro divinitate accipi*, and the best thing in it is that one should know how learned Zwingel is in all kinds of arts; the things, indeed, he does little enough, prevented from great art.

(300) Oecolampad also does too much about this in this place, that he puts Christ, contrary to himself and all Scripture, after the Godhead in heaven, and after the body alone on earth. They do not see my reasons correctly and do not understand their own word. If Christ is One Person in the Godhead and in humanity, then humanity must also be on earth and in heaven at the same time, as I proved above against the Zwingel. For to be One Person in God and with God is higher than to be in heaven. So it is also not true that Christ was then in heaven after the Godhead. Where was he after the Godhead, when he became man in mother's body? Was he not personally and essentially

also after the divinity in mother's body and on earth? I have said so much in the next booklet. But it is a matter of overrunning, not to look at nor to think rightly what one hears or says.

(301) Therefore his similitude does not stand, when he says that if one descended from the mountain and clothed himself in the valley, one could say that no one ascends but he who descends. For the Godhead does not descend from heaven as he descends from the mountain, but is in heaven and remains in heaven; but is also at the same time on earth and remains on earth. So also of the clothed one it cannot be said, He is on the mountain, if he is still on earth, as Christ says of himself, "The Son of man, he is in heaven." What is there to say? The kingdom of heaven is on earth, the angels are in heaven and on earth at the same time, the Christians are in the kingdom of God and on earth at the same time, if one wants to understand "on earth" as they speak of it, mathematice vel localiter. God's word is on. The Spirit was given on earth; and Christ the King was on earth, and shall have a kingdom on earth as far as the world is, Ps. 2:6, "and establish justice and righteousness on earth," Jer. 23:5, 33:15. Oh, childishly and foolishly they speak of heaven, so that they make a place for Christ up in heaven, as the stork makes a nest on a tree, and they themselves do not know what and how they speak.

302 After this he challenges that Christ has not joined himself in places, nor will he be found here or there, but will be known in the spirit. Then they rush over again, and do not see what I write against them. Recently, who binds Christ to special places? Do not the enthusiasts themselves put Christ in a special place in heaven, and force us to say, "Behold here, behold Christ" [Luc. 17:23]? And what do they themselves do when they direct people to the gospel and to their neighbor? Is not the neighbor and the gospel in but places on earth? Is not Christ in the believers? Spiritually he is there (they say). What does spiritual mean? Does it mean carnal or real? Just as if we were saying that he is bodily or visibly in the sacrament.

ssi. Is not Christianity and God's kingdom, as far as the world is, on earth, as the prophets proclaim? Where are they themselves, if they want to be the most distinguished in the kingdom of Christ? If the kingdom of Christ is on earth, it is also here and there. I have written such things against the heavenly prophets. It almost displeases them that I always praise such a book as unbitten by them; it is still unbitten by them, and shall also remain unbitten; I do not call mouthing and chattering biting.

Here the children's logic is lacking in the spirit, so that they do not distinguish these words "to be here and there", because Christ clearly interprets himself, whereof he speaks such words, and how they are to be understood, since he speaks before [Luc. 17, 20]: "The kingdom of heaven does not come with an outward manner or gesture. Neither shall it be said, Behold here it is, behold there it is. For behold, the kingdom. God is within you." What is lacking in these bright words, so that no enthusiast may look at them: "The kingdom of God is within you"? Who are these "you"? If they are not on earth, to speak bodily, as they speak of it, then they are certainly here and there.

304: Therefore such word "here" and "there" must be understood in two ways, loco 6t *more loci*. First, essentially, thus: To be here and there is that it is certainly found there and is present. For they must let God be here and there and in all places, and let him be sought and worshipped both here and there and everywhere, that I truly know. On the other hand, *more loci*, useful, that is, it does not remain or live in the same place where it is. Just as Paul says 2 Cor. 10, 3: "We walk in the flesh, but we do not fight in the flesh." What is this but: We are in the flesh, and not in the flesh? If we are in the flesh, we are certainly here and there; for one would not let flesh be here and there. But we do not fight in the flesh, that is, our being and doing does not go as it is wont to go in the flesh.

So I may say: We are on earth and not on earth, that is, we live on earth, but we do not live earthly, that is, earthly way. Item, we are in the world and not in the world, that is, we live

We may be in the world, but we do not live in a worldly way. Just as Christ sits with the disciples and lives after his resurrection, he still confesses that he is not with them nor does he live. "These things spake I while I was yet with you." What can such "with you" be but: in your way, or as you are now? Personally or essentially he sat there, and spoke, and let himself be touched.

306 A similarity: A wanderer can come to Wittenberg and say: I am in Wittenberg, and I am not in Wittenberg. How so? So: I am physically and essentially here, but I am not Wittenbergian here, that is, in the Wittenbergian way for I do not have a civil right here, nor do I nourish or live by the Wittenberg law and goods. So also St. Paul writes Phil. 3, 20: that our *πολίτευμα*, that is, our citizenship or civil being is not here, but in heaven. Now because Christ says, "The kingdom of heaven cometh not by outward means," he plainly confesses that the kingdom of heaven cometh to us on earth, as he says, "Repent ye; the kingdom of heaven is at hand" [Luc. 17:20, 10:9. Matt. 3:2.). But it does not come in such a way as the worldly kingdoms come; for it does not keep and live in a worldly or human way, as I have said. The spirit only led into the school, and the *puerilia*. learned from Petro Hispano, that would be highly necessary for him!

307 But there he gives Luther even more of a haircut 1) since he cites the saying of John 4:24: That "God wants to be worshipped in the spirit, not in Jerusalem, nor on the mountain." From this you have a certain answer, that Christ's body is not here and there, therefore also not in the Lord's Supper. If the spirit only answered, it would be fine; but where it leaps, there it is hostile. Well then heaven is spirit; for Christ is in the spirit, that is, to worship in heaven. But how will he be in heaven in one place? Is spirit also so much as a special place? Why not? If the spirit says so, then it is certain; but how did the blind man John 9:38, who worshipped Christ on earth?

Christ has been fooled into accepting it; or spirit will also resound as much as "on earth". Dear, you do not have to laugh, the spirit wants to be angry, because it is his seriousness.

But this is even more subtle. Christ speaks of the worshippers, the same should neither worship at Jerusalem nor on the mountain [Joh. 4, 21.], just as also the woman said to him [Joh. 4, 20.]: "Our fathers worshipped on this mountain, and you say that one must worship at Jerusalem." Such words also speak of the worshippers; for it does not speak, GOD is not on the mountain; Christ also does not speak, GOD is not at Jerusalem or on this mountain 2c., but the Spirit teaches us such saying of GOD that He is not here and there, and not to be understood by the worshippers.

Dear, what do you think God means by letting the swarm spirit so grossly deceive you in the Scriptures? Certainly nothing else, but as if he should say: Dear child, I shall not be lacking, I will do faithfully enough to you, and not allow the spirits to act in the Scriptures, for so rudely, clumsily and foolishly, that whoever allows himself to be seduced has no excuse, as if he was not warned and preserved enough by me. He who believes such spirits will be lost, because he cannot do so much as look at what they are fooling about, but he takes it all on, as they say, as an impudent sow.

310. But we believe that "worship in the spirit" means that we should worship spiritually or in a spiritual way, whether Christ is in heaven, on earth, in the sacrament, or wherever he wants; For spiritual worship Christ sets against bodily worship, which the Jews and also our hypocrites bind to place and time, so that it must be done outwardly, as the place and time determine, as if prayer had its essence, power, life, and all virtue from the place or time, as they teach that obedience is the chief thing in such prayer, though they ask nothing nor know what they babble. Behold, this is Christ at Jerusalem and in places, not prayed in spirit and truth.

311) How strong then this saying is, that Christ's body may not be in the bread, and that these words "this is my body" may be otherwise.

1) give haircut == prepare a sensitive defeat.

are to be understood, for they are, I hope, to be understood by a child. Rather, if they want to protect their thing and persuade us, then they must truly, truly put themselves differently to it; with such a way they scare us further away from them, so that we must say that the thing is not serious to them, or they go around with insolence, that they build so hard on such uncertain, false, loose reasons.

312 So also Oecolampad stands cold in this main part, and cannot prove that Christ alone is in heaven in a special place, and still does not want to find an answer how the two are against each other: Christ in heaven, and his body at the same time in the Lord's Supper, which I have insisted on in my little book; they cannot teach it, it is impossible, and they also feel it well; because all what they talk about teaches us nothing more than that Christ has gone to heaven, which no one desires to know. But as it happens that Christ's body is not in the Lord's Supper, after the words, "This is my body," there is silence, fluttering, leaping, or speaking against themselves, and seeing themselves in their own words, as we have seen.

And what is the use that I stir all the dirt of the devil? I would do sin to rob myself and the reader of time 1) with such idle jokes. For even if we took the whole Scripture over this matter in all its sayings, we would do nothing more than, as has been done up to now, only give the spirit a lot of room to chat uselessly and to misinterpret the Scripture, so that it forgets the main things in the meantime and demonstrates unnecessary art.

For, I have said it, I still say it, and I keep on saying it, the reason of their doctrine is that Christ's body should no longer have the way to be sth. 2) than as flour in a sack or money in a bag, id est, localiter. The same reason they shall show us with the Scripture, what may much book writing? Let them show you this reason, and then cheerfully give it to them; for, believe me, if they could have done it, they would not have kept silent for so long. Because they then

here are so patient and out of measure good monks, who keep silence very well, since it is most necessary to speak, and in as many books as they scatter, have never wanted to touch this blood swarf with a letter, it is good to notice why they boast, rumble, flaunt and throb so, as if their thing were certain, namely the devil fears the light and wants to silence us with rumbling.

Because now (I say) no one can bring out of this dumb poltergeist this few necessary pieces, I will also let Oecolampad go herewith, and only look at the last piece: "Flesh is no good. For what he blasphemes about the external word should be shown one day, when I write again about baptism, which God bestows.

316) Oecolampad wants to prove from circumstances of the text, Joh. 6, 53. ff., that flesh here is to be understood as Christ's flesh, and yet does nothing, because there is a likeness of a king in a torn garment, which the citizens should kiss and do not want to, but are annoyed by it 2c. This is his answer to me, and he fortifies his iron wall. Then behold the fluttering spirit again; he promises to bring his understanding out of the circumstances of the text, and gives a parable of the king. What do we ask about the parable? It is equally good and valid as it wishes; but how can we be sure that it belongs here? We say no, and he must prove it. But that is not necessary, it is said: *sufficit ita nos dicere*, Graad-Herr, da stehet's; so I have my answer.

317 After that, he makes do: "It is certain that the Jews grumbled because of his flesh; therefore he must speak and answer of his flesh and of no other. Is it not a fine consequence and a certain consequence? The Jews grumble about his flesh, therefore Christ must also speak of his flesh; that is, prove it from the circumstances of the text. Dear, why should not someone be able to speak of Christ's flesh, of the Spirit, of the Gospel, of faith, or whatever he wants, and yet soon after of flesh and blood or of men?

1) Erlanger: raube.

2) Compare the note to § 287.

speaking? Just like Christ Matth. 16, 15. when he talks to the disciples and asks them what they thought he was, that is, he talks to them about Christ, who was God and man, and yet immediately says of common flesh v. 17: "Flesh and blood did not reveal it to you. And Paul Gal. 1, 16, when he writes of his profession, immediately says: "I did not converse with flesh and blood." If the iron wall is not stronger than this, let him build on it who wants to fall; I do not, it is not as good as paper.

318 The circumstances of the text help our understanding much better, if we pay attention to it without quarreling and simple-mindedly (as it should be); for I do not give the same opinion, but the text says openly that the Jews and disciples were annoyed at Christ's speech about eating his flesh, which is certain. Here I can and must say from the circumstances of the text that Christ had two kinds of disciples; some who were angry and murmured, and some who believed and reformed. Now if a master has disciples who do not understand his business properly, it is natural that he should turn to such unruliness to punish them, and may say, "Oh, rough heads will not do it," or, "An ass is not a good disciple; new hoses belong to the moste 2c.

319 In the same way Christ can do here; when he finds rude disciples, he turns the speech to them and says: Does this upset you? Here he punishes their false understanding, and may say finely afterwards, Oh, flesh is of no use, spirit gives life; so spirit here must be called spiritual understanding or teaching, because Christ himself interprets it this way and says: "The words that 1) I speak are spirit and life. Therefore, of course, flesh must be opposed to fleshly mind or doctrine. This, I say, is much better given by the text, with all its circumstances, without all its equal, than by the enthusiast's gloss.

This is also said above against the Zwingel, and Oecolampad needs just the sophistry over the little word *mea*, which Zwingel needs, and answers nothing. Item, he also wants to make my rule wrong, that I have said: Where flesh and spirit contradict one another.

other, the flesh cannot be Christ's flesh, and yet do nothing, for it leads to the saying 1 Tim. 3:16: "It 2) is manifest in the flesh, and justified in the Spirit." What shall I say? I am speaking of the spirit and the flesh, which are opposed to one another in Scripture; so he gives a saying that the flesh and the spirit are one. Nor does it prove that there Christ's flesh is to be understood; nor must it all be answered. Well then, my rule still stands, that here flesh may not be called Christ's flesh; because the same stands, this must be its main part.

He also acts in this way with the fathers' sayings. I have their texts; so he gives his gloss for it, and forces nothing out of the text, as I have done; just as he has also mastered John 6 out of his head. With this they indicate how highly they despise all men, and consider that when they say something, it is to be held strictly thus. Well, I have written against the celestial prophets; there is nothing answered but such their own conceit and gloss. To the booklet against the enthusiasts it goes to me in the same way: They want to chat, they cannot answer, as I have well proved in this booklet. So let them go and be holy, spiritual, learned; I have done according to the teaching of St. Paul, and have admonished them for the next time. May God convert them and protect our people from their poison, amen.

322 But so that I may be free and loose in this matter everywhere, I must also remember my neighbors 3) so that they do not think that I despise their art and spirit. This spirit writes that neither Zwingel, nor Oecolampad, nor Carlstadt, nor Luther, nor Pabst is right, and makes the text in the Lord's Supper thus: "My body given for you is this." Since the evangelists and Paul put the little word "this" in front, he puts it at the end, and should mean as much as: "a spiritual food"; therefore their text stands thus: "My body, which is given for you, is this, (hear) a spiritual food". Do you ask why they do this, and not, for example, the Carl-

2) "It" i.e. according to Joh. 1, 14: "the word".

3) Here the Jenaer has the marginal gloss: "He means the spirit in the schlesi", namely Schwenkfeld and Krautwald in Silesia.

What do you think about the text of Stadt, Zwingel, or Oecolampad, if they are of the same opinion?

There may be three answers: The first is divine, namely, that God would have them disagree and be repugnant and unequal among themselves, so that the Holy Spirit may remain unsuspected and be publicly excused before all the world, as having nothing to do with them, because he is a spirit of unity and stings of disunity, and thus warns everyone against their lying spirit. The other is human, namely, why should they be so humble and accept Carlstadt's, Zwingel's, or Oecolampad's text, when Carlstadt, Zwingel, and Oecolampad themselves are so proud among themselves that none of them accepts the other's text? Should they not be as witty to make a special text as those, that would be a great shame! Rather, the honor does them well as gently as it does those three. The third is diabolical, namely, that the evangelists and Paul have been drunk or insane, that they have gone on the ears and head, and thus have put the highest to the lowest, the foremost to the hindmost in the text of the Lord's Supper; therefore this spirit had to come and set the text right, and master the evangelists.

The reason and cause of their conceit is, first, that these words, "this is my body," must be put out of sight, and the things must first be considered by the spirit. For he who begins with these words, "This is my body," cannot come to such a conceit (I should say, to such a high understanding) that bread is bread and wine is wine; but he who puts these words out of his sight can then come to such an understanding. There you have a certain rule that guides you better into all truth than the Holy Spirit himself can do, namely, where the holy Scriptures mislead or hinder your conceit, put them out of your sight, and follow your conceit first, and you will surely find the right way of all things, as Moses teaches Deut. 12:8: "You shall not do what seems right to you," that is, you shall do what seems right to you.

This devil walks freely without a mask and does not teach us to look at the Scriptures in public, like the coiner and Carlstadt.

who also had their art from the testimony of their inwardness, and were not allowed to teach the holy scriptures for themselves, but for others, as an outward testimony of the testimony in their inwardness. Whoever believes such a public devil wants to go into the hellish fire. No one is allowed to answer, even for vain fools, but such blasphemers shall have such a reason for their faith, because they do not believe Christa.

326 Secondly, the incarceration of the body of Christ (as they say) is against the whole holy scripture 2c. How thinkest thou of this spirit? he may open his mouth wide enough; for he will be far, far, high, high, far, far above the 1) Zwingel and Oecolampad, which lead not all scripture against it. But listen; the Old Testament (he speaks) says nothing of this, to which yet Christ points us Joh. 5, 39. So the New Testament says of his future into the flesh, of which John is a forerunner, and not into bread. Thus Christ himself says: "No one knows the Father without through me", does not say: without through bread.

You see how much it helps the truth when these words, "This is my body," are put out of sight; for otherwise how could this spirit say that our mind is contrary to all Scripture, if he should keep these words before his eyes? Above this, if these words were bound before his eyes with iron chains, so that he could not take them away, he has another art and rule for truth, namely, he says: that such words are not in the Old Testament. For that St. Lu'cas [Cap. 22, 19], Matthew [Cap. 26, 26], Marcus [Cap. 14, 22], Paul [1 Cor. 11, 24] put them in the New Testament, that is nothing, he can well put them out of sight; but God must and shall give himself captive, that he may not put his words when and where he wills, but where and how this Spirit directs him. If he then tunes and seeks them in the Old Testament, and God does not set them there, then the spirit has once again won freely and beautifully 2).

1) "den" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) Wittenberg and Jena: already.

How can this spirit lack truth? Yes, who can resist him, because he has such two fine arts and rule for himself? One is to put the words of God, where they are written, out of his sight; the other, where he cannot put them out of his sight, to turn his eyes from them to another place, where they are not written, and then he says, "Behold, there are no such words, prove to me that they are written here, here; if not, you have lost; for you must present the words to me in such a way that I cannot put them out of my sight, or turn my eyes from them to another place. So shall we carnivores be attacked, so shall we overthrow our brute god.

329. See and take hold, if the devil does not mock us with great courage; but it serves us nevertheless for the strength and security of our faith, because the wretched Satan is so unskilful in his jugglery; he knows that we cannot show the words of Christ to him 1) in the Lord's Supper in the Old Testament, therefore he poses as if he wanted to be shown where we showed them in the Old Testament; and thinks that his gross lies are not seen; for since he does not want to see them in the New Testament, but does them out of sight, what should he do, if we could show them in the Old Testament in the same way? Then he should do them much more out of sight, and pretend that the Old Testament is dark or abolished, one should show them to him in the New Testament, that would be the fulfillment 2c.

And if it were all in the Old Testament that we should believe, what should we 2) believe of the New? What would it be necessary for Christ to come on earth to teach us? In the same way, I wanted to say: Baptism would be nothing, the sending of the Holy Spirit would be nothing, that God's mother is Mary would be nothing, and recently, no article of the Christian faith should exist. For in the Old Testament it is written of Christ's future; but that He has now come and fulfilled everything, instituted baptism, granted forgiveness of sins, given the Holy Spirit, 2c., there is not a letter in it. The New Testament had to explain all these things; but the Spirit has to explain himself, what he considers to be the reason for his coming.

1) "him" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) Wittenberg and Jena: may.

his lies, so that we may be all the safer from him.

331 The third reason is that incineration is contrary to the Christian faith. For faith must have a spiritual sight to cling to; but bread is a bodily sight. For this reason it can also be concluded that Christ was not a man on earth, for his humanity was a bodily and not a spiritual sight; therefore no one can believe without heresy that such a man is God. Item, no one can believe that a Christian man is our neighbor, that husband and wife are our parents, cousins, brothers. Item, no one can believe that heaven and earth are God's creatures. Cause, faith can have nothing corporeal to look at; but these pieces are all in the corporeal sight. Such a blind mind is this, that it knows nothing, how a bodily sight is always presented to faith, under which it understands and comprehends something else, as I have proven this in my booklet with many examples, as from Rom. 4, 19. of the body of Sarah, and the like.

The fourth reason is that it is contrary to the nature and kind of the word. For the word is not called the voice or oral word, but the eternal truth of God 2c.; this same word cannot bind itself to bread and creatures. This article, in which they blaspheme the outward word as unfit for faith, needs to be proved; therefore it is nothing that they prove by it, because it is not itself proved. Another time about this.

The fifth reason, that it is against the priesthood and kingdom of Christ, as the epistle to the Hebrews teaches. For Christ, where he is, is king and priest; but in bread he cannot be king, for bread is a creature in the world. Now his kingdom is not of the world. Is it not fine? Christ's kingdom is not of the world, therefore it is not in the world: for this Spirit makes "of the world" and "in the world" one thing. Woe to us poor Christians, who must be in the world, in death, under the devil, and our King is imprisoned in heaven, that he cannot rule us, nor protect us, nor help us, nor be with us, for his kingdom is in heaven, and

not in the world. Such great, nonsensical teachers should have this pack and no others. Praise and thanks be to God, we know that Christ did not say before Pilate: "My kingdom is not here," but rather: "My kingdom is not from here" [Joh. 18, 36]. It is and reigns everywhere he is, in bread, the world, death, hell, among devils; but his kingdom's power is not in the power of bread, the world, death, hell, devils; for he takes nothing from it to strengthen his kingdom, as the world and devils must do in their kingdom.

The sixth reason is against the glory of God, because Christ is in heaven in the glory of the Father, Phil. 2, and has not prepared his seat in bread, but in heaven 2c. This reason wants just that the previous, that Christ is in heaven, as in the dungeon and stick, imprisoned. For it would be a shame for him to be with us on earth in all the troubles of sin and death; it is better for him to leave us the devil here, and to play with the angels above. Isn't it a wonderful thing? It is not contrary to God's glory that he should be after the Godhead everywhere, even in hell, and it should be contrary to God's glory that his body should be in bread, as if his body were more noble than the Godhead. Away, away, it is a beautiful fine spirit.

Lastly, it shall be against the institution of Christ and the rehearsal of the first church. For the words of Christ are words of the baptism, when he saith, "This is my body," and are not words of heat: for nowhere saith Christ, When ye have spoken these words, then shall my body be there. He has stolen this piece from the kennel, and has answered it sufficiently above. So we have also heard this mad spirit, and no tooth wants to come forth yet, which bites the words of Christ, yes, which also attacks my little book. I have also read my booklet against the celestial prophets again, and I am surprised that the devil, who is a fugitive from the field, does not oppose it with writings, but only with words, and has left it unbitten until now.

De praedicatione identica.

336. it is the biggest and most annoying piece in this matter back there, which, methinks,

No enthusiast understands, because they do not touch it, or even touch it unskillfully, against which the enthusiast's chatter is vain quite jugglery. But this piece moves all honest reason, which the Viklef 1) in his books drives as the noblest, even the high schools have blued themselves with it in all the world until they have forced themselves to teach that in the sacrament no bread remains essential, but only the form; because there is neither in Scripture nor reason such *praedicatio identica de diversis naturis*, that is, that two different natures should be one thing. If the enthusiasts were not so unlearned logicians, they could have done this; it would have been worth talking about, and they would have left their useless flesh and Christ in heaven with others of their children's work, therefore we will speak of it here.

It is true and no one can deny that two different beings cannot be one being. As, what is an ass, that cannot be an ox; what is a man, cannot be a stone or wood. And do not suffer me to say of St. Paul, This is a bodily stone or wood; for I would make stone and wood a new word and a new interpretation, as is said above. All reason in all creatures must confess these things, for nothing else will come of it. Now when we come to the Lord's Supper with such an understanding, reason is displeased, for it finds that two different beings, as bread and body, are spoken of as one thing or being in these words: "This is my body," so it shakes its head and says: "It cannot and may not be that bread should be body; if it is bread, it is bread; if it is body, it is body, which is the one you want.

338 Now here the sophists have kept the loan, and have left the bread, and say: The bread perishes, and leaves its essence above the words, and the little word "that" points not to the bread, but to the body of Christ, since the text says: "This is my body." Wiklef, on the other hand, contests this and keeps the bread, leaving the body, saying,

1) In the old editions: Vigleph.

The little word "that" points to the bread and not to the body. So these pointed heads have sharpened each other, that the Sophists had to invent a miraculous sign, how the bread perishes, and let its essence come to nothing.

339 Now I have taught hitherto, and still teach, that such a struggle is not necessary, and that there is no great power in it, whether bread remains or not. Although I hold with Wiclef that bread remains; again, I also hold with the Sophists that the body of Christ remains. And so, against all reason and pointed logic, I hold that two different beings may well be and be called One Being, and this is my reason: First, that one should give reason and all wisdom captive in God's works and words, as St. Paul teaches in 2 Cor. 10:5, and allow oneself to be blinded and led, guided, taught and mastered, so that we do not become God's judge in His words. For we certainly lose with our judging in His words, as Psalm 51:6 testifies. 1)

340 Secondly, if then we are caught and confess that we do not understand his word and work, that we are content to speak of his works in his words, plainly, as he has commanded us to speak of them and has made us speak of them, and not in our words, but to speak of them differently and better; for I shall certainly miss where we do not plainly repeat after him as he speaks to us, just as a young child repeats after his father the faith or the Lord's Prayer. For here it is a matter of walking in darkness and blindness, and of badly hanging on to the word and following it. Because God's words "this is my body" are written here, dry and bright, common, certain words, which have never been a trope, neither in Scripture nor in some language, one must grasp them with faith, and thus blind and captivate reason, and thus, not like the pointed 2) Sophistria, but as God speaks to us, repeat and adhere to them.

341 If now here the *praedicatio identica* wants to speak into it that neither in the Scripture

nor reason shall suffer two beings to be one thing, or one being to be another, as it is said that stone cannot be wood, water cannot be fire, even in the Scriptures; therefore it shall be contrary to God's word and article of faith, that one thing shall be something else than it is, and bread must be bread, and cannot be body: you must answer that it is not contrary to Scripture, nor to reason, nor to right logic; but it seems to you to be contrary to Scripture, reason, and logic, because they do not hold it right together. We must prove this with examples, so that it may be understood all the better, first from Scripture and then from common language.

342 The high article of the Holy Trinity teaches us to believe and speak that the Father and Son and Holy Spirit are three distinct persons; yet one is the only God. Here it is said of the one Godhead that it is threefold, as three persons, which is much higher and harder to reason than that wood is stone; for wood, of course, does not have such a unity of essence in itself as the Godhead, and again wood and stone are not so certainly and unmistakably distinct as the persons are. Now, if the unity of nature and essence can cause different persons to be spoken of as one and the same essence, then it must not be contrary to Scripture or the articles of faith that two different things are spoken of as one and the same essence, as bread and body. But let this article be too high; let us take another before us.

I point to the man Christ and say: This is the Son of God, or, this man is the Son of God. Here it is not necessary that mankind perish or come to nothing, so that the little word "this" points to God, and not to man, as the sophists in the Sacrament of Bread write, but mankind must remain; nevertheless man and God are much more different and farther from and against each other than bread and body, fire and wood, or ox and ass. Who makes here that two so different natures become one being,

1) Walch and the Erlanger: *zeitet*.

2) Erlanger: *top*.

and one the other is spoken? Without doubt not the essential unity of natures (because there are two different natures and beings), but the personal unity. For although it is not one being according to the natures, it is nevertheless one being according to the person. And so from this arises two kinds of unity, and two kinds of being (as one natural unity and personal unity), and so on. From the personal unity arises such a speech that God is man and man is God. Just as from the natural unity in the Godhead arises this. Speech that God is the Father, God is the Son, God is the Holy Spirit; and again, the Father is God, the Son is God, 2c.

344 There we have two unities, one natural, and personal, which teach us that *praedicatio identica* is not contrary to Scripture, or that two different beings are spoken of as one being. Want to seek more of the same. Ps. 104, 4. says, "He maketh his angels winds, and his servants flames of fire." Here also are two kinds of beings, as angels and wind, or angels and flames of fire, as in the sacrament bread and body; nor does the Scripture make both of them one kind, saying, "He maketh his angels winds and flames," as he maketh his body bread, so that of such wind and flame it must be said, This is an angel; and the Scripture thus speaks, that whosoever seeth such wind or flame, the same standeth an angel. Now no one can see an angel in his nature, but only in his flame or bright form, nor must such a bright form perish, if one shows and says: This is an angel, as the Sophists destroy the bread in the Sacrament 2c., but it must remain.

345. Now here is also a unity of the two different beings, namely the angel and the flames, I do not know what to call it; it is not a natural unity, as in the Godhead Father and Son are One Nature; also not a personal unity, as God and man are One Person in Christ; let it be called real unity, because the angel and his form perform one work; nevertheless the Scripture speaks thus here:

Abraham and Lot saw, heard, fed and sheltered angels [Gen. 18, 2. ff. 19, 1. ff.], 1) Gideon and Manoah saw and heard angels [Judges 6, 12. 13, 2. f.], David and Daniel saw and heard angels (2 Sam. 24, 17. Dan. 7, 10.), the Marys at the tomb of Christ saw and heard angels [Matth. 28, 5], and so on many other examples; in all of which no angel is seen according to his nature, but only according to his form or flames; and where one points to it, one must say: This is an angel, and yet such "this" points to the form of the angel.

346. Whether here the pointed Wiklef and Sophists wanted to pretend the *praedicatio identica*, that two different beings may not be one thing, nor one the other be spoken, but either a vain form without angel must remain, as Wiklef wants, or a vain angel without form, as the Sophists want, we do not inquire; the clear Scripture and the public work of God stands there, that God makes his angels flames, and the flame is the angel, if one points to it and speaks: This is an angel, for the sake of real unity, that the two beings have become One Thing; as in Christ, for the sake of personal unity, God and man are One Personal Being. So also of the sacrament one must speak: "This is my body", although such "this" points to the bread; for it has also become a unity of two different beings, as will follow.

347. Fourth, the evangelists write how the Holy Spirit came upon Christ in the form of a dove in the Jordan River [John 1:32]. Item, about the disciples in the form of wind and fiery tongues on the day of Pentecost [Apost. 2, 2. ff.]. Item, on the mountain Thabor in the clouds figure 2c. [Matth. 17, 5.] Here Wiklef and the Sophists may lie and say: this dove is there without the Holy Spirit, or, the Holy Spirit is there without the dove. We say against both parts, that if one points to the dove, it is right and well to say: This is the Holy Spirit; for the sake of this, that here the two different beings,

1) Here the Bible citations are offset in the Erlangen edition, just as in Walch's old edition.

as the Spirit and the dove, are also one and the same being, not natural or personal. Well, they are called formal unity, because the Holy Spirit wanted to reveal Himself in such a form, and here the Scripture freely says that whoever sees such a dove sees the Holy Spirit, as John 1:33: "Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining upon him" 2c.

348 Why should one not say much more in the Lord's Supper: "This is my body", although bread and body are two different beings, and such "this" points to the bread? For here also a unity of two beings has been established, which I will call sacramental unity, because Christ's body and bread are given to us there for the sacrament; for it is not a natural or personal unity, as in God and Christ; so also perhaps a different unity, as the dove has with the Holy Spirit, and the flame with the angel; nevertheless it is also a sacramental unity.

349 Therefore it is rightly said that if one points to the bread and says, This is Christ's body, and whoever sees the bread sees Christ's body; just as John says that he saw the Holy Spirit when he saw the dove, as has been heard. So from now on it is rightly said that whoever attacks this bread attacks Christ's body, and whoever eats this bread eats Christ's body, and whoever crushes this bread with his teeth or tongue crushes Christ's body with his teeth or tongue; and yet it remains true throughout that no one sees Christ's body, grasps it, eats it or bites it, as one visibly sees and bites other flesh. For what is done to the bread is rightly and properly appropriated to the body of Christ for the sake of sacramental unity.

(350) For this reason, the pagans do wrong, as well as the glosses in spiritual law, when they punish Pope Nicolaus for having urged Berengar 1) to make such a confession that he says, "He crushes and grinds with his teeth the true body of Christ. Would God that all popes had acted as Christian in all things as this pope acted with Berengar in such a confession.

has! For it is the opinion that whoever eats and bites this bread eats and bites that which is the right true body of Christ, and not bad vain bread, as Wiclef teaches, for this bread is the body of Christ, just as the dove is the Holy Spirit, and the flame is the angel.

The pointed Wiclef and the Sophists were deceived by untimely logic, that is, they did not first consider grammar or oratory. For where one wants to know logic before one knows grammar, and before teaching than hearing, before judging than speaking, nothing right shall follow from it. Logic teaches rightly that bread and body, dove and spirit, God and man are different natures; but it should first also hear the grammar for help, which teaches to speak in all languages in such a way that where two different beings come into one being, it also grasps such two beings in one speech; and as it sees the unity of both beings, it also speaks of both with one speech.

In Christ, God and man are one being; therefore it speaks of both beings thus: He is God, he is man. Item, of the dove, Joh. 1, 32: This is the Holy Spirit, this is a dove. Item, of the angels: This is a wind, this is an angel; [item,] this is bread, this is my body. And again also at times one from the other; thus: the man is God, the God is man; the dove is the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit is the dove; the wind or this flame is the angel, the angel is the flame; the bread is my body, my body is the bread.

For here one must not speak according to which the beings are differentiated and two in themselves, as Wiclef and the Sophists wrongly use logic, but according to the essence of unity, after such different beings have become one being, each in its own way. For it 2) is also in truth thus that such different natures, coming together in one, truly get a new one being from such joining together, according to which they are rightly and well called one and the same being, although each one for itself is peculiarly one and the same.

1) In the old editions: Berenger.

2) "it" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

Such has deceived the Wiclef and the Sophists, quod, de unitate totali per unitatis partiales, et econtra, syllogisant.

Such a way of speaking of different things as of one thing is called synecdoche in grammar, and is almost common, not only in writing, but also in all languages. As when I show or present a sack or bag, I say, "These are a hundred florins," the pointing and the little word "this" go to the bag; but because the bag and florins of some measure are one being, as a lump, it also applies to the florins. According to the way, I touch a barrel and say: This is Rhenish wine, this is Welsh wine, this is red wine. Item, I touch a glass and say: This is water, this is beer, this is ointment 2c. In all these speeches you see how the little word "that" points to the vessel, and yet, because the drink and the vessel are to some extent one thing, it applies at the same time, indeed primarily, to the drink.

355 Thus I have also given an example above: Whoever pricks the king's son in the hand is judged to have pricked the king's son, because the hand is one being, that is, one body with the king's son, although it also has a special being in itself, as a hand; for the hand is certainly not a body. Here also belongs my parable of the fiery iron, taken from St. Augustine, on which the enthusiasts have almost committed a crime, and yet have achieved nothing. For be the fire what it may, so it is rightly spoken in all languages: This is fire, and this is iron 2c.

356 If now here a pointed Wiclef or Sophist should laugh and say, Thou showest me the bag, and sayest, This is a hundred florins; how can the bag be a hundred florins? Item, if he said: You show me the barrel and say: it is wine. Dear, the barrel is wood and not wine, the bag is leather and not gold; even the children would laugh at this as a fool or a joker. For he tears apart the two united beings from each other, and wants to speak of each one separately, since we are now in such speech, since the two beings have come into one being. For the barrel is no longer here.

It is not bad wood or barrel, but it is a wine wood or wine barrel, and the bag is no longer bad leather or bag, but a gold leather or money bag. But if you want to separate the whole thing, to separate gold and leather from each other, then each piece is of course for itself, and then you must speak differently of the thing, so: This is gold, this is leather, this is wine, this is barrel. But if you leave it completely, then you must also speak of it completely, point to the 1) barrel and bag and say: This is gold, this is wine, for the sake of the unity of the essence. For one must not pay attention to what such pointed sophists are joking about, but look at the language, what kind of way, custom and habit there is to speak.

Since this way of speaking is common to both the Scriptures and all languages, nothing prevents us from praedicatio identica in the Lord's Supper. Neither is there any, but it dreams the Wiclef and the Sophists thus. For although body and bread are two different natures, each for itself, and where they are separated from each other, certainly none is the other; but where they come together, and become a completely new being, there they lose their difference, as far as such a new one being is concerned, and as they become and are one thing. So they are called and spoken of as one thing, so that it is not necessary for the two to perish and become one, but both remain bread and body, and for the sake of sacramental unity it is rightly said: "This is my body", with the little word "this" pointing to the bread, because it is now no longer bad bread in the oven, but flesh bread or body bread, that is, a bread that has become a sacramental being and one thing with the body of Christ. So also of the wine in the cup: "This is my blood"; with the little word "this" pointed to the wine, because it is now no longer bad wine in the cellar, but blood wine, that is, a wine that has come into a sacramental being with the blood of Christ. That is enough about the piece for ours; the others are taught by their spirit to respect nothing but what they think is right.

The other part.

Now let us take the sayings of the evangelists and St. Paul before us to strengthen our conscience. And first of all, you must accept the confession of the false-minded. For they confess, and must confess, that our understanding is as the words naturally are in themselves, and to speak according to the sound of the words is our understanding right, that has no doubt. But they fight that the words should not be understood as they are. Such a confession you (I say) shall accept. For this is as much as more than half gained. Since they now confess that if the words were to be accepted as they are, our understanding would be right, they free us with their own testimony. First of all, that we must not prove our understanding any further than the words tell how they are written and read. That is one thing, mark well. Secondly, they burden themselves with two great labors; one, that they must prove why the words should not be understood as they are, but in a different way. The other, that instead of such words they give us other words and text, which would be certain to stand on. They have not yet done either of these, and especially the other they have never yet undertaken to do; as we have told and proved all this above, so that they force us at once to remain with the meaning that the words give as they read, and disgrace themselves with their uncertain lies.

Secondly, you know and should know that our text "this is my body" is not spoken and set by men, but by God Himself from His own mouth, with such letters and words. But the gushing text "this means my body", or, "this is my body's sign" 2c. is not spoken by God Himself with such words and letters, but by men alone.

Third, you have heard above that they themselves are all uncertain of their text, and none of them has consistently wanted to prove that it should and must stand as they claim,

and can also never bring up a certain one. But our text is certain that it should and must stand as the words read; for God Himself has placed it thus, and no one may add a letter either to it or to it.

Fourthly, you know that they are divided, and make many vile texts of the words, so that they are not only uncertain (which alone would be devilish enough), but also against one another, and must punish themselves among themselves with lies. But our text is not only certain, but also unanimous and simple and one among us all.

362. fifthly, suppose that our text and understanding is also uncertain or dark (as it is not), as well as their text and understanding; nevertheless, you have the glorious, defiant advantage that you can stand on our text with a good conscience, and thus say: If I then and must have uncertain dark text and understanding, I would rather have that which is spoken from the divine mouth itself, than that I have that which is spoken from the mouth of man. And if I should be deceived, I would rather be deceived by God (if it were possible) than by men; for if God trusts me, he will answer for it and make restitution to me. But men cannot make restitution to me if they have deceived me and led me into hell. Such defiance cannot be had by the enthusiasts, for they cannot say: I would rather stand on the text that Zwingel and Oecolampad speak in conflict than on that which Christ himself speaks in unity.

363 Therefore you can speak joyfully to Christ, both at your death and at the last judgment, thus: My dear Lord Jesus Christ, a dispute has arisen over your words in the Lord's Supper; some want them to be understood differently than they read. But because they teach me nothing certain, but only confuse and make uncertain, and will not nor can prove their text in any way, I am stayed on thy text, as the words are. If there is something dark in it, you have wanted it to be so dark, because you have no other explanation about it.

given nor commanded to give. Thus in no scripture nor language is it found that "is" should be "interprets"; or "my body" should be "body sign".

If there were darkness within, thou wilt give me credit for not meeting it, as thou didst give credit to thine apostles, when they understood thee not in many things, but when thou didst proclaim thy passion and resurrection, and yet they kept the words as they were, and did not do otherwise. Just as your dear mother did not understand when you said to her, Luc. 2:49, "I must be in my Father's house," and yet she simply kept the words in her heart and did not change them. So also I have kept these words of yours, "This is my body," 2c., and have neither wanted to make any others out of them, nor have I allowed them to be made out of them, but have commanded you and kept them secret, if there were anything dark in them, and have kept them as they are, especially because I do not find that they strive against some article of faith. Behold, so shall no reprobate speak with Christ, that I know well; for they are uncertain and divided about their text.

For I have tried, though the Lord's Supper were all bread and wine, and though I would for pleasure try to say that Christ's body was in the bread, I could not say it more surely, more plainly, and more clearly than thus, "Take, eat, this is my body. 2c. For where the text thus stands: Take, eat, in the bread is my body; or, with the bread is my body; or, under the bread is my body; there should first of all rain, hail, and snow vain swarms, which cry, Behold, hearest thou? Christ saith not, The bread is my body: but in the bread, with the bread, under the bread, is my body: and should cry out, O how gladly would we believe, if he had said, This is my body, that would have been spoken arid brightly. But now he says, in bread, with bread, under bread; so it does not follow that his body is there; and thus a thousand evasions and glosses would be invented about the words "in, with, under," even with greater pretense, and much less to be kept than now.

366. nor may they say: where does it stand ge

Just as if they were ready to believe, where we could prove it, and yet do not want to believe, since we prove more powerfully that the bread is the body of Christ, which expresses his body to be there more strongly and clearly than this text: In the bread is my body. But they lie and pretend that God should put texts as they show them to him, and even if he did, they would not accept it, because they do not accept him.

367 Since we have now proved strongly enough that neither Zwingel's interpretation, nor Oecolampad's drawing, can stand, we have also contended that all the texts that speak of the Lord's Supper should give us an understanding of what they say. And although I have sufficiently dealt with them in the booklet against the celestial prophets, and still today nothing has been brought up by the enthusiasts against them, but mere, naked little bells, without some saying of the Scriptures, invented from their head, and built on the foundation of their interpretation and signatures, and now all this together with the interpretation and signatures has also fallen to the ground, and my booklet still stands, as you may read and experience for yourself in the sexters J. K. 1) 2c., so I will once again deal with the same texts one after the other, to strengthen our understanding.

368 St. Matthew is the first to speak Cap. 26, 26, 27: "As they were eating, Jesus took the bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my body. And took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it unto them, 2) saying, Drink ye of it all: for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

369. these words are by the mouth of GOt-.

1) Thus the Jena edition. In the Wittenberg edition: "D. E". In the old edition of Walch and the Erlangen: "G. H. J. K". That we have decided for the reading "J. K", this is the reason. Luther refers here to the second part of his writing Wider die himmlischen Propheten. In the original edition, it has 15 sheets, signed A-P. By the indicated signature, we are referred to the section that bears the superscription: "Von Frau Hulda, der klugen Vernunft D. Carlstadts in diesem Sacrament. Cf. in this volume Col. 251 ff., § 130 ff. Our reading is confirmed by § 397 in this writing.

2) "den" is missing in the Erlanger.

They may not think more highly of the enthusiasts than if they had been spoken by a fool or a drunkard. For even the devil in one place is equally angry with us, and says: We hold so firmly over five 1) poor and wretched words. He does all this 2) out of the art of rhetoric, when someone has an evil thing, and the opposite with the bright truth causes him heartache and anxiety, he should reject it with his hand, and open his mouth and say: it is nothing, it is not worth answering for, it is five poor miserable words 2c. But besides this he must not think otherwise, for God is an idol or ape, and all the world is vain sticks and stones, which let them off badly when they hear such contempt. Thus Zwingel's rhetoric finely agrees with the spirit in Silesia 3) that one must put such words out of one's sight and despise them as poor miserable words; thus they have won and found the certain truth; that should be the reason to gloss over and understand these bright words.

We poor, miserable carnivores must nevertheless wonder how it is that such mighty iron-eaters and hell-breakers can muster nothing at all against these miserable, poor five words, but a mere, naked, arrogant contempt. If contempt is enough for the truth, then the devil is God above all gods. But with such speech they testify against themselves what kind of spirit they have, and how highly they esteem God's word, that they revile these same precious words as poor, miserable five words, that is, they do not believe that [they are] God's words. For if they believed that they were God's words, they would not call them wretched, poor words, but would also consider one tittle and letter greater than the whole world, and would tremble and fear them more than God Himself. For he who despises a single word of God, of course, does not esteem any of them very highly. If they were to peel away our understanding or wrong sense, and not the words of God Himself, it would be to suffer. But how do you do to those who do not despise such wretched words?

1) Erlanger: funft.

2) Erlanger: as.

3) Compare the note to § 322 of this paper.

but glorious, mighty and terrible? How shall one do? They must also be taken for miserable fools, who cannot despise such words, nor put them out of their sight.

371. Since here "is" cannot be "interpreted" and "my body" cannot be "my body's sign", and the sayings "flesh is of no use", "Christ is seated in heaven" do not compel, and indeed no reason can be given to understand the words differently than they are, as we have heard above: we must remain and cling to them as to the very brightest, most certain, surest words of God, which cannot deceive us nor make us miss them; for it is most plainly said, "This is my body, this is my blood of the new testament," that, if all the language and words of the world were put together, one could not choose or take from them more plain speech or words. Christ cannot speak more simply of his body and blood, than thus, "My body," or "this is my body," "this is my blood."

372 For that the falsifiers pretend that Christ did not say: In the bread is my body, or: If you speak these words, then my body shall be there, is nothing. Let them have the choice and try for themselves how they would speak of it more simply. If Christ had said, "In the bread is my body," they would have much more pretense, and would want to pretend that Christ is spiritual or spiritual in the bread. For if in these words, "This is my body," they could find a figurative speech, how much more would they find it 4) in these words, "In the bread is my body," and with greater appearance; for it is more brightly and plainly spoken when I say, "This is my body," than "in whom is my body."

373 But if Christ had thus said, When ye speak these words, my body shall be there, they would soon depart: Yes, beloved, Christ does not say, The bread is my body, but my body shall be there. Now he may well be there, that yet bread is not his body. Behold, how well would they be kept? But if he said thus, If ye have these words

4) In the editions: the same.

they would say again, "Yes, Christ's body is indeed present in the bread, but not essentially, but spiritually or figuratively. But if he were to say, "When you say these words, my body shall be substantially present in the bread," they would say again, "Yes, indeed his body is substantially present in the bread, but in such a way that "substantially" is understood of Christ's body, namely, that Christ has an essential body and not a Marcionian one; the same essential body is indeed present in the bread, but as in a sign and not truly.

In sum, if God Himself gave them the choice of setting the text, they themselves would not set one as simple as this one is, but would always find many more holes and gaps in it than they find in this one. Therefore, whoever does not allow himself to be held by this text in our understanding, will never be held by one. Now it is certain that the enthusiasts have decided among themselves that they do not want to be held. They prove this by drilling and perforating this simple text in so many different ways. One wants to make a hole through Tuto; another through "is"; the third through "my body"; the others otherwise and so, as the fish tore the net of St. Peter, and thus lead loose, rotten causes, which are much more uncertain and darker than this text is. And it is all lies and deception that they demand a more certain, simple, lighter text. For they know that it cannot be made brighter nor more simple, if they themselves had the choice to make it so; but because they feel that this text is too bright and too certain, they would like to entice us to make another, since they could find many more holes and gaps in it, and thus have a pretense that they have overthrown a brighter text than the one in the Gospel, which would then have to count for nothing at all. No, devil, you create nothing, you shall and must strangle and succumb to this text, nothing shall help you for it.

375 St. Marcus is the other one who speaks Cap. 14, 22. 23. 24.: "And as they were eating, Jesus took the bread, blessed it and broke it, and

gave it to them, saying, "This is my body. And taking the cup, he gave thanks and gave it to them, and they all drank from it, and he said to them: This is my blood of the new testament, which is poured out for many."

From this text Carlstadt has drawn his first thoughts of the Tuto, because here Marcus reads, as if the disciples had all drunk from the cup before Christ said: This is my blood; so that he should then point to his sitting blood, because the cup was now already drunk; but all this has long since been misplaced and nullified. For not only do the other evangelists and St. Paul write differently, but he himself, St. Marcus, in speaking of the other part of the sacrament, does not write that the disciples ate the bread, and after that Christ said, "This is my body." Therefore, the talk about drinking must be in accordance with the order of the other evangelists and Paul, and St. Marcus himself in the talk about eating; for he cannot be against himself and against all the others.

377 But I wonder how it is that only St. Marcus writes this piece: "and they all drank from it," and does it at the very place where Matthew writes in his text: "Drink from it, all of you," so that it seems for the most part as if the text in St. Marcus was changed, and made xxxxx [drink] into xxxxx [they drank]; for where xxxxx would be there, it would be the same text with Matthew, with whom St. Marcus otherwise tends to agree almost identically. This I command the scholars. I think that both, since Matthew alone writes "drink from it" before all others, and since Marcus also writes "they all drank from it" before all others, are written because the two evangelists want to show how the disciples all drank from this cup; not to thirst, as other drinks might have done, when it was necessary to pour more than once before it went round; but that they should let this cup go round, and so drink moderately from it, that they all drank from it; just as Lucas also writes that he also gave the last drink before the sacrament, that they all drank from one cup.

When he says, "Divide this cup among yourselves," Luc. 22:17, he should say, "There were more cups at the table, for each one drank from it, or one cup was poured out more than once, but this cup was given for the last time, so that they all drank from it, to give valet to the old paschal lamb.

So Matthew and Marcus may also be understood by this special cup, that the apostles otherwise had each a cup for himself at the table, or indeed there was more than one cup. But here, when he gives a new special drink of his blood, he tells them all to drink from this one cup, so that Christ, with presentation and special gift, takes his own cup and gives it to all, above the other common cups over the table, so that they may know all the better how it is a special drink, above the other drinks that are given over the meal. For he could well give out the bread, indeed, he had to give it out in such a way that each one got his piece for himself. But the wine he could not distribute in this way, but had to leave it in one cup for all of them, and indicate with words that [it] was a common drink for all of them, and not to be put in front of one or two or three alone and to be drunk, as the other cups over the tables were free for each one as he wanted.

Thus, with these gestures, he wanted to distinguish his Lord's Supper noticeably from the old Lord's Supper. First, that he gives the valet drink, as Lucas writes. With this he moved the minds of the disciples, so that they had to think: What does he want to do with this, that he gives the last drink from his cup? So far he has not done this over tables. And especially because St. Lucas writes that he also expressed such a last drink in words and said: "I tell you that I will not drink from the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes"; as we will hear.

380 Secondly, that he takes a special loaf in his hands before all the other loaves, blesses it, and breaks it after such a last drink; so they must have thought, "How will he eat again, since he has had the last drink?

than has. They were watching what he was doing and listening to what he was saying. For so he did not do with the other bread at the table and at the supper of the Lamb, and now, after the last drink and supper, he sows a new bread, saying, "It is his body. Here they are silent, and believe simply; no one asks how the bread is the body.

381 Third, that he gives his cup and tells everyone to drink from it, which must have moved them, because he had not done this with any other cup before, and says that it is his blood, and they keep quiet and believe. For they thought that what he said must be true. Because they see such a new offering after the last, that he begins anew, gives thanks anew, speaks the Benedicite anew, and takes a special bread, which he divides among them all, and also divides his cup among them all, and blesses such a supper with one bread and with one cup. Then they thought that he knew what he was doing and saying, that there should be no question about it, and yet they saw that it was a new and different supper.

382. Summa, they ate the paschal lamb in such a way that he did not call them to eat or drink, nor did he present or set it before anyone; but each one ate and drank for himself as it was placed and stood before him, as Matthew and Mark also say: "As they ate, he took the bread" 2c. But here it is done in a new way: he takes and approves a certainly special bread, gives thanks for it, breaks it himself and divides it among them, and puts it before them and tells them to eat, saying, "This is my body, given for you." He does the same with the cup, agrees and gives a special drink for them all. He does not make them eat other bread or drink other cups, nor does he put or set anything before anyone, as he does here. By all of which he indicates that this bread and wine is not bad bread and wine, as was eaten at the paschal lamb, but much more special, higher, namely, as he himself says in words, his body and blood.

1) In the old editions: from neues.

So we have that Matthew and Marcus agree, and both speak the most simple and almost one and the same words, without Matthew adding at the end this part: "for the forgiveness of sins". Again, Marcus, speaking of bread, says:

Ευλογήσας, that is, "He blessed it," since others everywhere say, *Ευχαριστήσας* that.

He gave thanks, as he himself, Marcus, also does with the cup, that it seems to me that he wants to bless and give thanks for one thing. But I leave this to those who have the desire to take care of it.

This is probably more useful to remember: Because the evangelists all so unanimously put these words "this is my body" in the simplest way, one can assume from this that there must be no figurative speech, nor some trope in it. For if there were some trope in it, someone might have touched it with a letter, so that there might have been another text or understanding. Just as they do in other things, where one puts in what the other leaves out, or puts it in other words, as Matthew 12:28 writes that Christ said, "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God," 2c., but Lucas said, "If I cast out devils with the finger of God," 2c, Luc. 11, 20., 1) and since Marcus says: one seed bore thirtyfold, one sixtyfold, one hundredfold fruit, Lucas says badly: And it bore a hundredfold fruit, and the pieces much, since one explains the other or speaks differently.

But here they are all the same in the most simple way, and none of them can be remembered with a different letter than the other, as if they should all say, "No one can speak of it differently, more simply and more certainly than thus, "This is my body," although Lucas and Paul speak much differently about the cup than Matthew and Marcus, as we shall hear. Since there are four witnesses, and they agree in words, we may cheerfully and confidently rely on their testimony, and judge and believe on it. For thus God speaks: "that the testimony of two mouths may be true" [Matth. 18, 16],

1) In the original edition, as well as in the Wittenberg and Jena editions, these two biblical passages are confused with each other.

How much more should these four testimonies be stronger for us than the cries and chatter of all the enthusiasts! They must not say that Matthew, Marcus, Lucas, Paul were not as learned, holy, pious and spiritual as they and theirs are. But if they make the speech of such witnesses doubtful, then the speech of the falsifiers should be much more doubtful, especially because they themselves disagree among themselves, none of them is certain of his text, nor can be; but these four witnesses in the text are also one in letter. With ours I speak thus; for the enthusiasts can answer all things well, because they may give no writing, but naked little bells from their own head.

386 St. Lucas is the third, Cap. 22:19, 20: "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This is the cup, the new testament in my blood, which is poured out for you."

387 If anyone wanted to say to him that he had enough in this matter at St. Luke's alone, he speaks about the Lord's Supper in such a clear and fine way. First, he describes the last drink of Christ (as stated above) and speaks:

He took the cup and gave thanks, saying, "Take this and divide it among yourselves, for I tell you: I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." Here Christ testifies that this is to be his last drink of wine on earth with his disciples; but soon after he gives the cup of wine of the new supper 2c. Now if it is all bad wine in the new supper, how can it be true that this is to be the last drink, that he will drink no more wine? If it is the last drink of wine, then this cannot be wine that he gives to drink afterwards. If it is not wine, it must be what he calls "his blood" or "the new testament in his blood. So Lucas says here, that in the Lord's Supper of Christ there cannot be bad wine.

389) Here you might say, "Yes, who knows whether Christ spoke such words about the last drink before or after his supper? for Lucas writes, "He spoke such words before the Last Supper.

But Matthew and Marcus write as if he spoke them after the Lord's Supper. Well, then, the matter stands on which evangelist keeps the right order in writing. If Lucas keeps it, then the matter is bad, and our understanding is right; and the scribblers are lost; there is no doubt about it. Or if the scribblers have doubts about it, we are sure that we are right, and that is enough for us.

390 Now let us learn from the words and works of the evangelists who keep the right order in writing. St. Lucas in the beginning of his Gospel testifies [Luc. 1, 3] that he wants to write from the beginning and in order, and this he also proves by deed; for his Gospel follows one another finely to the end, as all the world testifies. But this is not what Matthew and Marcus promised; nor do they do it, as would be proven in many pieces. As when Matthew describes the temptation of Christ, Matth. 4, 1 ff., and the appearance of Christ after the resurrection, 2c., when he does not keep the order at all; and St. Augustin *De consensu evangelistarum* works much in it. Marcus does not keep the order in this place in the Lord's Supper, since he put the part "and they all drank of it" before these words "and he said, This is my blood," 2c.

Since there is no doubt that Matthew and Marcus do not keep the strict order, but Lucas, who undertakes to keep the same 1) and also keeps it, Matthew and Marcus must be judged with their writing according to St. Luke's order, and not again. And have to say that Matthew and Marcus have put this after the new. They do not ask much about the order, they have enough that they write the history and truth, but Lucas, who wrote after them, confesses that the causes of his writing were that many others had written such history without order, therefore he had undertaken to write properly. And so also many think and is

It is almost believable that St. Paul meant St. Lucam, because he testifies to the Corinthians, praises and says: "We have sent a brother with him, who has the praise of the gospel through all the common people" 2). [2 Cor. 8:18.] This also helps Lucas to keep the order with diligence, that he not only writes and speaks the last drink, but also the whole paschal lamb's last beforehand:

When the hour came, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them: I was heartily desirous to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, that I will eat no more of it henceforth, till it be fulfilled in the kingdom of GOD. And he took the cup" 2c. There you see that everything in one text is spoken of properly one after the other, both in eating and drinking, which Matthew and Marcus do not do. So then, if the last part of the meal stands before the new supper and should stand before it, then the last part of the drink must also stand before the new supper, because they are both one last part, and not different from each other.

393 Now we come back to the above-mentioned reason and decision. If Lucas keeps the right order (as is now proved), then Christ drinks the last drink of wine before the new supper; but if he drinks the last drink of wine before the new supper, then in the supper no worse wine can be drunk; for his words are clear that he says: He will no longer drink of the fruit of the vine after this drink.

394 "But if any man say against this, Thou thyself dost contend that wine should remain in the new supper; and this speech of thine ought well to be papistical, who believe no wine in the supper. I answer: I do not care much about that. For, as I have often enough confessed, it shall not matter to me whether wine remains there or not; it is enough for me that Christ's blood is there, let the wine do as God wills. And before I join the gushers

2) Thus the Wittenberg and Jena editions, according to the Bible. Erlanger: "We have sent along a brother, whose praise in the Evangelio gehet with all Christians." - Jenaer: "im" instead of: am.

1) In the editions: the same.

If I wanted vain wine, I would have kept vain blood with the pope.

395 Further, I said above that when the wine has become Christ's blood, it is no longer bad wine, but wine of blood, so that I can point to it and say, "This is Christ's blood. Neither is Christ silent about this, when he says, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine. Why does he not say wine, but the fruit of the vine? Without doubt, the drink that is in the Lord's Supper does not come from the vine, like other bad wine; and even though it is wine, it did not grow as it is now. It is like pouring malt liquor under a little water; there is water, but it has become malt liquor to such an extent that it is no longer tasted. Then I can say of such a drink: The water is not drawn from the spring. So the wine in the Lord's Supper is no longer a crop from the vine, for a crop from the vine is certainly bad wine.

How? if Christ had not drunk in his supper, but only the disciples? I answer, How? if a fool could ask more than ten wise men could answer? It is not written that he gave the last drink; nevertheless, he did not give it to the disciples alone, but also drank it with them. After the last drink, the disciples will not have drunk any more, but will have kept themselves like Christ. Again, if the disciples drank the Lord's blood after the last drink, he will undoubtedly have drunk with them. Also 1) what am I fooling myself with such great questions? Let it be enough for the first piece from St. Luke, which is clear enough, it must not be vine's growth in Christ's supper. If it is not the vine, it can be nothing else than Christ's blood, according to his words: "This is my blood.

397] On the other hand, this part "who is given for you", which Lucas and Paul alone put, is also still tormented by some enthusiasts, especially of the Carlstadian kind, and they pretend that because it says "who is given for you", as a present history, Christ can be given for you.

1) Maybe: Oh.

The Lord's body will not be in the Lord's Supper, because neither then nor now will his body be given for us, nor will his blood be poured out; but in the first Lord's Supper it should read: who is to be given for you, and now: who was given for you. O wise high spirits. To this I have answered abundantly in the booklet against the heavenly prophets to the woman Hulda in the quatern J. K. 2) 2c.

They do not see, such spirits, that what they conjure up is just as strong against them as against us. For let Carlstadt's text apply: This is my body, which sitteth here; this is my blood, which sitteth here 2c.: how then shall his body be given, and his blood shed presently, as the words are, "Which is given for you, which is shed for you"? Christ cannot lie nor speak in vain, since he says in the Lord's Supper, "This is my body given for you; this is my blood shed for you." Now it is neither given nor poured out, as it should be, where the fanatic art should consist in these words. If they can now have both in their supper, namely, that Christ's body and blood are sitting there, still un-given and un-poured out for us, and yet it is true that he says: the body and blood are given and poured out for us, dear one, then our supper will also keep the same words true, although Christ is not given now, but once before. Read further in the same booklet, if you feel like it.

Thirdly, this text comes from Saint Luke: "This is the cup, the new testament in my blood, which is poured out for you", which must suffer, and still today are not one, how they want to torture and break the same enough. One takes the word "new testament" before itself, the other the word "in my blood" 2c. But no one pays attention to how he dresses or strengthens his naked thoughts and glosses with Scripture and good reason.

400 We also want to pay ourselves. 3) First of all, Lucas and Paul alone put these words

2) Thus the Wittenberg and the Jena. The old edition of Walch and the Erlangen: "K". Should the latter probably have it from its original?

3) "To teach" here means to instruct, to bring into the right direction.

"These things do in remembrance of me," and put them both when they speak of the bread, and not when they speak of the cup. For they think that it is said once enough, as it is true, although it refers to both parts of the sacrament and thus to the whole supper, as Paul further emphasizes and says: "As often as you eat this bread and drink from this cup, you shall proclaim the death of the Lord" 2c. [1 Cor. 11, 26.] They do this to indicate the cause and fruit of this supper, namely, that we should praise and thank God for the redemption from sins and death, as the Jews had to give thanks and praise for their redemption from Egypt. This is what we should speak and write about, because this is how the zealots get us into such hostile disputations.

401 Both Lucas and Paul also put these words for the cup: "The same also the cup after supper", or, "after they had supped". Why this? I truly respect, all for the sake of future enthusiasts, as if Lucas wanted to point back with the word, as with a finger, and remember the last drink. As if to say, "Remember what I said above about the last drink, that Christ will no longer drink of the fruit of the vine, so that you may know that I am speaking here of another drink, which took place after the Last Supper, when people had stopped drinking of the fruit of the vine, and that you do not understand this drink to be the same last drink, but a drink for the beginning of the New Supper. And especially Lucas and Paul speak this about the cup and not about the bread; because it is more dangerous and necessary with the cup, because one does not use to eat at the last, but to drink, so that it would not be understood as the last drink; although it goes to both, and to the whole supper/just as also the piece above about the remembrance 2c.

402 We let them rave and gloss as they wish; of course, 1) we are certain that Lucas does not mean anything else with this text "this cup is the new testament in my blood", but just the same as St. Matthew and Marcus mean with this text.

say, "This is my blood of the New Testament." For they must not disagree with each other, but with each other. Now make the text of Lucas as you will, so this must be the opinion that Marcus and Matthew say, "This is my blood of the new testament." If we now understand Lucas' words in such a way that they give us in the Lord's Supper the blood of Christ for the new testament, as Marcus and Matthew do, then we certainly have his right opinion. But whoever takes it differently or martyrs it, does not have it right. For then he would not agree with the others.

403 From this it follows that they are gross hemophiliacs who want to conclude from the words of Luca that the cup must be in the blood, when we want to follow his words as they are, because he says: "The cup, the new testament in my blood. For they think that "in the blood" here means the same as a peasant in boots, or meat in the pots, when they must confess that such an opinion cannot be in Mark and Matthew, and yet must not be contrary to each other.

But Lucas speaks (as he often does) in a Hebrew way, because this is how the Hebrew language speaks, Ps. 78, 64: Their priests fell by the sword, that is, they fell by the sword. Item: The princes were raised up in their hands, Klagl. 5, 12, that is, raised up by the hands. Item [Klagl. 5, 4.]: We drink our water in money, that is, for money. Item [5, 13.]: The boys fell in the wood, that is, they fell under the wood they had to carry. Item [Hosea 12, 13.]: Jacob served in Rachel, that is, for Rachel's sake [Gen. 29, 20.], and likewise much. So you see that "in" in Hebrew has a broad interpretation, but so that it nevertheless indicates that the thing of which it speaks must be present.

405. so here also Lucas wants to say: this cup is the new testament, in the blood of Christ, that is, through the blood or with the blood, or for the blood's sake 2c. Just as Matthew says, "This is my blood of the new testament." For the cup cannot be the New Testament, in silver, or by silver, or for silver's sake. Speak now, as you desire, these words:

"This cup is the new testament in blood", so far that you do not speak against Matthäum and Marcum. For it is soon told to a quiet, unconcerned spirit that the words Luca in German mean so much: This cup is a new testament, not because of its beautiful silver, or because of the wine, but because of the blood, and because of or for the blood of Christ. So that a German might read the text of St. Luke at home, or otherwise speak to himself in this way: This cup is the new testament because of the blood of Christ; which everyone understands to mean that the cup is a new testament because of the blood of Christ in it. Christ's blood is in it.

406 I have had to go so far as to make the text of Lucas certain, because, except that he speaks in the Hebrew manner, it is spoken in himself in the most obvious and simple way, and agrees with Matthew and Mark, without transposing the words, as the Hebrew language is wont to do. For as Matthew speaks in the Greek way, "This is my blood of the new testament," Lucas speaks in the Hebrew way, "This is the new testament in my blood." Now "new testament in my blood" and "my blood of the new testament" are not spoken against each other, but one word and interpretation, without one order being set; which makes the Hebrew speech kind, 1) as the scholars well know. And in order to avoid all confusion, I interpret the text of Lucas in the clearest and shortest way: "This cup is the new testament in my blood. Although Lucas does not put "is", but speaks thus: "This cup, the new testament in my blood" 2c. Which, if someone lusts, would like to interpret with two "is", thus: This is the cup, which is the new testament in my blood. But because Paul (who uses these very words of Luke) puts only one "is" and says: "This cup is a new testament in my blood", Lucas' text must of course be interpreted with one "is".

407 But I like Lucas with St. Paulo very much that they have kept the Hebrew way of speaking stiffly in this place, because Mat-.

The words of Christ were spoken in the Greek way by St. Matthew and St. Marcus, so that the words of Christ would be all the more true and so that the future mobs could be controlled. For they themselves confess how mightily Lucas and Paul have overthrown Tuto with their text of Carlstadt. And who does not know it, read my booklet against the heavenly prophets, tormentors G. H. 2) 2c. As they overthrow Carlstadt's Tuto, so they overthrow also the Silesian 3) Tuto, who reverse the Tuto and put it behind, as we have heard above, and say: My body, which is given for you, is this, namely a spiritual food.

408 Well, because here St. Lucas puts the tuto by the cup, and says, "this cup," let them also turn this text thus, and say, The new testament in my blood, which is shed for you, is this cup, that is, a spiritual drink. How thinkest thou here? A bodily cup is a spiritual drink. Dear, what does Lucas make of such enthusiasts when they thus turn him back? He makes such people who think silver or gold cups are spiritual drinks. This should be a strange spirit to me, who would drink and devour bodily, silver, and gold cups; he would not come to me, he would soon have drunk up my money and gold, and should be much more difficult to keep than the whole papacy, and devour more gold without masses than the papacy devours with masses.

409 See, this is what happens to the careless spirits, who think that where they can make a color in one place for their conceit, it is well done everywhere, and do not see around them how it rhymes in other places. For since they could say in Marco and Matthew: My body is this, my blood is that, namely spiritual food and drink, because they found the Tuto standing there alone, they wanted to deal with it to their liking, like those in Daniel with Susanna, and to dislocate the same and desecrate it with a false sense.

2) Thus the Wittenberg and the Jena edition. This refers us to the second part against the heavenly prophets, in this volume Col. 218, § 50 ff. - In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlangen: "K. 2c.

3) Krautwald and Schwenkfeld.

1) The old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: Redeart.

But they did not look to Lucas to turn them around with their art through his text, so that they would be seized with all the disgrace of their evil.

That is, "with the perverse you consort," Psalm 18:27. They want to turn God's word from the physical to the spiritual, and thereby turn themselves from the spiritual to the physical; for Lucas stands there clearly with his Tuto, and points with it to the physical cup and says, "this cup," that it is impossible to point Tuto here to a spiritual drink. Again, these gushers stand there with their reversal, saying that Tuto should point to a spiritual drink. Either Lucas or the enthusiasts must lie and deceive publicly. But if this Tuto in the cup cannot be turned around and made into a spiritual Tuto, then Tuto in the bread cannot do so either; and so the Silesian Tuto lies as deep in the mud as the Carlstadt Tuto. But when will the Rotten ever be ashamed of themselves, when they are so often caught in lies?

411 Ahead of the line, Oecolampad must also appear before St. Lucas' judgment seat with his sign. Body and blood (he says) are tropi in the Lord's Supper, and are called body's sign, blood's sign. If this is true, then without a doubt blood must also be a tropus, that is, blood sign, in Luke's text; for he speaks of the same blood that Matthew and Marcus speak of, no one can deny that. Well then, according to Oecolampad's opinion, Luca's text must be considered as such: This cup is a new testament in my blood sign, namely in the bad wine. This will be a good thing, if the new testament is no more than a drink of wine, or that a drink of wine has the power to make this cup a new testament; for this is what such an Oecolampadian text gives and wants.

(412) Take "testament" here as you will, it is certainly set against the old testament, because he calls it the new; therefore it must have the spiritual goods in it, which are signified and promised by the old testament and its goods, and are directed and fulfilled in the new; no one can say otherwise. But what Christian heart can suffer that our New Testament is a drink of wine?

Or that this cup is a new testament for a drink of wine? For Oecolampad leaves the word "is" as it reads, therefore, according to his art, the New Testament must be nothing else than the wretched cup, and yet that same thing no other than in virtue and for the sake of the wine, as a sign of the blood of Christ; so all the figures of the Old Testament would also be justified in calling the New Testament, because they are all such signs.

413 But if he wants to say that the text is to be put thus: This cup is a sign of the new testament in my blood, that the trope here is not in the blood but in the new testament, why then does he not make it all a sign and vain trope, and thus says: *Ista figura calicis est figiira testamenti in figura sanguinis mei, id est, iste pictus calix est imago novi testamenti per signum sanguinis mei, id est, per vinum*: This sign of the cup is a sign of the new testament, in the sign of my blood. That would be in German: This painted cup is a picture of the new testament, through the wine. O beautiful thing! who wants to show cause why one word and not the others all must also be tropus?

414 But let us admit to him that he verses this text thus: This cup is a sign of the new testament in my blood, so that blood here is not a trope, but real blood. First of all, he confesses that in the Lord's Supper, "blood" is not a trope, but the true blood of Christ. Here we ask, why does he make it a tropus in Matthew and Mark? How can Lucas be said to call the blood in the Lord's Supper different from that of Marcus and Matthew? If it is the right blood of Christ in Luke, then it must also be in Matthew and Mark; for they certainly speak of the same Lord's Supper, so they must also speak of the same blood and drink. Turn as you will: if blood is a trope in Matthew and Mark, it must also be a trope in Luke; if it is not in Luke, it must not be in Matthew and Mark. But if blood is not a trope, then body must not be a trope either. And so Lucas makes all the tropes null and disgraceful at one time.

Word. So the Trope, like the Tuto, falls over himself.

415 Secondly, it is even more shameful that such a text "this cup is a sign of the new testament in my blood" confesses that Christ's true blood is in the cup, and yet creates nothing more than that this cup is thereby a sign or figure of the new testament. This is nothing else than: the cup with the blood of Christ is a figure of the new testament. And so Christ's blood must not give the true new testament, but be a sign of the new testament, which is nothing better than the paschal lamb or goat's blood in the old testament, which is also a figure or sign of the new testament. For we have heard above that this word "in my blood" means as much as: through or with my blood, so that it is present in the cup, and the cup is therefore a new testament, because it has the blood of Christ in it.

416 This is called his death, and Christ's blood honored, that it should be reckoned like the blood of a goat, and be a figure of the new testament, and that we should be in the new testament, and yet at the same time be in the old testament. For he who has the figure of the New Testament cannot yet have the same New Testament, as the epistle to the Hebrews teaches. But from such a text of Oecolampad (where he wants to hold it) we would still have the new testament at the same time and would not have it; for we would have the figure of the new testament at the same time, and the new testament itself; that is not different, because we would have Christ's blood at the same time, and not his blood.

417 About that it is not to suffer, that "new testament" should be a trope. With what one wanted to prove it? Where is any of it an example? Yes, where would common language remain, so that I would like to or perhaps should speak plainly of the New Testament, if one wanted to have understood a sign or figure, as often as I called the New Testament? In this way, the New Testament would not be the Gospel or promise of the Spirit or of eternal life, but an old figure or image of the future New Testament. And in short, the trope does not want to send itself anywhere in the word "new testament".

much less can it be proved with some reason; that Oecolampad must remain on the first text, since blood is a trope, and say: This cup is a new testament in the sign of my blood; which text, nevertheless, our faith cannot suffer that bad wine should make this cup a new testament.

418 For the new testament is a promise, rather a bestowal of grace and forgiveness of sins, that is, the true gospel 2c. For though the cup is a bodily thing, yet because it becomes a sacramental thing with the blood of Christ, or with the new testament, it is properly called a new testament, or the blood, that one may point to it and say, This is a new testament; this is Christ's blood; just as above the bodily flame of fire is and is called a spiritual thing, namely the angel, and the dove the Holy Spirit. Therefore he that drinketh of this cup drinketh truly the true blood of Christ, and the remission of sins, or the Spirit of Christ, which are received in and with the cup; and shall not receive here any living figure or token of the new testament, or of the blood of Christ; for that is due to the Jews in the old testament.

419. But if someone wanted to look for a little help, and pretend that Oecolampad would put his text thus: This cup is a sign of the new testament in my blood, that not the blood should belong to the cup, but to the testament, on this opinion: The new testament is in the blood of Christ, and exists through the blood of Christ, and not so that the cup is a sign or figure through the blood of Christ, as if its text were written out, thus: This cup is a sign of the new testament; but the new testament is a thing that stands in the blood of Christ. Answer: Oecolampad knows well that such a text cannot be here; because there would have to be an article in the Greek after the "new testament", thus: xxxxx xxxxxxx x xx xx xxxxxx xxxx. The same article, however, is not there, but the text is attached to each other, as if it were all one inseparable word, just as the cup, blood, and New Testament are also in each other, as if it were one inseparable being, so that the meaning must be: This cup is one

new testament in my blood, that is, because of my blood the cup is such a thing, and without my blood it would not be.

420 As Oecolampad lies down here with his tropo or sign, so also the Zwingel lies down with his interpretation. For what is contrary to the sign, is also contrary to the interpretation, because it is almost equally valid. For the Zwingel's text would have to stand thus: This cup signifies the new testament in my blood; that would be so much: This cup has so much through my blood, which is in it, that it thereby signifies the new testament; and therefore Christ's blood would have to be a signification and nothing more, however, as I have proved about Oecolampadii signification. For Zwingel cannot make the text so either: This cup means the new testament, so in my blood is. For the article "so" is not there, but it is the whole text equal as one word, as is said.

421 Is not St. Lucas a hostile man, who with a single word (to speak so) at one blow strikes so great giants and heroes, both tutists, figurists and interpretists, and all enthusiasts into one heap? And what does it help, if their texts could stand with the signification and interpretation? they cannot show a cup of likeness, in which such signification or figure could stand, as we have just heard in Oecolampadii Tropo. For in what is the cup like the New Testament through the blood of Christ? Is it in this that just as our sins are forgiven by it, so they are also forgiven by the blood of Christ? Or wherein will they be found? In the smoke hole. Why then do they teach figures when there can be none?

422. but Lucas has in this text a piece which no other evangelist has, nor Paul, namely, "which is shed for you," and not, which is shed for you; for in the Greek it is of the cup, and not of the blood, as no one can deny:

τοῦτο τὸ ποτηριὸν etc. ἐχχυνόμενον, and not

ἵν τφ

αιματι etc. ἄχχυνόμενον. In Latini

It's hard to remember when they say: Qui pro vobis funditur, because cup and blood are both "der" in Latin; but in German it's easy to remember, because blood is "das" and cup is "der. Such has me

Once, three or four years ago, a fine learned priest in a village recalled and presented to me his opinion that Lucas should be understood thus: This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is poured out for you, that is, which is given over tables to you, and set before you to drink, as one otherwise pours wine out of a jug for the guests. And was that of his causes one, that Lucas (as said) is poured not of blood (as Matthew and Marcus), but of the cup says ἐχχυνόμενον. And led to this the text of Paul: "This is my body, which is broken for you", that is, divided out and presented to you over tables.

423 I, because I found that he did not hold it with the enthusiasts, but confessed that true body and blood were in the sacrament, I was glad, and let myself like such an opinion, without me considering it unnecessary, because no driving stood in the old mind, and pleases me still today, would also well wish that one could bring such an opinion from the Greek text; because with it the mouth of all enthusiasts would be shut again with all force. There is no doubt in my mind that Paul's text, "This is my body which is broken for you," is to be understood badly of the breaking and dividing over tables, as he also says in 1 Cor. 10:16: "The bread which we break is the body of Christ divided."

424 Since the text in Paul, which speaks of the bread or body of Christ, is understood of the distribution over tables, and not of the giving on the cross, the text of the cup can also suffer the same understanding. And so Matthew and Marcus would also find themselves, namely, "this is my body"; in which they say nothing of giving, as if it were otherwise well to be noticed that he gives his body to them, when he says, "this is my body," "there you have my body." So also of the cup, "this is my blood, poured out for you," that is, distributed over tables and set before them for the remission of sins. I still see nothing in [the] words that almost contradicts such understanding. For even St. Paul leaves out of the cup "which is poured out for you," as if he wanted to have said enough, because the bread was for them.

When the cup is broken, the cup will also be distributed for them.

425. Although this understanding was not held until now, but from the giving into suffering, and from the shedding on the cross everyone understood the text, it would not have been a harmful error, as it is not yet; For no one does wrong in keeping Christ's body and blood given and shed for us on the cross, though he does it in a place where nothing is said or read about it, without it being disputed or disputed, as otherwise the dear fathers have often kept the Scriptures without a road, in an uneven place, but in a good and useful understanding; so it looks to me as if some of the old fathers also had this understanding, as when they say that Christ's blood is so often given and shed on the cross: that Christ's blood is shed as often as one takes the Lord's Supper. And especially Ambrose, when he says: "If the blood of Christ, as often as it is poured out, is poured out for sin, then I should take it daily, because I sin daily. For the word *luneitur* means not only to pour, but also to pour and to give. Item, Gregorius: The blood of Christ is poured into the mouth of the faithful 2c.

I do not say this because I am sure of it, for I do not want to teach anyone what I am not sure of myself; but because I would like it to be so, and because I am not experienced in Greek, I would give scholars cause to investigate whether the Greek language would give it: then all the devotees would no longer have a remedy of an excuse against our understanding. They would have to confess 1) that Christ's body and blood would be distributed over tables, eaten and drunk in the flesh in bread and cups.

427. for my court right 2) I say that also meues Dünkens Lucas and Paul are strongly on this opinion: Paul with that he speaks (as is said): "this is my body, broken for you", and "the bread, so we break, is the distribution of the body of Christ." Thus we find probably more oerter, since Paul needs xxxx xxxxx, for us, pro:

coram vel ante, than 1 Cor. 15.: "Why let

1) Erlanger: had to" and immediately following: "became".

2) For "Court Law," see the note to Col. 285 in this volume, § 211.

they baptize themselves before the dead?" Lucas with that, that he speaks: "The cup in the blood is poured out", also xxxx xxxx, that is, for you, before your eyes presented to drink 2c., and with that, that he speaks: "The body is given for you", as Paul also speaks. Now "to give" admittedly means to give something, and not to deliver something in death.

428 But Matthew and Marcus let themselves be looked upon as if they were against it, because they say, "This is my blood, shed for many," or poured out. This is as if Christ were speaking of many, who are also not present over tables; and say not *ὑπερ υμῶν*, sed *περί πολλῶν*, which I leave to be fought out by those who understand Greek. Whoever would have a mind to the above opinion, let him answer thus or similarly, that Lucas and Paul speak of pouring or giving over tables, but report the shedding on the cross by saying: one should do this in his memory, or proclaim his death; as they speak more properly and clearly than Matthew and Marcus.

Again, Matthew and Marcus speak of the pouring on the cross, and are silent about the pouring on the tables, as they want to have sufficiently indicated by the word "that". Since we know that it is the habit of the evangelists that one says more and more about one thing than the other, and one leaves out what the other says. And so this word "which is given for you" would not be so clear and certain of the suffering of Christ, as the Zwingel dreams, who thereby wants to explain the previous part "this is my body", as we have heard above.

430. but he who has no desire to do so may answer that Lucas says, "The cup is poured for us," and thus say, "Since cup, and blood, and New Testament are One Sacramental Being, for the sake of such unity the cup is poured, though the blood alone is poured, per *synec*-.
but as we have said above, that the Son of God is spoken rightly, that he dies, although mankind alone dies, and the Holy Spirit is seen, although the dove alone is seen, and the angel is seen, although his bright form alone is seen 2c. Does anyone think this is too stale or

be too lazy, he had better give it, or let the above opinion stand. I think it is right and enough to answer; for we also see and drink the cup, that is, Christ's blood. With us there is no driving, but vain advantage, which opinion we keep of the two, they are both good and right; for it is both so in fact, namely, that Christ's body is both given over tables and on the cross, though we do not meet it in the right place of Scripture (as has happened to many saints), yet we lack nothing of opinion and truth. But the enthusiasts have all power in this; for if such an opinion is not right in this text, they have nothing better in their cause with it; but if it is right, they lie altogether in ashes.

The fourth and last is St. Paul, who says 1 Cor. 11, 23-25: "I have received it from the Lord, which I have given you. For the Lord Jesus, on the night that he was betrayed, took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, saying, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you, do this in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink, in remembrance of me."

If I were as learned in Greek as Carlstadt and Zwingel, I would conclude from this text that in the bread the true body of Christ is eaten. For Erasmus shows that in Greek there is no "is" in the bread, but thus: *φάγετε τοῦτο ἐμὸν σῶμα*, comedite hoc meum corpus, which I wanted to interpret thus: Take, eat this body of mine which is broken for you. This would have to be interpreted 1) from word to word correctly, without me skipping a little point, that would not have to hinder, so I would have won pure and fine. But now that I am not so learned, I must let it go, that I do not also compose an article for a pronoun, or an *alloosin*, and need *casum pro casu*.

433 But this is nevertheless true, how imperfectly Matthew and Marcus describe the Lord's Supper, we must notice from it,

That if it were not for Lucas and Paul, we could not have this sacrament. For Matthew and Marcus do not write that Christ has called us to do this, and also to keep it that way. And so we would have to leave it as another story of Christ with his disciples, which we could not or would not have to do. But Lucas and Paul write: Christ also called all of us to do this. Yes, if it were not for Paul, even Lucas could not do enough for us, as the only one who would be understood by the apostles that they should imitate Christ in this way; unless in Matthew something were done at the last, when Christ says: "Teach them to keep what I have commanded you. But whether it would be enough, I do not know. Paul is the right teacher and apostle, sent among us Gentiles, who also speaks freely and abundantly, saying, "Take, eat, this is 2) my body, which is broken for you."

434 For he places the word "my" harshly after the word *τοῦτο* or "this," which none of the others do. In addition, as some texts should read, he leaves the little word "is" outside, just as Lucas also leaves it outside with the cup. Which two little things the Holy Spirit shows us for our strength, that we may be sure that the body of Christ is in the bread. For although it is spoken as much among us when I say, "This is my body," and "This my body," or "Here my body," yet it is spoken more clearly and certainly of the presence of the body when I say, "This my body," or, "Here my body," and the spirits of the wicked with their swarming therein cannot so easily deceive as in the speech, "This is my body."

435 Now there is no doubt that Christ speaks such words against the old paschal lamb, which he herewith abolishes, as if he should say: Until now you have eaten the lamb and the body of an animal; but now in its place is my body, "mine, mine," I say even differently. Therefore Paul insists so diligently on the word "my" that he puts it in a new way soon after "that," and says, "That my," as if

2) is" is missing in the Erlanger. That it must stand here, proves the immediately following. Because if the "is" should be missing here, Luther could not say in the following: "Dazu, als etliche Texte sollen lauten" 2c.

1) Erlanger: had to.

he would like to tie it to it in such a way that it would become one word with the "that," since "my" and "body" must be much closer to each other. He does all this so that he may pronounce the body of Christ clearly enough in the Lord's Supper.

436. "Who is broken for you." Of this we have said much above, that the Scripture cannot suffer that "breaking" should mean Christ's suffering. The enthusiasts may say it, as they say other things, but never prove it; for we must neither interpret nor use "breaking" according to our own conceit, but according to the scriptural custom. Now "to break" in Scripture, especially where it is said of bread or food, means as much as to cut or divide; so that even such broken bread is called both in Greek, Latin and German χλάσμα, fragmentum, Brocken.

Yes, also in Hebrew, for the sake of such breaking, grain is called Sheber, that is, Brocken, Gen. 42, 1: "Jacob heard that Brocken was in Egypt", that is, food or grain, which is broken for eating; and after that buying grain there is called Shabar, as if we should say: We want to get Brocken, that is, food 2c. But Christ's body was not broken nor cut in pieces at the cross, of which more is said above. So this text is strong, that Christ's body is broken over tables, and cut in pieces, and crushed, and eaten, as other bread, but in the form of bread, or in the bread 2c.

437 And if it could be proved that the breaking here should be called Christ's suffering, wherein then will the likeness stand, that in the Lord's Supper the bread of Christ's body is a sign? For I gave in above, that they might make broken bread, as they might, the likeness. But now they separate the breaking also from the bread, and appropriate it to the body of Christ on the cross, tell me, wherein then will the bread of his body be the likeness? Not otherwise, for as I said above, the bread must be called like Christ's body, and yet is nowhere like it in the sense demanded by the words in the Lord's Supper. Further:

438. "This cup, the new testament, is in my blood." Now it may be that this text applies just as much as if I say: This cup is a new testament 2c. Still

Paul did not put the "is" after the word "new testament" and not before it for nothing. The Holy Spirit has wanted to precede the future rotten. For St. Paul puts *utrumque a parte subjecti, tam calicem, quam testamentum, ceu unum subjectum*, that is, his text reads thus: that this cup, being a new testament, is the same in Christ's blood; and thus freely calls the cup the new testament. If the enthusiasts had as much text for themselves as we have here, how should they defy and insist? Now the New Testament cannot be bad wine or cup.

439 But that they would pretend that "new testament" here means a sign or figure of the new testament is abundantly and mightily accounted for. For they say it and do not prove it. But nothing is given to their saying, for it has never been heard in Scripture that the "new testament" should be called a sign of the new testament. They say: The thing itself compels it. Which one? The cup (they say) must be a physical thing, as silver, wood, gold or glass 2c. Now silver can never be the new testament, but if it is something, then it is its sign, and that is all it can be. This is what is said above in Luke.

440 But because they are so stubborn and stiff, I will also need their umbrella. Tell me, how can the cup be a sign of the New Testament, since it is bad silver or wood? Is it a sign of the new testament according to the material, or according to the sound, or according to the form, or in what? Well then, any cup, whether it be in a box, or in a goldsmith's store, or wherever it may be, empty or full, is nevertheless a sign of the new testament, for it has silver, wood, sound, form 2c. What then might Christ call the cup over tables, as no other cup in the world has silver, sound, form, that is, the likeness of the new testament in itself? No (they say), but the cup, as presented with wine to drink, so it is a sign of the new testament 2c.

441 There hear two pieces: The first, here they themselves must make a new unity and being out of cup and wine, if they are nevertheless two different natures, and must make such a unity and being out of cup and wine.

new beings call cup and sign, yet they do not mean the the wine should be a sign of the blood of Christ, or new cup alone, but especially the wine, just as we said above testament, and yet in it such likeness should stand, about the flame and angels. Can they now let it happen however grossly acted. For the new testament is the among themselves that one says: The cup is 1) a sign 2c., gospel, the Spirit, the forgiveness of sins, in and through if they do not mean the cup alone, but the wine (as it has the blood of Christ, and what is more; for it is all one thing, become one thing with the cup), and do not like that one and gathered into one heap or essence, all in the blood, separates such unity or essence of the cup and wine, and all in the cup. Where one is, there is the other also; calls the cup without wine a sign: We kindly request that whoever names or shows one thing, meets it all. Now they also allow the Holy Spirit to speak to us in this way in how can bad wine interpret or signify such great things, his matters, so that he may call the cup a testament and when all the figures of the Old Testament can hardly show that it has now become not only a cup, but with the signify them? Not differently, because as I said: The wine testament and blood of Christ a sacramental being; or should and must be called a sign, even if it can not be, show us the reason and causes why they have such there is no power. Are these not poor people who not only power to speak in this way among themselves, and that lose the essence, as the body and blood of Christ in the the Holy Spirit should not have it. Lord's Supper, but also the sign or figure for it, and have

442 If they mock us, that we call the cup a new nothing more than the peasants in the common wine testament, and us the cup of the new testament, and house, without being able to comfort themselves with divide such sacramental unity or essence, we again mock words, as if the figure were there, and cannot say in what their sign, and divide the cup and wine from one another, such a figure stands. So it serves them right; because and divide their sign unity or essence, as they divide our they do not want to have the kernel and pith, they should sacramental unity. For if the cup and the new testament not keep the skins and husks either, and over which they were to be separated from one another, and if each were want to dispute and spoil our thing, they should also lose to be kept apart in its own essence, we would know that a their own and keep nothing.

cup is nothing more than a cup or silver, even as well as 444 We have proved above in Luke that these words they know that if cup and wine were to be separated from cannot be a trope: "This cup is the new testament in my one another, then the cup would not be a sign of the new blood", because the word "in my blood" means as much testament, but a bad cup. Such deception is called the as through or with my blood. For Christ's blood does not logici arguere a parte ad totum negative, hoc est, ab have to be such an impotent thing that it only gives a sign inferiori ad superius negative, sive a particulari ad of the new testament, as the calf's blood of Moses did in universale; which is common to the enthusiasts. As if cup cannot be such a great thing, namely the new said: Peter has no ear, therefore Peter has no body; gold testament, by blood sign, or bad wine. is not black, therefore gold is without color. But the gushers can't do child logic either.

443. secondly, we would like to know how or with which piece the cup with the

445. Summa, if we hold the evangelists and Paul together, that they stand for one man, then they suffer no Tutists, Tropists, nor Dentists. If the tropists in Matthaeum and Marcum want the blood to be called blood sign, Lucas and Paul come forth and overthrow the tropists by force, because they show with their text that blood should not be called blood sign or be tropus, because the tropists themselves have no blood sign.

In this text, "this cup is the new testament in my blood"; therefore, in Matthew and Mark, the same blood must also be without a trope, because it is the same blood, of which all four speak.

But if they want to take Lucas and Paul and make the word "new testament" into a trope, that is, a sign of the new testament, then Matthew and Marcus, along with Luke and Paul, go and overthrow them again, and show that the "new testament" cannot be a trope. And even in Matthew and Mark, the enthusiasts cannot make the word "new testament" into a trope, just as little as they cannot in Luke and Paul. For it does not suffer me to say in Matthew and Mark, This is my blood of the figurative new testament. For Christ's blood is not of the figurative testament, or of the old testament, but of the new, which consists in his blood; and yet the same new testament must be understood in Luke and Paul, which is understood in Matthew and Mark, because all four of them speak of the same testament. So Matthew and Marcus hold the word "new testament", pure and simple without any trope. Lucas and Paul hold the word "blood", pure and simple without any trope. There the enthusiasts must lie, that I know for certain, and if they answer you correctly on this, then you shall give them cheerfully won.

447 Therefore the text must remain as the words read, that, I hope, is tremendously won, and our conscience well assured that our understanding is right, and the enthusiast not only uncertain, but also wrong.

448) Where are now the little enthusiasts, who are insisting that Christ has never done no sign, except 1) visibly or sensitively 2) standing there? Was this not a sign that John saw the Holy Spirit coming from heaven? John 1:32; the Holy Spirit was not yet visibly present.

but in the form of the dove. Was this not a sign? When Zacharias saw the angel Gabriel at the altar of incense? Luc. 1, 11. The angel was not yet visible, but in the form of flames of fire. Was this not a sign that the Son of God was walking on earth personally? God's Son was not yet visibly there. What is it then, that one builds on such loose, rotten grounds, and thereby denies and blasphemes God's word and works, without wanting to be deliberately lost?

449 Admittedly, it is a miraculous sign that Christ's body and blood are in the sacrament; it is not yet visibly there, but it is enough for us to feel that it is there through word and faith. Yet their sign is not visibly there either. For though they see the cup of wine visibly, yet they cannot see that it is a sign of the body and blood; but they must speak it with words, and believe it with their hearts; for it is not written on the cup, neither painted, nor formed, that it is a sign of the blood of Christ. This is foolishness, but it is terrible that one should build on it and defy God's word.

(450) Where are all the others who say that there is no forgiveness of sins in the Lord's Supper? St. Paul and Lucas say that the New Testament is in the Lord's Supper, and not the sign or figure of the New Testament. For the figure or sign of the new testament belonged to the old testament among the Jews; and whoever confesses that he has the figure or sign of the new testament confesses that he does not yet have the new testament, and has run back, and denied Christ, and become a Jew. For Christians shall have the New Testament in themselves without figure or sign. They may have it hidden under a strange form, but they must have it truly and presently. If then the new testament is in the Lord's Supper, then forgiveness of sins, spirit, grace, life and all blessedness must be in it. And all these things are put into words; for who would know what was in the Lord's Supper if the words did not proclaim it?

451 Therefore, behold, what a beautiful, great, wonderful thing it is, how it is all intertwined and is one sacramental being.

1) "denn" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) "or sensitive" is missing in the Erlanger.

The words are the first; for without the words the cup and bread would be nothing. Further, without the bread and cup, the body and blood of Christ would not be there. Without the body and blood of Christ, the New Testament would not be there. Without the New Testament, forgiveness of sins would not be there. Without forgiveness of sins, life and blessedness would not be there. Thus, the words firstly include the bread and the cup for the sacrament. The bread and the cup fast the body and blood of Christ. The body and blood of Christ fast the New Testament. The New Testament fasts forgiveness of sins. Forgiveness of sins grasps the eternal life and blessedness. Behold, the words of the Lord's Supper suffice and give us all these things, and we grasp them by faith; should not the devil then be hostile to such a Supper, and raise up enthusiasts against it?

Since all these things are one sacramental essence, one can well and rightly say of each piece, as of the cup: This is Christ's blood, this is the New Testament, there is forgiveness of sins, there is life and blessedness. Just as I point to the man Christ and say: This is God, this is truth, life, blessedness, wisdom 2c. That is enough of that, Paul wants to hear further.

453. "As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you shall proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes. Notice again that cup here cannot be understood for bad silver and wood (for who can drink silver and wood?), but because the cup has become one being with the drink, cup here is also called the drink in the cup; so that you see how such a way of speaking is common in all languages. After this also: "He eats of this bread and drinks of this cup. Who can drink of the cup, that is, of silver or wood? But, as I said, it is the way of all languages to speak in this way, where two things become one, that the same one thing keeps both names; as the Holy Spirit is the dove, and the dove is the Holy Spirit.

Here the enthusiasts are rejoicing and shouting: Won! There, you hear that St. Paul calls bread and cup, and does not say, "As often as you eat the body of Christ and the blood," but, "I have won.

Christ's drink 2c. Dear, let us also cry out: St. Paul does not say: As often as you drink the wine, but the cup. Why then do they drink wine, and not the cup? When St. Paul speaks of drinking the cup, does it not follow that they drink the cup, but understand the wine in the cup, because the cup and the wine have become one thing? Dearly beloved, why then must it follow that we eat vain bread, when Paul speaks of eating bread, and may not also as well be understood the body in the bread, for the sake of the sacramental unity? May the poor carnivores not have such understanding, but only the glorious enthusiasts?

I call out once again. St. Paul does not say: As often as you eat the sign of the body and drink the sign of the blood 2c. Therefore bread cannot be the sign of the body, nor wine the sign of the blood. Is it not fine? But if such a text does not deny to the enthusiasts their sign, dear one, why should it then deny to us that there is body and blood? For he speaks so little of the sign as of the body and blood. Therefore he must be as strong against them as against us; and if he does not strike them, he does not strike us either, if that is enough: Paul says here not so, therefore it is not so; that is, *ex puris negativis syllogisare*. What reason this is for founding special articles of faith, children know well.

456 But this is true, according to the rule of the Silesian spirit they are right, and I must give them victory; for this rule holds: that one should put the texts out of sight and not look badly at them, since Christ's body and blood are spoken of as being in the Lord's Supper, for they hinder the spirit and spiritual mind. The other rule is to turn one's eyes elsewhere, where such texts are not written, and then cry out, "Behold, behold, it is not written here that the body and blood are in the Lord's Supper. They follow these rules also in this place. For hard before, when St. Paul said, "This is my body," item: "The new testament in my blood," that is nothing, they act as if this text were in no place in the world, and do not look at it. Here again, when it is not there, they stare, open their mouths and noses, and search for such a text.

as if St. Paul in all places and in all ranks 1) had to put no other word than this: "This is my body" 2c., so that they could see it. But since all their diligence is to look for this text "this is my body" elsewhere, where it is not written; why do they not also look for it in Marcolpho, or in Dietrich of Bern? then they would be sure that they would not find it. These must be either boys or furious people, who seek and demand a thing, since it is not, and do not want to see, since it is, and since one puts it before their noses.

457 Although St. Paul does not forget this text, even in this place, because he does not speak of bad bread and cups, but says: "This bread, this cup", and with these words: "this" and "this" he points back to the bread and cup, since he had said about it. Now if they were to follow these two pointers back, and see what kind of bread and cup he is pointing to, they would probably find that this bread is the body of Christ, and the cup the New Testament; for he is speaking of the same bread and cup when he says, "this" and "this," as even children and fools well know.

But the enthusiasts jump over these words "this" and "this", yes, they do them according to their rule from the eyes, and stare only at the words "bread" and "cup" old, but do not want to suffer that one should look at "cup" so over, as they overlook our "this" and "this". If they now cry out: St. Paul does not say here: As often as you eat the body of Christ 2c., you should say: He nevertheless says it here. Where? and with what text? Then say, With the word "this" and "this"; behold the same, thou shalt find therein such a text, "This is my body, this is the new testament in my blood," for they repeat such a text, and lay it before thee; but before thine eyes they cannot lay it, for thou turnest them always elsewhere.

But how serious it is to the spirit such questions and defiance, notice: Dro-.

1) d. i. series.

When there are bright words: "This is my body", "This is my blood", they can find little bells and say: "This is my body's sign, my blood's sign. If then Paul already puts such a text here: "As often as you eat the body of the Lord and drink his blood," 2c., how sour it would be for them to do the same and say: "As often as you receive the sign of the body and the blood," 2c. The spirit thinks that one does not understand his mischievousness; rather, whoever can gloss over this text: "This is my body," which cannot be said more brightly nor more clearly, will certainly be able to gloss over this text much more: "As often as ye eat the Lord's body," which is not so bright as that; without the mind having to color and preen itself as if it would believe where Paul said, "As often as ye eat the Lord's body," lest it should be seen how his hopefulness despises the text, where it is clearly stated that one should eat his body, namely, "Take, eat, this is my body." Rather, let them themselves give a bright text, which they could not gloss over, that I would like to hear. For where the word "body" comes out, there can soon be the gloss: "sign of the body"; although it is a shame that one should use such words in such matters; but the enthusiasts are not ashamed of it. 2) Well, it helps us for the best that we become the more certain of our understanding, because they are so frivolous and childish in their giddiness against it. Further:

V. 29. Whosoever therefore eateth the bread unworthily, or drinketh the cup of the Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the suffering and blood of the Lord.

460) Now here is bread and a cup for the scribblers, since they are to make out bread and a cup (that is, wine), and then ask and demand why St. Paul does not say, "He who eats the body of Christ unworthily" 2c. For the fact that St. Paul says, "This bread," and points back to the bread of which he spoke above, must not be looked at, but put out of sight, lest it hinder the spiritual mind, and think otherwise than that St. Paul did not say, "This bread," badly.

2) Erlanger: nothing.

"Bread", as if its text stood here thus: Who a bread unworthy is set 2c. So we certainly find the truth. But we praise God that we see how Paul always repeats and introduces this text "this is my body" with the word "this", as it is said above; and confirms this even more brightly, since he says: "Whoever eats this bread unworthily, let him be guilty", not of mere bread, or of the sign of the body of Christ, but "of the body of the Lord".

461 Dear, let us here also insist a little on their way. Why does not St. Paul say: He is guilty of the bread or of the sign of the body of Christ who eats this bread unworthily? Since the text forcibly enforces that this sin is the unworthy eating, and yet they pretend that it is vain bread which they eat, he must be guilty of the bread which he eats, according to the manner of the words and language. For Paul saith not, Whosoever unworthily considereth the passion of Christ is guilty of the body of the Lord. If they can attack us with the questions, why Paul does not say: Whoever does not eat Christ's body worthily 2c., and want to have won that Christ's body is not there, where we do not show it; then they should stand us again to our question: Why St. Paul does not say: Whoever does not consider Christ's suffering worthily, or does not eat the sign of his body worthily 2c.? And where they do not show it, they shall also have lost their gloss, according to the measure and right, since they want to measure us with it.

462 But I know well that they themselves do not believe such glosses; but because they stand on it, that it is vain bread, they think it must be said and glossed. For where they do not stand on it, they would spit at such glosses themselves. And they themselves see Carlstadt's gloss and must confess that it is a pure poem. For St. Paul does not punish the Corinthians for the unworthy remembrance of Christ's suffering, as a child can read and prove; for he describes in express words that the Corinthians were sinners, that one did not wait for another, but he who came before ate before, so that those who came after found nothing, and passed with disgrace, and so made a noisome meal of the Lord's Supper, as if they had not come before.

Otherwise it would be a bad meal. For thus saith he, When ye come together, there is no supper of the Lord, but every man taketh his own supper before him." Do you hear here that they did not take supper of the Lord, but of their own bellies; for because the others were slow in coming, they went and left the Lord's supper, and ate in the meantime, just as he also says afterwards, "When you come together to eat, wait one for another, lest you come together for 1) judgment." There you see that sin has been in the eating.

Therefore Oecolampad gives a better gloss (as he thinks) and says: The Corinthians have sinned against the sacrament, that is, against the bread and wine, which are signs of the body and blood of Christ, with unworthy eating, as if he who dishonors an emperor's image dishonors the emperor himself. So whoever eats this bread and wine unworthily dishonors the body and blood of Christ, whose image or sign they are. So they are divided among themselves of the glosses, as well as of the text; nor shall the one Holy Spirit teach them both. In particular, however, Oecolampad's gloss is nothing. First of all, since we have just proved and lamented that bread and wine are not, nor can they be, signs or images of the body and blood of Christ; for no little thing can be shown in which such likeness stands; therefore even this example of the emperor's image cannot rhyme with the gloss, unless it is first made certain that bread and wine are images or likenesses of the body and blood, just as the emperor's image is likeness.

464 Secondly, if such a simile were here, it would be a fine idea for a gloss, but not certain. For who could not make glosses and go away and say: Here I have been? No, because they want to interpret the text differently than the words read, and overthrow our understanding, they do not have to set such naked, bare, hungry and thirsty little bells there, and turn and troll away; but they must prove tremendously that such little bells are right and must and should belong here. Now we

Oecolampad does not even think that he wanted to do such a thing, but thinks that his mere little bell is enough. But where is my conscience, which would like to stand on good ground and secure? Should it stand on the hungry, thirsty and meager little bell? But what is it to the spirit where the conscience remains?

465 Thirdly, such a gloss, because it is uncertain, can also have no appearance, unless it is first certain and proven that in the Lord's Supper there is only bread and wine. For where the true body and blood of Christ is in the Lord's Supper, this poor fainted little bell lies in the ashes. Now they have not hitherto proved, nor can they prove, that there is the same bread and wine, neither have they proved, nor can they prove, that there is the sign of the body and the sign of the blood, if they could prove that there is the same bread and wine; for they have neither proved, nor can they prove, either of these; but we have strongly proved that, as the words are, there is the body and blood of Christ. Therefore, if they had previously proved the text in the Lord's Supper according to their meaning, we might suffer such little bells in this place for the sake of good friendship; for it [the gloss] is not good even in itself, 1) as we shall hear.

Fourth, the very finest thing, that Oecolampad in this place does not consider "body and blood" to be tropus, but as the words read, "he is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," what will come of that? This is what wants to come out of it: If body and blood are to be understood in this place, as the words read, and are not tropus, then they must not be tropus in the text of the Lord's Supper either: for it will not suffer itself into any way that Paul should use one and the same word over one thing or matter, and in one speech, differently and otherwise, as a two-faced and cunning deceiver; but he must plainly let body and blood be the same in both places, and one word. If "body" in the Lord's Supper is called the sign of the body, and "blood" the sign of the blood, then here it must also be called the sign of the body and the sign of the blood. If here it is properly called body and blood, then in the Lord's Supper it must be called body sign and blood sign.

1) In the editions: taug.

If he speaks of the same Lord's Supper in both places, he must also speak of the same body and blood, for there he teaches and institutes it, and here he exhorts to the proper use of it.

467 Where is this hungry, thirsty little bell: "He who eats unworthily is guilty of the Lord's body," that is, he who scorns the King's image scorns the King himself? If the body is the sign of the body, then the little bell must turn: Whoever eats this bread unworthily is guilty of the sign of the body, that is, of the bread; for the body here must also be called the sign of the body or the bread; if not, then both text and glosses, with gushers and all, lie in the dirt over a heap. See what toil, what journey and what misfortune are those who want to make lies into truth and bring them to market against the truth.

468 If the saints are to persevere, they now have three great tasks. The first is to prove in the Lord's Supper how the body and blood are the sign of the body and blood, or vain bread and wine. The other, that they prove how such vain bread and wine is the sign of the body and the sign of the blood. If they have done this (on the devil's ascension), they must again have so great and greater an effort that they prove in this place that body and blood are not signs of body and blood; for they must prove that at the same time in the same speech and thing blood is not blood, body not body, yet again that same blood is blood, and the same body is and is called body; there art will belong, id est, contradictoria simul vera facere.

Fifth, even if all other things were bad, and he lacked none, yet the little bell itself is also unworthy. For St. Paul does not say: "Whoever eats this bread unworthily is guilty of Christ," according to Oecolampad's opinion, as he is guilty of the king who scorns the king's image, but St. Paul indicates that the guilt is due to the pieces of Christ, to which the bread and wine should be equal or a sign, namely, "of the body and blood (he says) he is guilty" 2c. According to this, Oecolampad would have to put his graces and examples thus or similarly: He who dishonors the nose on the image, the

dishonors the king's nose. He who mocks the mouth of the image mocks the mouth of the king. So that the dishonor done to the image is not to the person, but to the pieces that are dishonored in the images. For Paul does not refer here to the person of Christ, but to the body and blood of Christ as pieces of the person.

I say this so that you may see how Oecolampad does not conduct his glosses and examples correctly and does not rhyme with St. Paul's text. For if it were to rhyme, St. Paul, as has been said, would have to speak thus: Whoever eats this bread is guilty of Christ; just as he is guilty of the king who dishonors the king's image, that is, he sins not against a member or part of the person, but against the majesty and regiment of the king. For this is what is meant by such speech. But here St. Paul says: "One sins against the parts of the person, as against the body and blood of Christ, which is closer and more than against the majesty or regiment of Christ. Therefore such a little bell is also in itself nothing that speaks of the majesty and regiment, as the text speaks of pieces or parts of the person. Further:

V. 28: Let man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup.

471 Here again is bread and cup. So Paul does one thing after another; now he calls it bread and cup, then again body and blood, then again bread and cup, and again for the third time body and blood. That he may make us ever sure that this sacrament is not bread and wine only, but also the body and blood of Christ. Without this, the enthusiasts must take their eyes off where he calls it body and blood, and stick to it only where he calls it bread and cup; or they must gloss and drop body and blood, but not gloss nor drop bread and cup, and thus play and go with the text as they please.

472 And especially is this place strong for them; for St. Paul saith not, So eat he of this bread, but badly, Of the bread, and of the cup, not of this cup. Well, we leave it up to them whether they want St. Paul to speak here of another bread and cup, or of the

the same. If he speaks of another, it does not matter to us, and we may suffer them to make vain bread and wine, and it does not help them; for we speak of the bread in the Lord's Supper. But if he speaks of the same bread and cup (as there is no doubt), we have heard enough what the same cup and bread are in the previous text. What is said there also belongs here. Last of all:

V. 29: He who eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks judgment to himself, as he who does not distinguish the body of the Lord.

I have written enough about Carlstadt's distinction in the booklet Against the Heavenly Prophets. For it cannot be spoken of the remembrance of the Passion, as Carlstadt's spirit pretends, because here the text forces violently that one thing is to eat unworthily and not to discern the body of Christ; which we understand from the word as it reads, that the Corinthians ate the bread with such ignorance or lack of reason as if it were bad bread, and made no distinction between this bread and other bread; that is, to eat the body of Christ unworthily. Therefore he exhorts them to examine themselves, and to know who they are, and what they think of this bread. For if they do not consider it to be the body of Christ, or if they handle it as if it were not the body of Christ, they do not distinguish the body of Christ; for this does not go unpunished. We know well how St. Paul uses the word *discernere* pro *discernere*, as 1 Cor. 4:7: Who hath discerned thee? That is, who has made you so special above others, as if you were better and different than the rest? And Rom. 14:23: "But he that distinguisheth is condemned," that is, he that esteemeth this sin and that right, and yet doeth contrary. And so henceforth St. Paul is called *discernere*, which we call making a difference, distinguishing, holding this different from that.

474 Oecolampad, however, has better appearances, because he also shows such a difference to the honor, which happens to the king through the honor of the image, as we have seen above in the other saying. But it lacks here just that

1) Thus the Wittenberg. Jenaer and Erlanger: a.

There, and everything I said against him in that saying is also to be said against him here. For since we have the text plainly as it reads, and they want to take it from us and interpret it differently, it is not enough that they say a naked little bell, and thus bid us good night, but must prove it with scripture and causes that such a little bell should be right and belong here. He does not do this, nor can he. For who will believe that "Christ's body cannot be distinguished" is nothing more than Christ himself in his signs of dishonor? For it has not yet been proven that in the supper there is only bread and a sign of the body, on which such a dilapidated little bell is based.

475. In addition, he must not take "the Lord's body" for the true body of Christ, but for his body sign, because St. Paul cannot speak of another body, because he says: "This is my body" [1 Cor. 11, 24], since he still speaks of the Lord's Supper in one thing; so he must also be in one word. If then here the body is not the sign of the body, why is it the sign of the body there? If it is body here, why is it not also body there? Therefore this little bell must go down with texts and with everything, or must be put thus: "Who does not distinguish the sign of the Lord's body. So the piece also lies, and Paul is still firmly on our side; for we find his words rhymed simply, unanimously, unobjectionably to our understanding, and must neither gloss over nor trouble to interpret them otherwise than they read.

476. Now let us also see the text of St. Paul in the tenth chapter, where he says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the fellowship of the body of Christ?" [1 Cor. 10:16.]

This text I have praised and still praise as my heart's joy and crown. For it not only says, "This is Christ's body," as in the Lord's Supper; but it calls the bread that is broken, and says, "The bread is Christ's body"; yea, "the bread which we break" is not Christ's body alone, but "the body of Christ divided. This is once a text so bright and so

clear, as the enthusiasts and all the world could not desire nor demand; nor does he help. To such a text they answer me nothing more, because after that they are divided among themselves. Some say that Paul speaks of symbolic or figurative fellowship; but others of spiritual fellowship, and add that it follows of the fellowship of the altar and of the devils, and so strike it off, not seeing that they prove it or force it out of the texts; so I am to be satisfied with their mere words and glosses, and do just as if I greeted one, and he turned back, and thundered with his buttocks, and so went away. Well, they should not run away and leave the stink behind, if God wills it.

In the first place, there is no doubt that St. Paul here also speaks of the Lord's Supper, because he speaks of the bread, cup, body and blood of Christ; and must certainly speak of the same body and blood, bread and cup, since the Lord's Supper speaks of them; if not, then this text is of no concern to us, and whoever may think that he speaks of bad common food. From this it follows that on Oecolampad's art this text must stand thus: The bread which we break is a communion of bread, which is a sign of the body of Christ. The cup of blessing which we bless is a communion of wine, so a sign is the blood of Christ. Isn't it a fine text? Bread is a communion of bread, cup is a communion of wine? What is this then? The broken bread is a fellowship of bread, that is, the broken bread is a common portion of bread? Could Paul not teach us anything else here, except that the bread that is broken is the bread that is made whole? Or was he worried that we would understand unbread as unbreaded sausages, and unbreaded wine as unbreaded water? These are their own words, that body shall be called body sign, that is, bread, blood shall be called blood sign, that is, wine, as we have heard enough, and they have clicked all books about it.

479 But if the trope is to stand on the word "communion" and be a sign of communion, or a figurative communion, thereby signifying spiritual communion, then, to this retrograde and ver-

According to Tropo, Oecolampad's text thus stands: The bread we break is a figurative communion of the figurative body of Christ, which is the bread. Dear, what is this more and more said: Bread is a figurative communion of the bread? For so they must speak, so their trope must stand. Now shall one bread be another's sign or figure, as the same is divided and common? For they must both be natural and corporal bread; the first because it is broken, the other because it is a sign of the body of Christ.

I consider that the Spirit, because he is able to do all things, considers the first bread that is broken to be a painted bread on paper, or a carved bread, which may well be a figure or sign of the other right bread that signifies Christ's body, so that the text may read: "The broken wooden bread is a figurative communion of the right bread, which is a sign of Christ's body. For all these things enforce their tropi. If not, it must stand thus: The broken bread, which may not be a figurative communion of the bread, is nevertheless a figurative communion of the bread. For it is not possible for one bread to be a figurative communion of another.

481 We have also proved above that such a retrograde and inverted trope cannot be in Scripture or in any language, but is a pure poem. For according to the Scriptures and all languages, the word "fellowship" must thus become a trope, so that it indicates a spiritual fellowship, or a new and different fellowship, above the old bodily fellowship. Just as body and blood must be called a spiritual or other body and blood, where they become a trope, or are not to be called the bodily blood and body. Therefore, in this place "fellowship" must be called bad bodily fellowship or distribution; or if it is to be a trope, it must be called a new spiritual fellowship, according to which the text should read thus: The bread we break is a spiritual fellowship of the body of Christ. But if body here is also a proper trope, it must be called the spiritual body of Christ, which is the church 2c. And the text would stand in summa thus:

The bread we break is a spiritual dispensation of Christianity, on the opinion that where this bread is broken, Christianity is dispersed, and many abominable abominations would follow.

482 Let them choose here which one they want. If the "body" and "blood" in this place are tropus, or the sign of the body and the sign of the blood, namely bread and wine, as their doctrine holds, then they may not resist all this abominable consequence which I have now introduced, as everyone must grasp this and cannot deny it, especially where they also want to have communion figuratively. But if it is not tropus, but the body and blood of Christ, as our doctrine holds, then it cannot be tropus in other places of the Lord's Supper. For no one can deny that here St. Paul speaks of the Lord's Supper, and calls and means the same blood and body that Matthew [Cap. 26, 26], Marcus [Cap. 14, 22, 24], Lucas [Cap. 22, 19, 20] and Paul himself call and mean in other chapters, when they say: "This is my body, this is my blood. What can they complain about?

483 Now they must choose that here blood and body are tropus. For so their doctrine holds: since here the sacrament is spoken of, and in the sacrament sacramental or figurative words must be, as Oecolampad teaches, then they must also have such a consequence that bread is a figurative communion of bread, that is, it is a painted bread, or is, which cannot be, as is said. For the Oecolampad admits that "is" does not mean "signifies," therefore he must admit that bread is the figurative communion of bread, and cannot say that the broken bread is spiritual communion; for with him bodily thing cannot be nor be called a spiritual thing.

484 But if he would have the trope on the word "fellowship" alone, and have his text thus: The bread we break is a sign of the fellowship of the body of Christ, and could prove this, then he would have his opinion well; but then "body" would not be a trope. But if the body were not a trope here, it could not be a trope there either in Matthew, Mark and Luke: "This is my body", because it is the same supper and body that are spoken of. So, where the spirit

When he wants to go there, he bumps himself so that he staggers and has to fall. I give the advice that they speak: The outward word of God is of no use, and they have enough of the testimony of the spirit within, and St. Paul's word poor, wretched. Ten letters scold them, according to which "body and blood" would have to be tropus and not tropus, as they wanted; otherwise I don't know how they can escape from Paul here. But they would also have to think how the whole world would be bound to believe their testimony and spirit, then they would have won.

485 What is now said against Oecolampad's text is also said against Zwingel's text. For where Oecolampad makes signs, Zwingel makes interpretations, and is one opinion without other words. Oecolampad has *figuram corporis*, Zwingel *significans corpus*; that is One Thing. Therefore Zwingel's text would have to stand thus: The bread, so we break, is the fellowship of the significant body of Christ, that is, of the bread, the same as Oecolampad. But if he could put his text thus: The bread we break means the communion of the body of Christ, it would be for his opinion. But this does not suffer the text in Matthew, Mark, Luke, since he [Zwingli] says: This means my body. If he has an important body there, he must also have an important body here; for it is one body, as has been said. Now everything follows him to the significant body that follows Oecolampad to his signifying body, as everyone can well think and see for himself; therefore it is not necessary to recover everything again.

486) The 1) Silesian spirit with its reversal let also Herkommen, which thus reverses the text Matthäi, Marci and Lucä: My body is that, namely, a spiritual food. For "this" is supposed to point to the Spirit, so it must be so here, and this text "the cup of blessing we bless" 2c. is thus reversed: The fellowship of the body of Christ is the cup of blessing which we bless, namely, a spiritual cup of blessing. Now this fellowship is a spiritual thing, and yet here it must be and be called a bodily cup of wine; indeed, the bodily cup must be too-

The same is also a spiritual cup, that is, spiritual and not spiritual at the same time, bodily and not bodily; for Paul speaks of the bodily, but the Spirit makes the same spiritual and not bodily. Is it not great spirits? Let them drive away with their mad jiggery-pokery.

Our text and mind are fine and bright, light and light: "The bread we break is the fellowship of the body of Christ" 2c.

488 Here you must first notice that he says of the bodily bread which we break in the Lord's Supper, which no one can deny. Then it is also certain that in such bodily breaking or communion there must be not only holy and worthy men, but also unworthy men, as Judas and his kind. Thus you have heard that "is" cannot nor may mean "interprets" in some language on earth, but speaks of the essence where it stands. Finally, "community" here means the common good, of which many are partakers and enjoy, as that which is given among them all in common. This may be received in two ways, bodily and spiritual. For common thing means, that much is enjoyed in common, as, common well, common goods, common field, meadows, wood, fire 2c. For it cannot here in this place mean the communion of faith in the heart; for the text here speaks of such common goods as are to be received and enjoyed, as there is the bread and the cup. For he says, "The bread we break, the cup we bless," and then, "We are all one body, partakers of one bread and of one cup," 2c. [1 Cor. 10, 17.] It is therefore certain that *κοινωνία*, the fellowship of the body of Christ, is nothing else but the body of Christ, as a common good divided among many and given to be enjoyed.

489 Paul therefore says, "The bread which we break is the fellowship of the body of Christ," that is, whoever approves of this broken bread approves of the body of Christ, as a common good distributed among many; for the bread is such a common body of Christ, says Paul; this is said plainly and plainly, so that no one can understand it otherwise, except he make the words otherwise. Now enjoy

of this broken bread, not only the worthy, but also Judas and the unworthy; for the breaking of bread is with the good and the evil. Now it is not possible for them to partake of it spiritually, for they have neither spirit nor faith; so also Christ has no more than One Body.

490 If then the unworthy are to partake of it and have it in common among themselves, it must be bodily and not spiritual, because there is no partaking, either bodily or spiritual. For the figurative, signifying, and signifying enjoyment cannot be in the Lord's Supper, because there is neither signification nor signification. Therefore the real true body of Christ must be bodily in the bread we break, so that those who are unworthy may enjoy it bodily, because they do not enjoy it spiritually, as Paul says: "The bread we break is communion," that is, the common body of Christ divided among those who receive the broken bread.

491 Against this, the swarming spirit fights over the little word "fellowship" and wants to make a spiritual fellowship, which is with the pious alone, which is to be signified by the breaking of bread, as by a figurative fellowship. So that Paul's text would have such a nose: "The bread we break is a sign of the fellowship of the body of Christ," in Oecolampian. Or thus: The bread we break signifies the fellowship of the body of Christ 2c. in Zwinglian. They prove this first of all for this reason: "It seems to us to be right; for their own conceit is the strongest reason they have in the whole matter, without baptizing and calling it Scripture and faith.

492 After this they use the saying that Paul uses after this text: "One bread it is, one body we many are, because we are partakers of one bread. Here some of them again make a new trope, that "bread" here is a spiritual bread, namely the body of Christ, and "one body" is also a trope, namely the saints alone, who are spiritually partakers of the spiritual bread, and fight against me thus: Because we are all one body of Christ, the unworthy must not be in this body, but only the right members;

therefore this fellowship of the body must be spiritual 2c.

What shall I do with the erroneous spirits? Now they make figurative bread and fellowship. Again, the others make spiritual bread and fellowship, running against each other as if they were mad, and no one is sure of his course. We know that St. Paul does not say here, "We many are one body of Christ," but rather, "We many are one body," that is, one group, one community; just as every city is a separate body and body from another city. From this it does not follow that all the members of this body are holy, spiritual members, and therefore have spiritual fellowship alone; but it is a bodily company and body, in which are both holy and unholy, who are all partakers of the one bread.

494 So also bread here cannot be spiritual bread; for St. Paul speaks of the same bread, as he speaks before of: "The bread which we break. Such bread is one kind of bread, therefore it makes a peculiar heap and body of those who partake of it; not one 1) body of Christ, but badly one body. For there is a great difference between the body and Christ's body, and here "body" is a true trope according to the Scriptures; not a figurative body according to the backward trope, but another new body, to which a natural body is a likeness 2c. And such a tropum is enforced by the text, since it says: "We are One Body." Now we cannot be a natural body. So the fanciers should also make and prove their trope, and prove that Christ's body and blood are signs of the body and blood.

495 In sum, St. Paul speaks in this whole place of neither spiritual nor figurative, but only of bodily fellowship, or of a common bodily thing that is distributed. You will see this in all the sayings and examples he gives. First of all in this: "One bread it is, one body are we many, who are partakers of one bread" [1 Cor. 10:17]. So that here you must understand the fellowship in the flesh,

1) In the issues: one.

He says: it is one bread, namely, he speaks of it in the text, "the bread that we break", of which we are all partakers. Now the broken bread cannot be spiritual bread; so also its distribution, breaking or communion must not be spiritual.

496. the other saying, "Consider Israel according to the flesh; which eat the sacrifices, are they not in the fellowship of the altar?" [1 Cor. 10:18.]

497 There is no spiritual or figurative communion here; for "to eat of the sacrifice" is to enjoy the altar bodily, or to be partaker of the altar bodily. And the altar with its sacrifice is also a bodily thing, bodily common and divided among the sacrificers. So our bread is also a bodily communion, divided among us. But if the bread is bodily broken, distributed and received by us, the body of Christ is also bodily broken, distributed and received by us. For the broken bread is the common or divided body of Christ, as Paul says: "The bread that we break is the fellowship of the body of Christ" [1 Cor. 10:16].

498 Yes, they say, St. Paul speaks afterwards, v. 20, of the fellowship of devils: "I do not want you to have the fellowship of devils"; here must be spiritual fellowship, because the devils have no body; therefore the fellowship of the body of Christ may also be spiritual. Answer: Methinks the word "fellowship" deceives them, that they do not rightly understand it. And it is certainly true that it is not really German as I would like it to be. For to have fellowship is commonly understood to mean to have something to do with someone; but here it should mean as much as I have explained above, as when many need, enjoy, or are partakers of a common thing; such I must interpret fellowship, I have not been able to find a better word for it.

499 Well, if the devils have no body, yes, if this saying speaks of spiritual fellowship, how does it follow that one must also understand spiritual fellowship of the body of Christ above? Is it enough to say so? But Paul is speaking here of the bodily fellowship of the teu

This is proven by the words that follow before and after. So before he says, "What the heathen sacrifice, they sacrifice unto devils." Then 1) thou hearest that he speaketh of things sacrificed unto idols, and calleth it devil's sacrifice, and dealeth with the matter of eating things sacrificed unto idols. He who eats devil's sacrifice is in the fellowship of the devil. This is bodily communion; for a devil's sacrifice is a bodily sacrifice, which many enjoy and eat, and so they are bodily in the devil's bodily communion, that is, in the devil's sacrifice made to the devil. Just as we would like to say that both of us. Worthy and unworthy, are in the fellowship of God when we receive Christ's body bodily, for we enjoy and are partakers bodily of Christ's body, which is a sacrifice to God and offered to God.

The following words, v. 21, also force this: "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of the devil at the same time. Do you see whereupon he says that he does not want us to be in the fellowship of the devil? namely, that we should not drink the devil's cup. Since "the devil's cup" is a bodily thing, "drinking the devil's cup" must be bodily fellowship with the devil; just as "drinking the Lord's cup" is bodily fellowship with the Lord or with God, that is, being partakers of the thing that is the Lord's or God's, or offered to God. Now the cup of the Lord is not only a cup, but also a communion of the blood of Christ, which we many enjoy.

He further says: "You cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the devil's table at the same time. Is this not clear enough that the devil's table is a bodily thing? So the fellowship or partaking of it must also be bodily, just as the Lord's table must be bodily, and his fellowship must be bodily. For we must not be so coarse as to understand here in this place the fellowship of the devil to mean that one enjoys or is partaker of the devil himself, without an outward bodily thing, because here both the table and the cup are called the devil's; but that one is called the thing of the devil.

or thing that is of the devil or belongs to the devil. Just as one is called God's or the Lord's fellowship if one is partaker of the thing that is God's or the Lord's, or belongs to it, as the text clearly says here: "You cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the devil's table at the same time, and I do not want you to be in the devil's fellowship.

502 It is a different speech, if I say: The community of the devil, and the community of the devil's table; but still the same opinion, as it is also of one thing. For the fellowship of the devil's table indicates the piece or thing in which such fellowship stands; but the fellowship of the devil indicates which that same thing or piece is, or to whom it belongs, since the fellowship stands within. So also fellowship of the Lord's table is a different speech than fellowship of the Lord. Fellowship of the Lord's table indicates the thing or piece in which the fellowship is; but fellowship of the Lord indicates who is the one in whom such fellowship is.

503 Just as Paul, in chapter 11, v. 26, uses the same two kinds of speech in the Lord's Supper, and sometimes says of eating bread: "As often as you eat this bread. Item [v. 28] "And so he eats of the bread," he says. Then [v. 27, "He who eats the Lord's bread" 2c. The first speech says what it is that one eats. The other, what it is, and to whom it belongs, that one eats. So in this speech "fellowship of the body of Christ" it is badly indicated what the thing is in which the fellowship stands, namely the body of Christ, and not what such a piece or thing is; for it is God's or the Lord's. Therefore, no spiritual fellowship can be understood here, because the broken bread is such fellowship of the body of Christ, and the body of Christ is the thing or piece in which such fellowship stands, which both. Worthy and unworthy may enjoy, because they enjoy the broken bread.

504 Even if one wanted to speak of spiritual communion, it would not be necessary to mention the two parts, the body and blood of Christ, but it would be enough to call them Christ,

as Paul says in another place: that we are called to the fellowship of the Son of God. [Why should he speak so differently of the body and blood, and put two fellowships together, as two different fellowships, since none is the other? Since the spiritual fellowship is only one fellowship, and not two different fellowships. Thus the fellowship of the body of Christ is not the fellowship of the blood of Christ, nor again. For St. Paul here divides them from one another. Now it is impossible that in spiritual fellowship the body and blood of Christ should be distinct from one another, and make two distinct fellowships, as happens here. Therefore, here the communion of body and blood must be bodily and not spiritual.

505 Thus we have this strong text for us against the naked, miserable little bells of the enthusiasts, still firm and pure. Whether they do not accept or believe all these things, we have thereby shown causes and reasons enough why we are forced to keep our wits about us. For if I were a Turk, a Jew, or a Gentile, who did not believe in the Christian faith, and yet heard or read such writings about the sacrament, I would have to say: I do not believe in the Christian doctrine; but this I must say: If they want to be Christians and keep their doctrine, they must believe that Christ's body and blood are eaten and drunk bodily in bread and wine.

506 And the enthusiasts should know that, because they must confess that our understanding is simple according to the sound of words, and yet they do not have enough of it, nor do they want to be disputed with it, that we, in turn, have much less enough of their hungry, thirsty, naked glosses, which they bring up from their heads against the simple sound of words, nor do we want to be disputed with them. For if we are to cling to naked, bare words, we would rather cling to naked, bare text, which God Himself has spoken, than to naked, bare glosses, which men invent. And whether they run and call the same little bells Scripture and faith, it does not matter to us until they also prove that it is Scripture and faith, as they falsely say.

call it. For they should also take it for granted that we are of this world, and to come before the judgment seat of our as reluctant to teach wrong as they are. As we have so Lord Jesus Christ. And whether someone would say after far, praise God, proved more and more than they by our my death: Where Luther lived now, he would teach and deeds, that they must not ascribe such glory to them so hold this or this article differently, because he did not gloriously, as if they alone were so minded. But Christ will consider it enough 2c.:

be the judge of all who lie and deceive.

. I will boast in God that I have conquered so much in this by the grace of God I have most diligently considered all booklet that no trope can be in the Lord's Supper, but the these articles, have often traced them through the words are to be understood as they read, "this is my body, Scriptures and back again, and have wanted to defend this is my blood," that I truly know. For if they were tropus, them as surely as I have now defended the sacrament of they would have to be tropus in all places where the the altar. I am not drunk or thoughtless now, I know what Lord's Supper is spoken of. Now we have seen how the I am saying, I feel well what I am saying for the future of the revelers themselves teach and confess that they are not the Lord JESu Christ at the last judgment. Therefore let no tropus in the saying of Paul [1 Cor. 11:27], "He that eateth one make a joke or loose theiding 2) out of it, I am serious. and drinketh unworthily is guilty of the body and blood of For I know Satan by the grace of God to a great extent; if the Lord." So also not in this saying [Cap. 10, 16.], "The he can pervert and confuse God's word and scripture, cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the what should he not do with my words or anyone else's?

508 The sixth chapter of John, because it speaks, First of all, I believe with all my heart the high article of nothing of the Lord's Supper, and is otherwise dealt with the Divine Majesty that Father, Son, Holy Spirit are three by others, such as Philipp Melanchthon and Johann distinct persons, One true, natural, truthful God, Creator Brenz and others more, I will now leave undone, although of heaven and earth, of all things, against the Arians, the Christian churches throughout the world. I have in mind to deal with the same with a sermon, and 1:1, as it has been held both in the Roman Church and in to add my own. 1)

Third.

509. Because I see that the longer I live, the more I err, Secondly, I believe and know that the Scripture teaches us that the Middle Person in God, namely the and that there is no end to Satan's raving and raging, lest Son, alone became truly man, conceived by the Holy Spirit without man's assistance, and born of the pure Holy in the future, during my life or after my death, some should Virgin Mary, as of a true natural mother; as all this is take advantage of me and falsely lead my writing to clearly described by St. Lucas [Cap. 1, 26.] and the strengthen their error, as the sacramental and baptismal prophets have proclaimed, thus that not the Father or Holy devotees have begun to do: then I will confess with this Spirit became man, as some heretics have taught. 3)

513. also that God the Son not only took the body, without the soul (as some heretics taught), but also the soul, that is, a whole complete humanity, and right seed or child, Abraham and David.

1) Erlanger: dazuthun.

2) Erlanger: Interpretation.

3) "have" is missing in the Erlanger.

and that the natural Son of Mary be born, in all manner [if death and sin are our masters, and the devil our god and form, a true man, as I am, and as all others [Heb. 2:17, and prince, there can be no strength nor power, no wit nor 4:15], having come without sin, of virgins only, through the understanding, so that we might send or strive for Holy Spirit. righteousness and life; but must be blinded and captive,

514. and that such a man is truly God, as One eternal, of the devil and of sins, to do and think what pleases them inseparable Person from God and man, so that Mary, the and is contrary to God with His commandments. holy virgin, is a right true mother not only of the man 518 Therefore I also condemn both, new and old Christ, as the Nestorians teach, but of the Son of God, as Pelagians, who do not want original sin to be sin, but to Lucas [Cap. 1, 35] says: "That which is born in you shall be an infirmity or defect. 1) But because death passes be called the Son of God," that is, my and all Lord Jesus over all men, original sin must not be an infirmity, but a Christ, God's and Mary's only, true, natural Son, truly God sin too great, as St. Paul says: "The wages of sin is death" and man. [Rom. 6, 23]. And again: "Sin is the sting of death" sl. Cor.

515. I also believe that the Son of God and Mary, our 15, 56. 1) So also David says Psalm 51, 7: "Behold, I am Lord Jesus Christ, suffered, was crucified, died and was begotten of sinful seed, and my mother conceived me in buried for us poor sinners, so that he might redeem us sins"; 2) does not say: My mother conceived me with sins, from sin, death and the eternal wrath of God through his but "I, I, I am begotten of sinful seed", and my mother innocent blood, and that he rose from the dead on the third conceived me in sins, that is, I grew in my mother's womb day, and ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand from sinful seed, as the Hebrew text is able to do. of God the Father Almighty, Lord over all lords, King over 519. Accordingly, I also reject and condemn, as vain all kings, and over all creatures in heaven, on earth, and devil's rottenness and error, all 3) orders, rules, under the earth, over death and life, over sin and monasteries, convents, and what is invented and righteousness. instituted by men above and apart from the Scriptures,

516. For I confess, and know to prove from the written with vows and duties, even though many great Scriptures, that all men are descended from one man saints lived in them, and as God's elect at this time were Adam, and from the same bring with them by birth and deceived by them, and yet were finally redeemed and inherit the fall, guilt and sin, which the same Adam escaped through faith in Jesus Christ. For since such committed in paradise through the wickedness of the orders, foundations and sects are lived and held in the devil, and thus together with him are all born in sins and opinion that one can be saved and saved through such die, and would have to be guilty of eternal death, if Jesus Christ had not come to our rescue and taken such guilt and sin upon himself as an innocent little lamb, paid for us by his suffering, and still stands and steps daily for us as a faithful, merciful mediator, savior, and priest and bishop of our souls.

517 I hereby reject and condemn as vain error all doctrines that praise our free will, as they strive against the help and grace of our Savior Jesus Christ. For since apart from Christ the

1) Zwingli also teaches this.

2) Thus the Wittenberg edition has quoted this saying according to the Bible, and in accordance with it is also the following execution. In the Erlangen and Jena: "Behold, I am conceived in sins, and my mother hath borne me in sins." Then in the Jena edition follows the text as we have given it here to the end of the paragraph, which does not fit the wording of the saying as it has it. Whereas in the Erlanger follows: "I, I, I was conceived in sins, and my mother bore me in sins, that is, that I grew in my mother's womb from sinful seed" 2c.

3) Erlanger: than all.

If any man, by his ways and works, would and might be saved, escape from sin and death, it is a public, abominable blasphemy and denial of the one help and grace of our one Saviour and Mediator JEsu Christ; "for there is no other name given unto us, whereby we must be saved, but this, which is called JEsus Christ" [Acts 4:12]. 4, 12.), and it is impossible that there should be more saviors, ways or means of salvation, without the one righteousness, which our Savior Jesus Christ is, and has given to us, and set before God for us, as our one mercy seat, Rom. 3, 25.

(520) It would be good if monasteries or convents were kept to teach young people the Word of God, the Scriptures, and Christian discipline, so that they could educate and prepare fine men to be bishops, pastors, and other servants of the churches, as well as competent scholars for secular government, and fine scholarly women, who could then keep Christian households and raise children. But to seek a way of salvation is a 1) Devil's doctrine and faith, 1 Tim. 4, 1. 2c.

521. But the holy orders and right orders instituted by God are these three: the priesthood, the married state, the secular authority. All those who are found in the priesthood or ministry of the Word are in a holy, right, good, pleasing to God order and state, as those who preach, administer the sacrament, preside over the common treasury, sextons and messengers or servants who serve such persons 2c. These are vain holy works before God.

522 Thus, he who is father and mother, who rules the house well, and breeds children 2) for God's service, is also holy and holy works and holy order. Likewise, where children or servants are obedient to their parents or masters, there is also a holy spirit, and whoever is found therein is a living saint on earth.

523 Thus also prince or overlord, judges, officials, chancellors, clerks, servants, maids, and all who serve such, to this all,

who are submissively obedient, 3) everything is holy and holy life before God, because such three foundations or orders are set in God's word and commandment. But what is set in God's word must be a holy thing; for God's word is holy and sanctifies everything that is in it and in it.

524 Above these three foundations and orders is the common order of Christian love, in which one serves not only the three orders, but also in general every needy person with all kinds of good deeds, as feeding the hungry, watering the thirsty 2c., forgiving the enemies, praying for all people on earth, suffering all kinds of evil on earth 2c. Behold, these are all vain good holy works. Nevertheless, none of these orders is a way to salvation, but the only way above them all remains, namely, faith in Jesus Christ.

525 For there is much difference between being holy and being blessed. We are blessed through Christ alone; but both are holy, through such faith and also through such divine foundations and orders. Even the ungodly may have many holy things, but they are not blessed in them; for God wants such works from us for His praise and glory, and all those who are blessed in the faith of Christ do such works and keep such ordinances.

But what is said of the married state should also be understood of widowhood and virginity, for they belong to the house and to the household 2c. If these orders and divine foundations do not save, what should the devil's foundations and monasteries do, which only arise without God's word and strive and rage against the one way of faith?

Thirdly, I believe in the Holy Spirit, who is One true God with the Father and the Son, and comes from the Father and the Son eternally, yet in One divine essence and nature a distinct person. Through Him, as a living, eternal, divine gift, all believers are graced with faith and other spiritual gifts, raised from death, freed from sins, and made joyful and confident, free and secure.

1) "one" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) Wittenberger: Kinderzucht.

3) "is" is missing in the Erlanger.

in the conscience. For this is our defiance, when we feel such a testimony of the Spirit in our hearts that God wants to be our Father, forgive sin, and give eternal life.

These are the three persons, and One God, who has given himself completely to all of us, with everything that he is and has. The Father gives Himself to us with heaven and earth together with all creatures, so that they may serve (us¹)) and be useful. But such a gift became obscured and useless through Adam's fall. Therefore, the Son gave Himself to us as well, bestowing all His works, sufferings, wisdom and righteousness, and reconciling us to the Father, so that we might again know and have the Father with His gifts, alive and righteous.

Since such grace would be of no use to anyone if it were so secretly hidden and could not come to us, the Holy Spirit comes and gives Himself to us completely; He teaches us to recognize the benefits of Christ shown to us, helps us to receive and keep them, to use them usefully and to distribute them, to multiply and promote them. And does the same both inwardly and outwardly: inwardly through faith and other spiritual gifts; but outwardly through the gospel, through baptism and the sacrament of the altar, by which he comes to us, as through three means, in an unprofitable way, and exercises the suffering of Christ in us and brings it to the benefit of salvation.

530 Therefore I hold and know that as there is no more than One Gospel and One Christ, so there is no more than One Baptism; and that Baptism is in itself a divine ordinance, as His Gospel is also. And as the gospel is not therefore false or unjust, whether some use it falsely, or teach it, or believe it not; so neither is baptism false or unjust, whether some receive it, or give it, or otherwise abuse it, without faith. Therefore, I completely reject and condemn the doctrine of the Anabaptists and Donatists and whoever they are who baptize again.

531 In the same way I also speak and confess that

1) "us" is in the text in the Wittenberg, bracketed in the Jena, missing in the Erlanger.

Sacrament of the altar, that there the body and blood in the bread and wine be eaten and drunk orally, whether the priests who administer it or those who receive it do not believe or otherwise misuse it. For it is not based on man's faith or unbelief, but on God's word and order. Unless they first change God's word and order and interpret them differently, as the present enemies of the sacraments do, who, of course, have vain bread and wine; for they have not changed the words and established order of God, but have perverted and changed them according to their own conceit.

532 Therefore I believe that there is one holy Christian church on earth, that is, the congregation and number or assembly of all Christians in all the world, the one bride of Christ and his spiritual body, of which he is also the one head; and the bishops or pastors are not heads, nor lords, nor bridegrooms of the same, but servants, friends, and (as the word bishop indicates) overseers, keepers, or overseers.

533 And this same Christianity is not only under the Roman church, or Pabst, but in all the world, as the prophets proclaimed, that Christ's gospel should come into all the world, Ps. 2, 8. Ps. 19, 5. So that under Pabst, Turks, Persians, Tarians and everywhere the Christianity is scattered bodily, but gathered spiritually, in one gospel and faith, under one head, which is Jesus Christ. For the papacy is certainly the right end-Christian regime, or the right counter-Christian tyranny, which sits in the temple of God and rules with the commandment of men, as Matth. 24, 15. Christ, and 2 Thess. 2, 4. Paul proclaim. Although the Turk and all heresies, where they exist, also belong to this abomination, which is prophesied to stand in the holy place, it is not equal to the Pabstacy.

534 In this Christianity, and where it is, there is forgiveness of sins, that is, a kingdom of grace and of right indulgence. For there is the gospel, baptism, the sacrament of the altar, in which forgiveness of sins is offered, obtained and received, and there is also Christ and his Spirit and God. And apart from such Christianity

there is neither salvation nor forgiveness of sins, but eternal death and damnation; though there be a great appearance of holiness, and much good works, yet all is lost. Such forgiveness of sins, however, is not to be expected at once, as in baptism (as the Novatians teach), but as often and often as one needs it, even unto death.

535 But the indulgence which the papal church has and gives is a blasphemous deception, not only because it invents and sets up a special one over the common pardon which is given in all Christendom by the gospel and sacrament, and thus defiles and destroys the common pardon; but also because it sets up and bases the pardon for sin on the work of men and the merit of the saints, when Christ alone can and has done enough for us.

536 For the dead, because the Scriptures do not report anything about it, I think that it is not a sin to ask this or the like out of free devotion: Dear God, if the soul is in such a state that it needs to be helped, then have mercy on it 2c. And when this has happened once or twice, let it be enough. For the vigils and masses for the soul and the annual celebrations are of no use, and are the devil's fair.

537 We also have nothing in Scripture about Purgatory, and it is certainly also brought up by the spirits of poltergeists; therefore I think that it is not necessary to believe one. Even though God can make all things possible, and even let the soul be tormented after parting from the body, He has not let it be said or written; therefore He does not want it to be believed. Otherwise, I know that you have a feg, but nothing of it is to be taught in the church, nor is it to be countered with pens or vigils.

Others have attacked the calling of the saints before me; and it pleases me, and I believe it, that Christ alone is to be called as our mediator; this is given in the Scriptures and is certain. Calling saints 1) is nothing in the Scriptures, therefore it must be uncertain and not to be believed.

539 I would let go of the obeisance if it was held according to the Gospel, Marc. 6, 15. and Jac. 5, 14.

1) In the Erlanger: to call.

is nothing. For just as one might preach a sermon on death and eternal life instead of vigils and masses, and thus pray at the funeral and consider our end (as it seems that the ancients did), so it would also be fine to go to the sick, pray and admonish, and if one wants to sprinkle him with oil, he should be free, in the name of God.

(540) Thus no sacrament may be made of marriage and the priesthood; otherwise they are holy orders enough in themselves. Penance is nothing else than the practice and power of baptism. That the two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, remain alongside the gospel, in which the Holy Spirit abundantly offers, gives, and exercises forgiveness of sins.

541) But for all the abominations 2) I consider the mass, which is preached and sold for a sacrifice or good work, on which all monasteries and convents now stand, but (if God wills) shall soon lie. For although I have been a great, grave, shameful sinner, and have also spent and lost my youth damnably, these are my greatest sins, that I have been such a holy monk, and with so many masses for over fifteen years have so grievously angered, tormented, and plagued my dear Lord. But praise and thanks be to his unspeakable grace for eternity that he has led me out of such abomination, and still daily sustains and strengthens me (though almost ungrateful) in right faith.

542 Therefore I have advised, and still advise, to leave the monasteries and convents, together with the vows, and to give oneself up to the proper Christian orders, so that one may escape such abominations of the masses and blasphemous holiness, as chastity, poverty, obedience, by which one intends to become blessed. For as fine as it was in the beginning of Christianity to keep the state of virginity, it is now abominable that one thereby denies Christ's help and grace; for one can indeed live a virgin, a widow, and a chaste life without such blasphemous abominations.

543. pictures, bells, chasuble, churches

2) Sense: But for the very greatest abomination of all re.

I keep the decoration, altar, light and the like free; whoever wants it, may leave it. Although images from the Scriptures and from good histories I keep almost useful, but free and arbitrary; because I do not keep it with the iconoclasts.

544 In the last place, I believe in the resurrection of all the dead at the last day, both of the righteous and the wicked, that each one may receive there in his body what he has deserved, so that the righteous may live forever with Christ, and the wicked may die forever with the devil and his angels. For I do not hold with those who teach that the devils also will finally come to salvation.

545. this is my faith; for thus believe

all true Christians do, and this is what the Holy Scriptures teach us. But what I have said here too little, my little books will give me enough witnesses, especially those that have gone out in the last four or five years. I pray that all devout hearts will be witnesses to me, and pray for me that I may stand firm in such faith and resolve my end; for (since God is for) whether I would say something else out of temptation and mortal need, it shall be nothing, and I hereby want it publicly confessed that it is wrong and inspired by the devil. May my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who is eternal, help me to do this, amen.

22. Ulrich Zwingli's writing, set against Luther's sermon against the enthusiasts. *)

Completed March 30, 1527.

To the pious noble Wilhelm von Zell, his godfather, Huldreich Zwingli conveys grace and peace from God.

Dearest godfather, when you sent me Luther's sermon against the enthusiasts, I did not think it necessary to write to you what I thought of it, but I perceived what it would bring, and felt that many have fallen from his opinion through the (sermon), only because they say: Luther is no longer equal to himself. However, some of the weak and the first ones have come into disagreement because of it, which is why I have taken so much trouble that I have hurriedly put together this short responsibility, which I will send to you, because I am not writing anything in German now, but I am writing in Latin, to Luther. Serve God with all your heart, as you do, who may preserve your age, Amen. Given hastily at Zurich, on the eighth and twentieth day of March. 1527.

To all believers in Christ, Huldreich Zwingli offers grace and peace from God.

I do not doubt, Christian reader, that you will fall into some displeasure if you consider this denigration and rejection of mine, which is almost necessary about the excellent Martin Luther's sermon against the enthusiasts, done and written about the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, because you worry that discord will arise among those who also stand by the Gospel; You may be sure that I do not deal with this in any way, but only see to it that we do not perish with ignorance or lack of understanding, nor that anyone holds himself so high in the church of Christ that no one may persuade him, if he speaks without the word of God, or if he does him violence with misunderstanding. For it should be proper for even the least, if God has given him understanding, to speak in the church, 1 Cor. 14.

*)This writing appeared in Zurich in 1527 (the letter to Wilhelm von Zell is dated March 28, 1527) under the title: "Verglimpfung und Ableinung über die Predigt des trefflichen Martini Luthers gegen die Schwärmer, zu Wittenberg gethan und beschrieben, zu Schirm des wesentlichen Leichnams und Bluts Christi im Sacrament. In good preservation of Huldreichen Zwingli hurriedly and briefly comprehended. Zürich 1527." It was translated into Latin by Rudolph Gualther: ?ia st amica, ack prasstantissimi viri Martini Imtüsri serinonsrn in VitsmdsrMnsi scclssia pro snvstantialiis corporis st sanZuinis OUristi in Sacraments aässrtions contra Knsmrsos ant l'anaticos xndliss Uaditnm, apoloßia st responsio. This translation is recorded in 2ninZiil opsa, Dorn. II, p. 367. the.indication Hospinians, inst. Sacrament, part. II, p. 78, that this writing was printed only after Zwingli's death (1531) is wrong. At the end of this writing is March 30, Darnach our time determination. We reproduce the text according to Walch's old edition.

Now, if I am the smallest, I want to indicate clearly, without all mischievousness and anger, that the Almighty God did not open the secrecy of his mind to Martino Luther in this doctrine of the Sacrament. Let no one take this for a scolding or an insult, if I say that it is not so. For in this way one must resist the untruth and bring it to light, no matter whom it may be. Martin Luther is as high in my bad judgment as some, nor is God higher; the word shall neither I nor another, for Martin's sake or another's, let it be misunderstood. Therefore, recently, dear reader, have stronger faith, neither let yourself be drawn into any weakening or division, although Peter and Paul, and again Paul and Barnabas, quarreled among themselves; see that your heart is right with God, and your life is shaped according to His will, then you will meet the right measure of a Christian man. For to believe that flesh and blood are eaten here does not make one blessed, for God has not promised it. "Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood," John 6, does not serve the bodily food of which those in the sacrament speak, but trusts in the Son of God, who gave his life for us in death, as all believers know well, to whom alone we are writing here, not to those who have not yet heard God's word. May God be with us that we do not teach anything that is not according to His will, nor accept anything that is contrary to the eternal truth, amen. I will also be more careful to be brief, so that those who are well-informed will have enough of little, and will be able to present what is necessary for this purpose.

First of all, I urge you, dear reader, to learn to read with judgment, and not to be so careless that, even though you have heard that Luther or Zwingli has written this, you leave yourself from that moment on to their words, regardless of the matter, but see whether they speak God's word and conform to the truth, or not. Questioning all men's doctrine by faith and by the written word. For some exalt faith, but teach contrary to the Scriptures, which are rightly understood according to faith. On the other hand, many are learned, but have not faith; neither do they belong to teach the Scriptures, for the Scriptures alone must be understood by faith, and faith alone must be proved to be righteous, with and in the Scriptures, which are rightly understood by faith. Equally as

If one wants to carry a load and lead it, if he takes the animal alone, without ropes and without cords, he cannot do it; on the other hand, if he takes the harness alone, without the animal, he also cannot do anything. In short, the animal and the harness must be led to the burden and girded together. So here the animal is the living faith; the rope and the ropes are the Scriptures. If I now want to teach what is not in God's word, or what is contrary to it, then I neither take nor move anything in the church; for it cannot be moved against God's word, or without it. But if I come with God's word alone, without faith and right understanding, I likewise receive nothing; for the church hears that I do not understand God's word, nor have faith. Example: Christ says Matth. 5, 25. 26.: "Unite yourself with your adversary, while you are on the way with him, so that he does not hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the weaver, and be thrown into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt not come out of this until thou hast paid the last oertle." This place was taken by the pope and interpreted without faith that it was a purgatory, from which no one would come until he had paid all debts. But faith says: If we had to pay for our sins ourselves, what would Christ have died for? how? that after Christ comes, we must first suffer purgatory, and before him there never was any? And so faith may not suffer purgatory. For so he finds that Christ in this place does not mean to speak of purgatory at all, but of the danger that often befalls one before the judge; that often one does not want to get along amicably with his adversary, and so he himself comes to be wronged; then he must pay all the debt without mercy. You see, one must have faith and the Scriptures together. This way from the Scriptures I teach not from myself, but from Christ JEsu, who saith Jn. 5:39: "Sin the Scriptures, in whom ye also think ye have eternal life; and they are they which make known of me." Behold, as Christ Himself let Himself in to the Jews into the bounds of the Scriptures, and will let Himself be protected and solicited by the Scriptures. So we also are to bring our doctrine from the Scriptures, and from the Scriptures rightly understood through faith; for Christ also proved his doctrine in every way by the Scriptures.

2 Luther says right after the beginning: "But whoever wants to go right and not to-

1) "vorzämen" will probably be as much as: together. 2) i.e. unobserved.

3) i. e. to get out of the way.

Beware of pointed thoughts", so you, dear brother, must not run straight ahead and blame us, Against whom Luther writes, so 1) we dealt with pointedness; but consider, first of all, how far it is fitting to be perceptive in contemplating God's Word, and to consider the words that forbid sharpening the mind, against those who call it pointed; as Paul says: "You shall not be wise among yourselves". And, "Ye shall know no more, neither need ye know"; and again, "Ye shall not be ignorant, but knowing and understanding what is the will of God." And Christ, Matt. 10, says, "Ye shall be wise as serpents, and simple as doves." Secondly, you shall then measure Luther's opinion of the Sacrament and ours against each other, which is pointed and which is not; for in this way you will find which reproach or revile the other. So we say that the words "this is my body which is given for you" cannot be understood without a tropum, that is, use. And therefore we indicate innumerable causes, the greater part of which will follow. Here we will now indicate the one that is taken in the words themselves, and is this: If the words were to be understood according to the simple form, then it would follow that we would have to eat the body of Christ visibly and sensibly; for he says: "Let it be the body that is given for us. Now there is no invisible, insensitive corpse given for us, but the visible and sensitive one, so we also have to eat it, because he says: "it is the one who is given for us". Furthermore, we also consult other scriptures together with faith (as will follow), so that we may obtain that these words are differently understood or used, that is, tropica. For this purpose, we present sufficient Scriptures that teach us to recognize the tropum and usage. If you want to find out by the word "is", 2) you have innumerable examples in the Bible, where "is" and all words of the essence are taken differently. In Gen. 41, 26: The seven fat cows are seven fruitful years; the seven empty ears are the seven years of hunger, in both places and still in many "is" is taken for "means". Christ says Matth. 11, 14: "He is Elias"; he means John; and John was not Elias, but he was like him. Gal. 4, 24: "These are the two testaments" for: they mean the two testaments. And the like innumerable. But if thou wilt call it by the word corpse-

- 1) "to suspect, so" - to have in suspicion, as if.
- 2) "aufthun" - to explain, to open up the opinion.

If you do this, you will have enough information, which we have amply shown in many books, especially against Strauss and Luther, and now finally in Latin. Here we want to show only the most distinguished ones; in Exodus 12:11 God speaks of the paschal lamb, or feast: "This is the transgression. Now the lamb may not be a leap over or a step over, but is only a memorial of the step over. So Christ used the same words in the 3) Abthun of the old memories and essays of the new ones, and also spoke thus: "The bread", or feast, "is my body", that is, means or reproduces my body, which is given for you; and referring to the Acts of the Apostles, Cap. 2, 42, where it says: "They strongly adhered to the apostles' teaching and to the church, and to the breaking of bread," which the apostles alone considered a sign used in the thanksgiving and renunciation of the church, and therefore called the breaking of bread alone. The same is noted in Paul, 1 Cor. 10, 16, where he calls it bread, and then in chapter 11, v. 23. 4) and in the last place he tells us with such brightness of mind that the Lord Christ Jesus, in the night when he was given up, took bread, and in the morning, when he was suffering a salvific death, instituted a memorial instead of the old memorial of passing over and carrying out, and said: Take, effet, the bread broken with one another, or the feast is a signification of my body, which is given to death for you 2c. So we also understand it of the drink, and recognize according to the words of Paul that it is nothing else, neither a proclamation, that is, thanksgiving to the Lord that his only Son suffered death for us. And the one who appears in thanksgiving 5) pretends to be one who trusts in the Lord Jesus Christ to be reconciled through his death. From this it follows that he follows Christ with his life, doing and suffering all things for God's sake and for the sake of others; and if he does not do this, he becomes guilty of the body of Christ and of his blood, not which he has eaten, but which he has testified to himself that they were given for him, and thus he escapes death and hell; and denies this with an unchristian life. Yes, this is according to the brevity of our simple mind; not

- 3) "im" put by us instead of "a" in the old edition.
- 4) was enough.
- 5) "who appears in thanksgiving" - who goes to the Lord's Supper.
- 6) These intercalations seem necessary to us in order to give meaning.

The Bible is not a book written by us, but drawn from the Scriptures and invented with the highest understanding of faith.

3 Luther again says that the words: "This is my corpse" 2c. must be taken simply, as they read, unused. And if we say [this], it must follow that bread, which must be signified by the little word "that," is the body of Christ; and then the pope would be right who says: The bread is substantially changed into the body of Christ. The bread would also have to be crucified for us if it were the body that was crucified for us. Luther answers that it is nothing less than bread, but that it is the body of Christ, as you, dear brethren, read in this booklet without any consideration. And even if we cry out, "Scripture, Scripture," Luther tells us that Paul called it bread, 1 Cor. 10 and 11. We know that, Lord God! We call it bread and consider it to be bread according to its substance, but no scripture comes forth to prove that it is bread and flesh together. Christ, indicating the bread, even offering it with his hand, says, "This is my body." And now nowhere is it mentioned, neither by apostles, evangelists, nor any scholars who have ever been, that he ever said: "This is bread, and is my flesh with one another. So far is it from Luther's mind that this opinion should be maintained with God's word, that there is also no human word that imposes such a meaning on God's word. But this is how he wants to embellish it with such a speech: 1) "The words are clear. Who would not know what I said if I offered a simml 2) and said: Take and eat, this is a simml"? Thus Luther speaks. But see, dear Christian, how an impossible example this is. If a man brings me a seed, and says, Eat, this is a seed; how can I not understand that it is a seed? if he says that it is just what it is, and that I know that it is. But here it is not so; we take bread and say that it is the bodily corpse of Christ; as if one said, Take away, the simmlen is a cabbage head. 3) But even if Luther had not failed to make a comparison in the example, it is still of no use to deal with such paintings. Examples of previous education teach well, but they do not prove. But here no thing is valid, because it is essentially based on God's word. Soon Luther says, bread remains bread, and in the bread one eats

the body of Christ. Behold, this is now another; first he said: the bread is bread and the body of Christ with each other; now he says: he is in the bread, these are two different speeches, and all without God's word, in addition he lets the words remain simple in either 4) speech. For thus speak: The bread is bread and the corpse of Christ, gives the words a different sense, as they, simply presented, can bear, so also: in the bread is the corpse of Christ, but gives a different sense. For "this is my body" ever carries the sense that the bread is the body of Christ; but then it cannot be bread in addition; and if the pope were right, it is not, for we see and feel that it is bread and not flesh. It also has the speech: This is bread, and is in addition my corpse, has no umbrella at all, neither in God's word, nor in philosophy, for it may not be two substances One thing. But the other speech: In the bread 2c., would like to be glossed by the *synecdocham*; but then it is a trope, that is, usage, and the words do not remain in their simple sense, as but Luther argues. Now, if he interprets it with the tropo, and falsifies it before the simple reader, he does not want to suffer the tropum, use, at all; item, if he also says without God's word: it is bread and flesh, since we feel the bread well, but no one is aware of the flesh, which is also contrary to all understanding; item, if Christ says: it is the corpse, which is given for us, but which is given for us visibly, sensitively, sufferingly: so now behold, those who deal in subtlety, 5) we who say, that it is only a sign of the body of Christ carried about and eaten in the meal of thanksgiving, and all this with Scripture; or Luther, who wants to eat the bodily body there, but cannot eat it, for he would have to eat it as it is dead. Therefore, dear reader, you see that you read with little judgment if you allow yourself to doubt Luther's sermon. But it happens to you because you want to be so wise and well-instructed, and you do not yet know what doctrine is. I speak only to some simple-minded people, for I am well aware that this sermon has set them on the right track; thus it is without any reason, and cries out very loudly, but no one hears it, for it is not God's voice. See also in this, which is panned, speak of the corpse of Christ,

1) Col. 737, § 6 in this volume.

2) i.e. a roll.

3) Calf's head (?).

4) i.e. each of the two.

5) d. i. bypass.

6) d. i. More practiced.

of which all who have ever spoken of it have only 1) I have God's word? but one must understand God's word spoken and not understood nor believed; or have versed rightly, and therefore rely on the right understanding of the truth 2) and proved the words with Scripture, that they God's word. But if the pope did not do this, he fell into the have the meaning. Luther must still have this against us pit and took with him everything that God, with His grace, before that we do not want to reproach and disgrace him did not remove from the pit 7). So it must also happen to before the simple as he does us. But in Latin I have him here, or else we miss.

addressed him more freely, yet without scolding.

(4) According to this he says: we have gone astray laid before you. Our faith, which we have in God through because we have followed our thoughts. Where, then, and in Christ Jesus, makes us whole. This is true; would this chip 3) have come on the track before 4) we however, it does not come from the fact that faith can were born? for there have never been any thoughts that actually do this, since it originated from us; rather, the one are not challenged with it, as Luther also confesses about who believes was chosen and drawn by God before and himself.

(5) And teaches how one must cleave to the words to God; for thus God made the covenant with all the elect, with faith alone. In this, however, the simple-minded are that they should worship him alone, adore him alone (as struck over the eye, because you think that this word, "to one God), adhere to him alone; as also the Lord Christ believe in the words with faith," is spoken in common of Jesus, Matth. 4, [10.] poked the devil in the nose. But now the faith that we have in and on God's word; but Luther the covenant may not be changed (we are not speaking verbally refers to faith, that flesh and blood are eaten here of the outward ceremonies, but only of the inward here. Therefore, notice that it is indeed right to teach that ground of faith; for the ceremonies must have 8) been one should believe all the words of God without any changed), so it follows that also trusting in the Lord Christ hindrance; 5) but in doing so, one must also understand Jesus is based on his divinity alone; therefore that he is the word of God correctly before one places faith in it, or the true God, as he himself clearly states John 12: "He we would deceive ourselves if we did not understand it that trusteth in me, trusteth not in me, but in him that sent and thought to preserve our misunderstanding by crying me." Behold, as he saith, trust not in him, understand, as out that one should believe God's word. For example, the he is man, but in him that sent him, with whom he is One pope based his actions on God's word in all ways, but not God; so it follows that we put our faith in Christ Jesus on the rightly understood word, namely: "And on the rock alone, because he is true God. What then is mankind? A I will build my church. But he misunderstood it, and said certain pledge of grace; for which is given in death, that that the church was built on Peter, and extended 6) the the divine justice might be heard, 9) and be reconciled to word "rock" to Peter, and therefore, according to Peter, us, that we might run in trust to the grace and mercy of he was also the rock on which the church stood. And God, through the precious pledge of His own Son, whom Christ applies the word "rock" to himself, in the sense: He has given to us. For what can he refuse us, if he has "Upon the rock, which you have sewn, and of which I given his own Son for us, Romans 8, of which enough have given you the name Rucker, because you have has been said elsewhere and thoroughly? Now if those recognized it, together with the others (for he speaks in who want to eat the body of Christ in the flesh draw faith all their names, as is also found in John 6), yes, upon the to the conclusion that we should believe that we are rock, which I am, I will build my church. See now, dear eating flesh and blood, or else we would not be saved, brother, that it is not enough to cry out: they teach very harmfully. For our faith is thoroughly in the Godhead alone,

1) "only" put by us instead of "now".

2) rejuvenate - assert, confess.

3) Span - Discord.

4) "denn" put by us instead of "und". Zwingli almost constantly uses "before and" instead of "before then," so we will no longer give an account of this change.

5) d. i. Reservation.

6) d. i. goals.

7) d. i. held by the jacket.

8) dennen - from then on, away.

9) d. i. satisfied.

and the true Son of God, Jesus Christ, has never pretended that anything is given to us through bodily eating. For, as it is said before, [in that] which Joh. 6. stands of his flesh eating and blood drinking, eating is to be taken for trusting. When then the disciples immediately in the same place pass away, we know and trust that thou art the Son of the living God. See how they speak and rejoice in the Godhead, but do not speak: We believe that your flesh and blood, eaten, forgive sin 2c. Now therefore take heed lest these men deceive us with the courtship, or the circumlocution, 1) which they have need of for and for. [They speak of the faith and do it justice, but they will then speak and lead it secretly, that one should understand by faith, believing that flesh and blood are eaten here; and they do this almost unjustly. God enlighten them and forgive them, for they teach this without the reason of God's word and faith.

7 Third, notice that there is a great difference between the words that promise and those that do not. For those who promise are undoubted by the believer that what they promise will come to pass; but those who do not promise, but tell or teach, they do and do not come to pass. For example, Christ's promise that if we give no more than a drink of water to one in his name, he will repay us, is quite undoubted by believers, and will certainly come to pass; but that he says, Whatever you want men to do to you, do to them; or, If you are smitten on one cheek, offer the other also; is an undoubted word of God, which we believe. But how? Do we also believe that all who believe him do so? No; for we have many who believe, but do not offer their cheeks. But this we believe, that it is godly and right to do unto our neighbor as we would be done unto us, and to overcome the enemy with virtue and goodness. Therefore, note that we trust in the words that promise something (if we are believers). But the words that teach or are called we believe; and so there is a difference between trusting in God's word, and believing God's word; for God's words are also distinguished. And does "trust in GOD's word" serve the word that promises something; and "believe GOD's word" serves on the words that mean or forbid something, ver-

mean nothing. And the difference is also in faith; for he who relies on God's word must first believe that it is God's word, so that he is only certain that he will receive what God, in whom he trusts, has promised him. So now take the words: "This is my body" 2c. and the: "You will conceive in your womb and give birth to a son," against each other, and you will see how Luther deceives himself. We are to believe the words: "This is my body". How? That they were spoken by Christ, and in remembrance of his death. But shall we also trust in them? No, because nothing is promised to us with them; therefore we cannot rightly and actually say 2) German of them that one should trust in them or rely on them. For if we should speak according to Luther's saw: we should rely on the fact that with the eating of the corpse, bodily, sin will be forgiven us, then we have no promise about it; but if we should rely on the fact that, where we speak the words, the bodily corpse of Christ will be there from the hour (as Luther says), then we have no promise about it. For the word, "Do this in remembrance of me," is not a promise. On the other hand, Christ did not call his body to be eaten in remembrance of his body, but he calls the words praise and thanksgiving to be done in remembrance that he gave his body to death for us. This is not what I say, but what Paul says in 1 Cor. 11, when he interprets these words, "Do this in remembrance of me: As often as you eat the bread and drink the drink, you should proclaim the death of the Lord," that is, praise and glorify God. But that Mary was told: "You will receive" 2c., is a word of promise, because after that she was also promised the way and measure, as it would go: "The Holy Spirit will come down into you from above" 2c. This does not happen here at all, because it is not spoken 4): So it shall come to pass, when you speak the words, that the body of Christ shall be there, or the like. And therefore Luther gives us one thing above reproach, when he speaks of these words in the same way, as if they were words of promise, and places them next to the word of promise, since the birth of the Son of God is promised to Mary the Virgin, and says: "Let thyself trust in it"; which "let thyself trust in it" does not serve for the simple telling and command, but is enough for the simple telling or command in faith, since we believe that he is the Son of God.

2) "actually" put by us instead of: "actually".

3) "his" put by us instead of: one.

4) i. e. nowhere.

1) "Balz" will probably be the same as "Falz", "Umlitz" the folded over, so that the sense will be: by crooked ways and twists.

He has thus instituted his memorial, and we should do that he, having eaten, also accepts the sin; or do you want the same to him. But that his bodily body is given to us to hold to the truth, so that you believe that he has for the washing away of sin, we are not to believe that at instituted a memorial and thanksgiving of his death? then all, because we have a word of promise about it, or else we are one; for we also believe the same understandably. we are not Christians, but Luthrists. This is indeed a Remain now with it, God has well for good, you must not promise that his death will take away our sin, John 1, 3 believe further in this word, because God gives there no and 12. But to eat his body bodily has as little promise as more to believe; but if you continue, then you want to know it is promised to me that I will become emperor. If any one more, neither is necessary. But that thou shouldst then desires to see more of this reason, let him read what I draw the words, that they should be words of promise, is have written against the ostrich. 1) Behold then, how well violence: for he hath nowhere promised that we should eat it is, when we thus cry, Let words bring thee not, let not his flesh, nor that sin should be forgiven thereby, nor that words bring thee; and yet secretly is the opinion, Let faith should be strengthened, nor that the gospel should words that are not understood, which have no promise. be substantially brought with it, as this preaching Do not let the words you do not yet understand bring you. signifieth.

Sam 2) One would say: Do not let the mind tell you, rely only on the words, God give how they stand against other words, do not inquire into the meaning.

8) And therefore, when Luther says: 3) "He who draws faith from the words believes that God gives, Christ creeps into the bread or cup, or whatever he wants. When I have the words, I will see no further nor think" 2c., do you first see that he turns it around? One does not learn faith from the words, but God teaches it to us, 4) and then we see faith also in the words, that is, if we believe, we also find the word for it. Example: I find in the Turk Alkoran well the knowledge of their faith, I give him however therefore no faith; because it is larger fool way never of a faith invented, neither they have. So there are many who hear what the faith is, they also know the pieces of the faith, but they do not believe because of it; for no one believes, neither whom the Father has drawn. Therefore you see how all his words are to the effect that he does not want to let them be seen for what they are, nor does he want to set them against other Scriptures. Yes, he wants to keep his words and not ask any further questions. So tell me, dear Luther, What will you do? Eat the body of Christ in the flesh for the forgiveness of sins? Then you are wrong, for he was not given to eat for the remission of sins, but he was given in death for sins. So your cry is no more than a cry, until you bring forth an open declaration in which we see,

Accordingly, Luther speaks of us enthusiasts: 6) "Now they have two things in particular which they bring up against us. First, they say that it is not fitting that Christ should be body and blood in bread and wine. Secondly, eat not of necessity." Behold, devout reader, how we poor enthusiasts are so badly supplied with intercession 7). First of all, he says that we say it is not fitting; as if we tempered "not fitting" according to human reason, that it is not fitting according to it; for that is where his images reach, which he then gives, that he would like to persuade us, Lord God, with images that are quite childish, and that do not rhyme with what will come afterward. But we give nothing for the likenesses, except on the basis of the Scriptures beforehand; then we let the likeness serve as an explanation, and no further. Therefore, notice, dear reader, our opinion, when we say, "it is not fitting," we are not speaking at all to carnal reason, but to the *absurditatem*, that is. 8) of faith and Scripture. In the first, Christ says, "He that trusteth in me hath everlasting life." If eternal life comes because we trust in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, then the eating of flesh goes away. 9) But Christ says, John 6: "He that cometh to me" (here "cometh to him" is also taken for "trusting in him," as it is also learned there), "shall not hunger; and he that trusteth in me, the same shall not hunger."

5) 'sam - as if.

6) Col. 737, § 8 in this volume.

7) Advocate - Advocat.

8) i.e. inconsistency.

9) "So the meat eating goes off" will mean here: so the meat eating falls away. At the end of § 16 of this scripture, "loose" is written in the meaning of: lapsed, unfounded.

1) No. 26 in this volume.

2) d. i. as if.

3) Col. 736, § 5 in this volume.

4) From these words of Zwingli we see that according to his teaching faith is not attained through the word of God, but through an inner enlightenment.

will never thirst." In short, faith or anointing feels in itself that God secures us with His Spirit within, and that all the outward things that come into us from without may do nothing to make us right. Therefore, God promises through the prophet Jeremiah on the 31st that He will write His law in our hearts; and Paul calls all the things that are done to us from without 1) the justification of the flesh, and also says that these things were only granted for a time, and are terminated by Christ, Heb. 9. 9) Also the description of faith, Heb. 11, against the bodily eating of the body of Christ, of which it is not now proper to say, since some think they want to put it on their part, 2) but in vain. 3) In short, the firm, righteous, sincere faith trusts in Christ's divinity, and recognizes his death to be our life; but he knows nothing of the bodily meal, for it is of no use to him, since God has not promised anything to the bodily meal, nor has he instituted it. On the other hand, it is not appropriate because of faith, for the articles of faith are: "He ascended to heaven, sits at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; then he is to be judged in the future" 2c. We believe that he ascended bodily, so he cannot be here; because his body is not more than in one place, even after the primal state 4). This is indicated first of all by all his appearances, with which he appeared to his own after the original state, none of which happened in such a way that he was once 5) in two places, let alone in many. Also in this way we have a bright word of the angel, Marc. 16. who thus speaks: "He is risen and is not here." If he was not there, then his body is not everywhere, but Luther wants to say that Paul's word Eph. 4: "Christ ascended above all heavens to fill all things" means that Christ's body fills all things, just as grain fills a sack. Now Paul does not want to say of such filling, but of the filling of the Christ, that he ascended into heaven, because he fulfilled all things that were spoken of him beforehand through the prophets; for Paul there draws forth information from the 67th [68th] Psalm, of which I have written enough to Luther in Latin. Much more information will come afterwards in the clumsy 6) Scriptures, which, however, also serve here.

1) "her" put by us instead of: "for".

2) "stoop" probably as much as: bend.

3) So put by us instead of: vergenlich.

4) i. Resurrection.

5) i.e. at one, at the same time.

6) i.e. inconsistency.

16 And now therefore take heed to the awkwardness of the Scripture. The scripture may not suffer us to eat Christ's flesh or body bodily. As he says in John 6, "The flesh is of no use at all" (understand, to eat, as Luther himself also recognized in the sermon on the Gospel of John 6, although he now says something else), it also follows that he did not give us this to eat, for he says just before it, "The Spirit who makes alive. And Christ himself contrasts it, saying, "It must be spirit," not flesh, "that quickeneth the soul:" so ever the flesh is of no use, understand all, to eat. Jn. 16, Christ says: "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go unto the Father." Now he may not ever leave the world according to the Godhead, for according to it he is by nature everywhere, pervading "all things: wherefore he must ever have left the world according to mankind. For that the opposing party says that he is invisible in the sacrament is true; yes, just as he is invisible in the lintmag, 7) or in the hearts of the faithful, but not bodily there; for if he himself were bodily in the sacrament, he would have to be there, as he hung on the cross, that is, visible, sensitive, painful. But that Luther fights a lot, as it is well possible for God to do, he does against himself; for in the book against the King of England he states quite theorously, 8) that it is not proper to conclude from God's ability to be. It does not follow that God is able, so it is. It does not follow that God may make harrows 9) into a snow goose, so he is.

11 John 16: "It is good for you that I go, for where I do not go, the Comforter will not come. If it is good for us that he should go, why do we say that he is here? Yes, if we say that he is here invisibly, we are always inferring the divinity, but by no means the humanity; for there is no evidence from the Scriptures, and even here it is heard that he has gone. He does not say, "I will be with you invisibly," which would have been a proper response to their mourning, which they had received from his absence, but he persists in his going. Now "to be here invisibly" would not suffer the word "to give up," nor the word "I leave the world," [least of all] which is John 17: "Henceforth I shall not be in the world, but they shall be in it." Behold, as they stand together, evil will he not alone after mankind.

7) "Lintmag" perhaps synonymous with heart?

8) In the old edition: darbringst.

9) Corners (?) d. i. D. Eck.

be in the world; for the disciples, even we, are, bodily in the world, so he will not be in the world; for he sets them over against each other, his being in the world, and ours being in the world. There: "when I was with them" 2c. Behold, all this must be understood of his humanity alone, and may not be accounted for by invisible being here; for he saith, "I will not henceforth be in the world." Much more writings are, so may not suffer that the words of Christ: "This is my body", are understood unused 1), which I have indicated in Latin to Luther, as well as everything more abundantly. This is the clumsy one of which we say. For otherwise we know well, that the well, which is called or promised by God, and we understand it rightly. No one has any doubt about the virginity and birth of Mary, for this is promised and foretold with bright words, but here there is none.

All of Luther's parables may, as has been reported, prove nothing; for they have no "back in God's word," nor are they unskillful to the all, not befitting his presumption. How the soul is after the whole body, taken from the [Tractat] de *anima Aristotelis*, does not befit. But if Luther could give an example of a corpse being in all souls or ends, that would be appropriate. Our question is not whether the divinity of Christ, or the fruitfulness of his suffering around and around, serves as an example of the soul, but whether his corpse is everywhere. So all examples are sufficient to show that Christ is in the hearts of all men, essentially according to the divinity, and also bodily according to the respect and memory; but essentially, bodily does not indicate a likeness, nor would it help if a likeness were equally well suited. That it is formed by the word is brought out in Strausen's answer. In short, it must not be Zürlemürlens: 2) "As it is with God in heaven, so he gives it into our heart; so the truly preaching mouth speaks, and does not the spoken word bring the thing with it, of which it speaks?" Or else, if we said, as the river of sin has passed over the world, we would drown the world, or as Sodoma is burned, we would burn the world, and thus be counted cheap for witches. That Luther writes on the measure, sam des Engels Wort die gegenwärtige Empfängniß Marien ein gebracht hat, ist gar eine ungeschickte Rede, und Gottes Worte

who says: "Let the Holy Spirit come down from above and overshadow the power of the Most High" 2c. Now the angel's word did not do this; for what else can the angel speak, neither that is called God? but God's power. 3) We would have liked to bring words that had also done something, so that we might prove that here the words, believed and spoken alone, would make the body of Christ present; but there is no reason for this.

Luther says: 4) "If we speak the words about the bread, then he is truly there. Oh, that God would have mercy on you, Luther, that you ever spoke the word, for it is an entirely papal word. Show scripture therefore.

14) "These words are given to us," Luther continues, "so that we know where to find him, namely in bread. Is false. For he has shown himself to us bodily at the right hand of the Father, there he will lie 6) until the last judgment, Matth. 26. But with grace he has shown himself in your closet, now go in and worship him in spirit and truth, you will surely find him. Further, he has shown himself: "what we shall desire in his name," though he has ascended to heaven, "he will give us"; so he is ever everywhere, and never comes from us, for he says: "I will be with you to the end of the world," must be understood of divinity and grace alone.

Since you, dear Luther, say that "the devil has possessed us; we have read that Christ is dead for us, 7) but we do not feel this in our hearts," we say nothing more evil than that: Why do you judge another man's own man? Rom. 14. If we tell you the sum of how we believe and what we teach, you either say, "We learned it from you; and yet if it is a miracle, we learned it from you, that you do not want to recognize your own teaching; or you say, "We did not believe anything that we understand. How then shall we do to him? Nothing else, but bear it cheerfully, and commend it to the right judge.

(16) Other words of shame and disgrace, dear reader, we also leave to the aforementioned judge, and show you that Luther, through all this matter, speaks the opinions listed below, without God's

3) Marginal gloss: Vas vietis! aut: Huia viotis, nist ckolor?

4) Col. 741, § 19 in this volume.

5) Luther does not speak like this. This is also an inaccurate twisted citation, which is probably supposed to refer to Col. 744, 8 25 (to the end).

6) probably: stay.

7) Luther, Col. 745, § 27: "died" 2c.

1) d. i. without tropus.

2) This word means (compare No. 24, § 49): parrot talk, useless talk. It seems to us that Zwingli aims at Col. 740, § 16.17 and Col. 743 f., § 25 by the following, but introduces Luther's words quite inaccurately and incomprehensibly....

Word, it may also not receive, so that you know you bß
1) to forgive.

1) The body of Christ, eaten in the flesh, fortifies faith.

2) The body of Christ, eaten bodily or naturally, forgives sin.

3) The body of Christ is brought bodily into the Sacrament as soon as the words "This is my body" are spoken over it.

4) The Gospel is given to the recipient with the offering of the Sacrament, and the Body and Blood of Christ are given.

Are all open, errors and reasons, on which the whole papacy would like to be erected again, because they are loose without God's word.

17 Therefore you, dear reader, when I initially

1) In the old edition: wütest. - vergaumen - to be on one's guard, to take care.

2) i.e. unfounded.

I have told you not to worry much about quarrels, but to look at the one thing that you love God above all things, and worship Him with pious innocence. Remember also that this point was never so important to the ancient Christians that they ever made an article of it in their faith. And keep God.

18) To the immodest, lying book, which Johannes Faber, after the right name Nebulo, or in German Heierli, has let go out, I will answer, if it will be necessary, when the disputation will come out, if I perhaps aligned two works with one; the same, the publicly lying preface, which Joakim has let go out in print at Grüt. And what someone would write in the matter repugnant, we want, whether God wills, with the time everything thoroughly answer. Until undoubtedly, the war will be judged, now storm no one. God with us all, amen. Given in Zurich on the 30th day of March. Anno 1527.

23. Ulrich Zwingli's answer that these words: This is my corpse, will eternally have the old unified meaning.*)

The letter of June 20, 1527.

Huldreich Zwingli wishes the most noble Prince John, Duke of Saxony, his gracious lord, grace and peace from God through Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our Lord.

Most gracious Prince and Lord! My rude, incompetent 3) writing shall not offend your F. G., to one, 4) that I think, all of you princes have long been very annoyed, that one makes even close 5) all speeches and writings with such words: Ew. gnädigste Gnad, Churfürstl., Fürstl. Durchleuchtigkeit 2c. more than incomprehensible, to the

3) i.e., the wealthless.

4) to one - one part.

5) In the old edition: "garnach", i. e. almost.

others, that I do not doubt, such titles, descending from the flattering Xind 6) of writers and orators, displeases all Christian princes higher, neither simple correct speeches. So now your F. Grace for the sake of Christian faith, which in your country is so bravely preached by Martin Luther and others, even among the most noble princes, noble and illustrious: I have no doubt that they hear my foolish simplicity best of all. For me, to write to princes now and then, truly no addiction of honors penetrates, which [as] I can well judge, would be more obscured, where one does not write to me for the best my

6) i.e. servants. In the old edition: "Lind der Schreiberen und Rederen".

*The complete title of this writing, which is directed against Luther's "That these words of Christ: this is my body etc., still stand firm against the swarming spirits", is as follows: "That these words, this is my body, which is given for you, will eternally have the old unified meaning, and M. Luther with his last book has not at all proven his and Pabst's meaning. Huldreich Zwingli christliche Antwort, Zürich 1527." This writing, like the previous one, has been translated into Latin by Rudolph Gualther and given to the op "r. 2uinM, lom. II, p. 374 inserted. The date of the letter to Duke John of Saxony, June 20, 1527, will probably indicate the day on which Zwingli began this "reply." We give the text according to Walch's old edition.

The same is true for the other parts of the country. If, however, the matter requires in part that it be unconcealed even to the princes, and if, on the other hand, they are found to have such Christian and friendly hearts and opinions that they do not take offense at anything, we wicked ones are ever compelled and comforted to present our concern in writing. Now if Doctor Martinus Luther, in the business of Christ's supper, not only hammers over the cord of the Christian spirit and love, but also tries to penetrate and see the Scriptures with the splendor of his name in an improper sense, this should not be concealed by the smallest one who sits in the congregation, if he understands it, but should be contradicted; regardless of how great the name is that is contradicted: how much more shall it not be unheard by the nobles of this world, whether they be put to the sword of vengeance, or to the sword of the word of God? But if here, too, there is an artifice that would soon make the teachers' tyranny and violence no less strong than the papacy has been, which is an artifice, 2) the doctrine, against which we cannot, with God's word, cry out so cruelly: it is heretical, raving, superstition, seditious, red spiritualist, and the like; so that the ordinary powers are introduced to forbid it unheard and unjustified: It is all the more necessary, then, to stand up against such authorities and to prevent special scholars from taking the judgment of the Christian people and making it their own; from this it would follow that they would keep God's word in prison according to their misguided understanding, no less than the popes did before; as Luther does publicly in this book. Against all truth, he wants to force the word of Christ: "The flesh is of no use at all" into the mind: carnal mind is of no use; and to this end he falsifies the word, uses the Greek articulum dennen, 3) is "that," in which the sense takes much light. Therefore, may your grace read and judge this answer of mine, which is not mine but God's (for it is taken from His one word), for God's sake, in which Christian truth and modesty stand, and as far as the Almighty (as I do not doubt that He will graciously guide you from now on, as before) will give you the truth.

4) and follow them gladly, and in the meantime do not be displeased with the quarrelling, since it has come to a quarrel; but be on both sides of it that one fights with the friendly, peaceful word of God, not with such improper scolding. For if Luther supposes that the church is not injured by his lewd words, and supposes that he has delivered the gospel to it again, he must ever be sure of himself that he has drawn a church that has been used to such scolding; 5) which, after all, is not at all befitting a Christian people, among whom all things are to be done with discipline and the fear of God. Truly it is not that we have such a pale rind that we cannot suffer such evil 6) but that it is ever unseemly to educate even the most wicked tongues rather than brave hearts. It is also more formal with those who are of Luther's opinion, and more skillful to find the truth, to seek and judge without anger, neither with such nonsense. Although the good comes from the angry speech, that all enemies of the Gospel, especially the popes, now see that there is no conspiracy between today's preachers, no cakes, 7) or superior, but free teaching. May the Almighty guide and protect your grace together with all its territory with all believers in Christ in the right knowledge of the truth! Amen. Given in Zurich on the 20th day of June 1527.

Martino Luther's wishes for Huldreich Zwingli

Grace and peace from God through Jesus Christ, the living Son of God, who for our salvation suffered death, and therefore left the world in the flesh and ascended to heaven, where he sits until he comes again on the last day according to his own word, so that you may know that he dwells in our hearts through faith, Eph. 3, not through the fleshly eating of the mouth, as you want to teach without God's word. This we wish you from the bottom of our hearts, dear Luther, for many reasons. In which we hope to be raised much more Christian, neither if one raises it with the devil, 8) than you have raised this great book.

4) d. i. listen.

5) In the old edition: Schelkens. To resolve it with "Schelten" is prevented by the previous sentence; perhaps it is: Schalkheit treiben; the contrast is: Zucht und Gottesfurcht Cf. § 29 of this writing.

6) i.e. shocks, blows.

7) cement cake - cook together (?).

8) By this Zwingli means Luther's writing "that these words of Christ: this is my body, still stand firm" 2c. (No. 20 in this volume.)-The writing of Zwingli, which is mentioned by him immediately following, is probably his "xsl6818, j<l "st, "xpositio "novaristas ngotii, aâ Llsrtium l,utv "rmm. Zürich 1527.

1) "Unwürdsche" is probably formed from "unwirsch" and will mean "displeasure, anger". The form "Unwirsse" also occurs.

2) i.e. whose [the Pabst's] art is to shout against the teaching 2c.

3) dennen - from then on, away.

lived. God has arranged that both of our writings have gone out at one time: ours in Latin, in which we have done everything that you complain about being unaccountable until now; but in a foreign language, so that you would not complain that I had been thirsty to 1) make you look bad in front of all the German country; but yours in German, so that it would not do harm in foreign lands; but, since Germany has the best possible account of God's word in the church, the effortful battle would be waged in the language, which might be stained with it in the least. The gracious Father takes such good care of us, that he can order the things that we think are clumsy (when I also thought that you should have done this battle in Latin, so that all things might first be well considered among the scholars before they are poured out among the people): yes, he can order things well. Now that everything you write here in German is sufficiently explained in our Latin, but only the Latins read it, I am also compelled to bring in German what serves the matter, so that both opinions may come before the church, and the truth may increase. In which of our opposition you shall have the advantage, that we do not want to insult you at all with such intemperate words, as you are accusing us of; but do not reckon us here under malicious words, when we will say: Here you pervert our words, here you reproach us without need, here you make gifts according to your own will, here you lie to us, here you falsify the Scriptures, here you do not understand them, here you are against yourself, and the like, for we want to explain all these things clearly. And yet we are still so rich in words that we have enough of the litter, nor (praise be to God) are we so angry that we cannot beware of them. But since you so strongly expose the untruth with such impudent, immodest words, they must also be forcefully drawn out according to the word of Paul, and point with the finger where the prest 3) lies; also put something before your eyes, so that you also learn to recognize yourself from your own words, for we truly, truly see that those falsely boast of the spirit, who write so very carnally, and speak with such great diligence, to injure the neighbor and to go out. 4) Be patient also, that we may answer thee according to the length of all thy writing, which thou wilt not, as at the end of thy

Book stands. Let us not forget the two points: "He sitteth on the right hand"; and, "the flesh is of no use at all." But, if we come to them, we will establish them abundantly on the basis of the Scriptures, for ever this is not to be suffered, that you, in order to redeem the matter, make us out to be such shameful lying people, that, if it were so in truth, not only our writings, but also our names, should be accepted and interpreted by all men. But the matter will be different (with God), neither you will muck it up. Here, God's word will prevail; not gushers, devils, mischiefmongers, heretics, murderers, rebels, gilders, or hypocrites; defiance, botz, blotz, Blitz, Donder, Po, pu, pa, plump, and the like. Dishonor, dirty words, and dirty tricks. Therefore, dear Luther, notice how we want to keep order. Go from one point to the other in general, and resolve it in short or long, according to the requirements of the matter, and if it comes to the two points mentioned, indicate and fix them clearly, as has been said. But that we do not follow thee, since thou dost urge us to let all the rest of thy speech fall, and to the two points alone: "He is seated at the right hand" and "Flesh is not useful," so that we do not go astray, happens for the following reasons: First, since you obscure the truth with so much useless talk, and then think that we should overlook it, we cannot honor you, for we would dishonor the truth, or else my service, they say. On the other hand, you would have your reasons of the two points: "He is seated at the right hand," and "the flesh is of no use at all," you would have brought them to two sheets, and made nine and a half of them: what is the rest, then, that is not necessary, which you also allow us to leave unaccounted for? Is it in your opinion? why; do you then permit us not to answer about it? since you so often cry murder, that one has not answered, which you wrote against Carlstadt, how would [you] only do so here? But if it does not fit your opinion, why did you put the useless many? Therefore, we will do enough for you, and not give you cause for further unrest, we will leave nothing unaccounted for, even though we would like to advise the work to be good, and lend it to more useful things, so that you cannot "say" that we have not accounted for this or that. Thirdly, it was also right and proper among the Athenians, as Demosthenes indicates per Ctesipüonte, that the answering party should not be imprisoned 5), that he only had to answer as his adversary wished. How much

5) d. i. restricted.

1) In the old edition: gehebt.

2) "Schenzelst" probably as much as: disgrace, revile. Therefore (soon to follow) "Schenzelworte" - Schmähworte.

3) "Prest"-break; "to paint something"-etlichemal.

4) i.e. to bring down.

Less should you dictate to us that we do not answer for the things that you have sown in the hearts of men with such impious words? But we will gladly do so, in God's name, and consume the words more with the seriousness of the matter, neither with long prefaces. You, devout reader, do not judge out of temptation or lack of understanding, but see what befits the true divinity and humanity of Christ, which are both real and natural in him, not from my but from his own words. May the Almighty of His grace give light to this, 1) so that no one may err, but may look upon the bright truth unblinkingly 2). Amen!

(1) Now that you, dear Luther, have told how the devil ran away the bridge, that is, the Scriptures, from the first Christians, you should have weighed yourself against us from the beginning; then you would have seen that it is our only work to stick to the Scriptures that are well and rightly understood; and herewith you would have found yourself wanting to force us away from the Scriptures in this matter and give us your word for it. As thou teachest now in the book only new error: the body of Christ eaten, even with the mouth, put away sin, establish faith, fill all things, and also be present in all things, even as well as the Godhead; preserve the body of man unto the primal state, 3) and such like things as shall come after; which thou teachest all the word of God; but wilt in short that men should believe thee, if therefore thou hast not the word of God, but it disputes against it: then see thou now, wedre 4) Part of the other want to run off the Scripture. But I hope that there are now so many 5) richer in the church in all speeches and understanding, that they may well know, not the speech of the puffed up, but the power, 1 Cor. 4.

(2) But that thou showest how the statutes of men are brought in by the concilia, is found to be really against thee, neither against us. For you make laws how the Scriptures are to be understood, which you do not like to shield in your way; as where "flesh" stands without "my" consent, it is called carnal wickedness, 2c. as will come afterward. Thus thou art more like unto them that bring in human statutes, neither we; for thou givest statutes which God's word doth not signify, neither doth he suffer.

(3) And when thou shalt show thereafter that out of the

Fathers' statutes the quarrel in God's word is accepted, which is a divine quarrel; but it does not affect us, because we alone have God's word for our reason. If, however, someone wants to fight with us, we want to protect ourselves with the sword of God's word alone. If this is a divine quarrel, as you say, then we will do justice to the matter. But not so. In the word of God one should not quarrel, but open it earnestly to one another, and if the truth is heard and seen, yield. All this is to be done with the kindling of the believing heart, as happened to the disciples who went to Emmaus. Our controversy is not only with the devil, but also with the flesh, which is always against the Spirit. Therefore, really know what these speeches are, as Ephesians 6 says. In short, we do not want to fight with you in any other boundaries, neither in the 7) New Testament nor in the Old Testament. But that the teachers are attracted by Oecolampadio and me is not because we want to base ourselves on them, as we have often enough indicated, but because we want to bring word from everywhere.

(4) Accordingly, you show yourself worthy, as you have brought forth the Scriptures under the bench; in my opinion, unreasonably. For if you ever consider those who have brought the Scriptures to us through the means and instrument of languages, you must recognize Erasmus in our time, and Vallam a few years ago in one, 8) and the pious Reuchlin and Pellicanum in the other, without whose help neither you nor others would be nothing 9) if only man, and not God, were to be recognized as the author. But what need is there of praising? Is it no longer he who makes everything grow 10) together? Does Paul no longer count for anything? 1 Cor. 3: "Who is Paul? Who is Apollus? I planted, Apollos watered; but God made it grow: therefore he that planted is nothing, nor he that watered, but he that made it grow, God. And not unto us, O LORD, not unto us, but unto thy name shalt thou give the glory." I will spare you here, dear Luther, publicly, because you have boasted of yourself in many writings, by epistles and otherwise much more proudly, so that you should probably be astonished; 11) but we will, if God wills, be moderate, and let you remain a man. For in truth you know well,

1) "give" put by us instead of: lift.

2) i.e. unblinded.

3) i. Resurrection.

4) i.e. which of the two.

5) d. i. already.

6) nevertheless" put by us instead of: accordingly.

7) In the old edition: innert.

8) to one - on the one hand.

9) In the old edition: nützig. With regard to this word, compare § 4 towards the end.

10) In the old edition: "as seed"; immediately following: "useful" instead of: nothing.

11) d. i. stäupen.

that at the time when you stood out, there was a great multitude of those who were much more skilled in reading and languages than you, although they did not stand out to protect Israel and to fight against the great Goliath of Rome because of fear, because God did not raise them, up and make them male. (I also follow your praise.) But you were called by God in all this, no different from David; you faced the enemy so comfortingly that all who were afraid of how the shameful Antichrist would be taken, were strengthened, jumped to you, so that the gospel came to a successful conclusion; Therefore we should thank God that he raised you up, since no one dared to do so, and hold you in honor as a useful piece of crockery, as we also gladly do, even though you turn the same into many ways. But anger is a bond of reason, and an enemy of love, nothing less, neither also nonsense confuses reason. But who is so unwise as to be angry with a good man who rages, if he rages more and more? No one; but the more he rages, the more one feels compassion for him. So we can truly see to this day how you have stormed the papacy, even though you have brought the powerless, hopeful flesh out into the light, how much God has given you power to speak. And even though you now rage out of anger, we would like to overlook [the same] for the sake of your former service, you do not want to recognize it. But that you are now raging out of anger, you cannot deny, if God wills, if you only read your own book, for the multitude of evil words and wrong opinions, as we will make clear, cannot come out of love and good consideration. For look at all those who have ever written out of bitterness, where no one has ever escaped himself as much as you have escaped yourself in the book. And shall you ever be able to reckon it to a spirit? or not speak against you? or give way to error? Saul was at first gentle, and dear to God, and skilful; but when he became haughty and tyrannical, God made him daily deaf; [he] did dishonorable things to him: shall it therefore have been right, because he was not skilful? The great Alexander also kept himself more free in the end of his life, neither in youth. Marcus Manlius, by his glorious deeds, came to know that he sought the empire, and was killed for the sake of tyranny. Pythagoras, the most noble philosopher, became the greatest tyrant; should it therefore be all right what they do? Much less should anyone in the Christian community, for the sake of a noble deed, carry himself in such a way that he should not be persuaded, or

believe what he wants. Therefore, I urge you by God, who created you and me, to go into yourself and let other people sing about you and say that you may be worthy. For "what do you have that you have not received from God? But if thou hast received it, why dost thou boast?" 1 Cor. 4. And if all this does not help, I will make thee know thyself more truly in all goodness. Thou wilt ever be seen, if thou alone hast judged the course of the gospel, wherein I almost admit much to thee. But I will make thee see that thou hast not known the wide and glorious light of the gospel, because thou hast forgotten it again. You have taught that Christ Jesus, the Son of the living God, is our only salvation, that faith comes from the uniting Father and Spirit, and the like. For you have therefore brought forth Scripture, both new and old. But if, in addition, you have strongly taught that absolution must be given to anyone who is to be sure that his sins are forgiven, and that this absolution is the key, you have not really recognized either the key or the gospel. For from the gospel comes the assurance of faith, since we know that the Son of God paid for our sins with his death. If there is faith, then there is also absolution or redemption, so there is no need for man to be made sure, for he must become sure in faith alone, and no one gives faith, not God. And even if a man were to say ten thousand times, "Your sins are forgiven you," no one is certain of this, not even one who is assured of God in his heart; for if one were to say, "Your sins are forgiven you through the death of Christ Jesus, and you are also made a son of God through Him," these words are the gospel. But no one accepts Christ JESum, because the Father has drawn him. Therefore it follows that as soon as he is drawn, he believes; and if he believes, he is already sure; for because assurance is not there, perfect faith is not there either; but if faith is there, assurance is there also. **What is the need for man's assurance, or absolution, or deliverance?** Doesn't Paul say in Romans 8: "The spirit itself makes known to our spirit that we are children of God"? Do you not see who makes our spirit secure? and Gal. 4: "But that you should be sons, God has sent into your hearts the Spirit of His Son, who cries out, Father!" From this comes the certainty of our spirit, that we are sons of God, not from the saying of the armpit. 1) By this you yourself

1) Mockingly put instead of: Absolvirer.

You may well see that you have not seen the full extent of the glory of the gospel, nor have you really known what the keys (*claves*) are, namely, the preaching of the gospel. And although Christ assigns the binding and unbinding to the disciples, it is of the working Spirit alone. They preached that the Spirit had also made alive in them before, and makes it alive for and where He wills; therefore, out of divine friendship, the apostle's name is given to it, which is of the Spirit alone. As soon as he speaks John 4: "He that trusteth in me, the works that I do shall he do; yea, greater works shall he do." But God alone does the miracles, nor does he put them to our names, so that we may see his love and grace all the more clearly. Here you have overlooked something, you cannot deny it. Item, you have added something to purgatory (is it, as they say); but which the gospel may not suffer. "For he that dieth in faith is saved, and cometh not into judgment or condemnation, but is passed out of death into life," John 5. And if we had to do enough for our sin, or purify ourselves, "Christ died in vain," Galatians 2. For this there was no purgatory before Christ, and it should be built only after the payment for sin is already paid in cash? Item, you have added something to the intercession of the blessed who are in heaven, without reason of Scripture, when we have only one mediator, intercessor and payer 2c., Gal. 3. and 1 Tim. 2. and 1 Jn. 2. and have you been deceived in this by the counter-accusation that the popes make, saying: "They are in love, because love does not fall down", 1 Cor. 13. 8. and therefore they ask for us. For you have not seen here, for one thing, that this little word xxxxxxxx should not be translated: does not fall down, or does not fail; but: love does not fall down, or does not forget to work. For the other, have you not seen that love is not described there as it is in heaven in the blessed, but as it should be with us here, because we are in the valley of tears, of which Paul's description is one, one, one, one, one, one.

Pre-painting. Item, in the matter 1) of images you decide the matter thus: that from the law of Moses only that which is measured by the law of love of neighbor applies to us; now the images are not counted there, therefore one may have them or not; as also Paul is of opinion, since he 1 Cor 8. thus speaks: "We know that the idol is nothing 2) in the world." In which of thy decision [thou] therefore errest, first, that it may be

not to suffer, because your canon or cord is contrary to God's word. For Christ says Matt. 22: "In the two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." So we must measure everything that is written in the Old Testament according to the two laws, namely according to the honor and love of God, and according to the love of our neighbor. If we now measure the images according to the first law of the honor and love of God, then they are completely against God. For the images are erected for worship, after we have taken those to whom they are depicted for helpers and gods. In short, faith should not and may not suffer images to be worshipped, or to stand in such a suit and danger of worship as they are presented in the temples, as Exodus 20 is well understood. If any man say, But if it be taught hereafter so strongly and truly that they should not be worshipped, it is not because they are left standing in the temples, or not: he speaketh out of his own conceit; and considereth not that God, who is eternal wisdom and prudence, hath well known what would come of the presenting of idols, although his word hath written, Thou shalt not worship them, nor serve them, or command discipline; and hath forbidden it. Therefore let us not be wise, neither let us say to God, We will or may have them, if we worship them not 2c. For if we leave them, we give hope to all the ungodly to bring back unbelief, and cause that the youth and descendants for and for may, where a little time the word would be omitted, be led again into idolatry with the present idols. We are certainly told that in some temples in Saxony and other neighboring countries the idols in the temples are placed unequally, one is placed behind, the other on the head, and thus one wants to prove the *indifferentiam*, that is, one may have it or not. This is called being good foolish. If one may have them, let them stand; if one should not have them, what is one doing with them? We speak only of the images that may come into veneration. For we, too, through the bank, have put away only the images that were there to be worshipped. Secondly, you are mistaken in the understanding of Paul's words in 1 Cor. 8: "We know that the idol is of no use in the world: For you think: 3) Paul understands by the word idol the carved or made image, which however is not Paul's opinion, but he wants to say: One knows well, that the gods, of which the

3) In the old edition: ifest.

1) d. i. dispute.

2) In the old edition: nüt.

Idols are nothing 1) as often in the holy scriptures idols are called idols, in derision, *metonymice*, even devils, because they answered out of images. And Paul wills the foolish, who thought that it was nothing that they were in the idols or idolatrous sacrifices, 2) they knew well that the god of the idol that stood there and was worshipped was nothing, therefore they cared little whether they ate with it or not. Yes, Paul wants to reproach the foolish in such a way: We know that idolatry is nothing; or: We know that all idolatry in the whole world is nothing. But that this is the meaning of Paul's words, we can judge from the words that follow from this point on: "and that there is no other God, neither the only one" 2c., by which and by the following words it is clearly seen that Paul did not take this word, idol, for the carved stick, but for the idols to which the images are presented. For no one has the idol for a God, therefore incomprehensibly opposed to it, "and that there is no other God, neither the only one" 2c. And in the same place Paul argues thoroughly against the compassions, that, 3) although they knew well when they boasted that idols were nothing, yet they should not give offense to the simple. Which is right against you, dear Luther, because since the simple and weak are hurt with idols, we should never have an idol in eternity. For to have idols is far more hurtful than to eat meat sacrificed to idols, of which Paul says: "Before he would hurt the weak with it, before he would eat no meat at all," not only to be without meat sacrificed to idols.

5 I have placed this place before your eyes, esteemed Martin Luther, so that you may see that you are not lost in one place, but in many, and that you may hereafter restrain yourself from the high praise among Christians, because you alone have done everything, which we would very much like to grant you, if it were so. But you alone are an honest Ajax or Diomedes among many Nestors, Ulysses, Menelaus. Thu gemach, lassen dich das kleine Lied, von dem Jacobi am dritten Kapititel geschrieben steht, nicht übereilen. We know the fame of Pauli and Demosthenis among the Athenians, also Ciceronis among the Romans, but

1) In the old edition: nützig.

2) In the old edition: "mitmassen". This word is a noun "mitmaß," which means: table companion. Compare the same word toward the end of this paragraph and in No. 24, § 46.

3) In the old edition meaningless: "against those, with masses that, whether they" 2c.

We need to think about this in every way: First of all, who are those who praise us, and then to see whether we are as they praise us. For we truly saw in your beginning where you were lacking, yet we kept silent about it amicably, for your name's sake, but we faithfully practiced the teaching, in which you did not walk rightly, without ceasing, so that there would be very little injury.

(6) If then thou canst not renounce in the good things 4) neither that thou hast failed in them: dear, do not argue thus, because thou seest that thou hast also failed in other places, and say: thou hast also often argued before, and therefore 5) hast not been right; but therefore thou mayest fail 6). So much of your boast, which you lead hiev nevertheless etwas more moderately, neither in other places. For my part, I say that I have always been grateful to those who have taught me, how much more should I be grateful to such an excellent man, whose honor, I know well, will never attain, what should it press me then? But I have my little knowledge from that, as I indicated to you in Latin; and little from you; neither, 7) that I am grateful to God and to you, that you stood out for the first time so graciously.

(7) Therefore, when you make us suspect that we have fallen backward into you, because you brought forth the Scriptures, you do us wrong. For many excellent men have kindly warned thee, saying that thou shouldst bear thyself well, 8) and do nothing out of temptation. I have suffered for myself, since you have given me the fourth time over with unkind writings, when, God willing, I will not let one go out against you, nor have I substituted myself, 9) never again to write against you by name, until you have let secret epistles go out everywhere, and open writings so much that I am forced to jump to the truth.

8) But since you make ten heads 10) of us, you do as through the whole book, which has long since been honestly answered for, you cry out for unk for, as if it had never been thought of. Notice, then, that Christ Jesus, who is the Truth Himself, taught some of the truth of the Gospel in one place by the similitude of drinking water, John 4; in another, John 6, by eating and drinking His flesh and blood; in the third, by an act of the Holy Spirit.

4) i.e. acquit.

5) therefore - in relation to it.

6) but - again.

7) neither, - only.

8) to explore --- to make observations, to investigate.

9) "I had replaced myself" - I had firmly resolved.

10) No. 20 in this volume, § 9.

The likeness of a householder who ordered laborers into his vineyard. On the fourth by the parable of the king who would have prepared a wedding for his son. On the fifth with the likeness of the prodigal son. On the sixth with the likeness of the murderous feudatories who slew the son of their lord. On the seventh with the likeness of water and wine, John 3. On the eighth with the likeness of the vine and the shoot. 1) On the ninth with the likeness of the keys, binding and unbinding. On the tenth with bright words: "God so loved the world that He gave His own Son that we might live", that is good German. And "go ye, preach the gospel," 2c. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." Behold, in how many ways Christ has taught a preaching, and we do not punish him for it. Yea, he hath taught this preeminence in many more ways, and it behooveth us not to preach his discourse in many ways unto the simple, 2) or to cut it, that they may learn the right understanding? How much you yourself have taught by others and others precutting, so that the sum of the sense remains intact, and the words may suffer the *tropos* welfare. Who will reproach you for taking up these words of Paul 2 Corinthians 11: "I have mated to you a pure daughter to give to Christ" in many ways? in the word: pure daughter; in the word: mated; in the word: to give, or to bring; and for this reason no one is reproached for many doubts. Thus, if one person records these words of Christ in the word "that"; another in "is"; the third in "my corpse," so that one meaning remains, and the truth is not only intact, but is only brought forth clearly in this and other places, then there is never any discord.

9) But that you say that we are united in ostracizing Christ, 3) we want to order the right judge, who knows whether it is so for him. It is also well learned in our answer who is most likely to ostracize Christ.

10) Do you also want to say that the devil will attack more articles: baptism, original sin, yes, Christ, that they are nothing. 4) I don't care much about baptism, that Christ is nothing, to overcome the opponents. If they come, we must receive them with the sword of God, just as the ancients did. Now keep thyself before God

well, because of baptism (say those who read your books) you have no other reasons, neither those of the Anabaptists ring 5) may be overthrown. For the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ, his true humanity may not be put into conflict any way before, neither with the doctrine that you lead in this book, as we want to convince publicly afterwards. The original sin says no one, nothing to be; but that it is a pest and disease, not a forfeited guilt of ours, but of the first Aetis 6) Adam 2c. when we wrote about it in Latin. Read it, and what is wrong in it, indicate, will I kindly report or give way. It has probably an old mutton against it in German something brögt, 7) but is not worth that one deß take.

11) The human statutes 8) half that one will have to come to the aid of the disputes, until without worry, as far as you do to him, as we do. We do not forbid any doctrine to be brought to the churches, be it pontifical, pure, 9) turbid or impure; but then we stand over it with the flail 10) of God's word, also lead the treading ox over it and astonish it quite well; then as much falls from some as when evil years are and there is no grain in the chaff. Thy two books, of images and of Christ's supper against the scribblers, have been freely read among us, and therefore threshed out with earnestness, there is nothing left but *inanes paleae*, empty straw, so much as meets the opinion, that is, nothing else, neither appearance of wise words, and is the fig tree, which alone has leaves.

12) Thust well up, 11) if one wants to be of the devil, he will leave us half of the scripture well quiet. Answer: Of course, we would much rather argue with him 12) and you forever in the insurmountable weapons, neither be his. Here we are on the plan. It will not end with a year, when you say that you want to fight with the enthusiasts this year. One year may not be enough. For even though you will give way in this, as I hope to God, even greater heresies will arise only when you yourself are threatening, against which we, with God, will argue more honestly than now with you.

1) i.e. shoots.
2) miglen---lump.
3) durächten -- to pursue. These words are said with reference to No. 2V in this volume, § 9.
4) No. 20 in this volume, § 9.

5) d. i. light.

6) d. i. Father.

7) "brögt" - bleated.

8) No. 20, §10.

9) Here is a play on Luther's name.

10) In the old edition: Pflaget. That "flails" are meant follows from the following.

11) I.e., you claim welfare. Cf. in this volume No. 20, § 10.

12) with him and you --- against him and you.

13th Schreiest: Alas! and alas! 1) About our teaching and writers, that they do not look at a thought ten times, whether it is right before God, before they spew it out. To this I say, like Christ to the weeping women: Weep over yourself, my Luther. If you had considered all things as good, not only ten, but a hundred times more than we have done in all dogmatics, that is, 2) opinions, then your doctrine would now also stand everywhere unconquered, as, by God's grace, ours stands. Go over them and break a dogma for us.

14 Now I must once put your own words, Luther, [Bog.] a. am 4 [Bl.] other Theil [hes Bl.] 2): It is precisely the same devil, who in the end attacks us through the enthusiasts with blasphemy of the holy reverend Sacrament of our Lord Jesus Christ, from which they want to make vain bread and wine into marks or symbols of the Christians, as they dream and like it" 2c. Do not be angry, my dear Luther, I must indeed be astonished at these words, and I must also be surprised at them; 4) only as a test, so that you may see how the whole book would fare if it were to be disheveled properly. 5) First of all, how is it that the poor devil must have done everything to you now, like nobody in my house? I thought, 6) the devil had already been overcome and judged. If then the devil is a mighty lord of the world, as thou hast spoken just before, where is it that all things are done by God's prudence? Say [thou], But he worketh by the devil in you, say ye, may we be against it or not? I mean, no. What kind of Christian are you that you have no mercy on us, seeing that God has given the devil so much power over us? Think about it and ask the devil, is he like that to you? Well known, what does it matter, he will tell you that all false doctrine will only come to nothing when all the hope that you and others have without God's word is accepted; then we will only go without learning anything. Moreover, we may well know whether the contestation of honor stings us in the heart or the love of truth and of our neighbor exhorts us to such a dispute. If, on the other hand, we see the motive for your crying and writing, we will not devil so much,

but we are sorry that Luther and many others do the same, as if they were full of "God who protects us. "Weep with those who weep; seek good from all men," Rom. 12. You call us enthusiasts, and I do not really know what enthusiasts mean. If it is more than a deaf man, a fool, or a foolish wise man, I cannot help but recognize something in myself; so mean and kind is my gracious wife Stultitia (Thorheit) to all men, and to me especially. Oh, I think, Luther, not that you therefore call us enthusiasts; or else you peel us alone with that which is common to all men.

Or is it as much, as *praestigiator*, *fanaticus*, Latin, which we might well call in German a deceiver, sorcerer, fantasist or fool: See, in fact, who are the foolish ones; those who recognize that no other eating of the body of Christ can be, neither the spiritual, which may be unanimous in Scripture everywhere; or those who want to eat him bodily and extend his corpse against all ability of his own word according to the Godhead, want to eat him completely in the mouth of man, and whoever does not desist from this, is a fool, a foolish man, 9) yes, a devil, a murderer and soul destroyer with blasphemy of the holy reverend Sacrament of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Dear Luther, you have outdone yourself. Long before that, you said that no more shameful heresy had not been seen. Everything is too dear. You may not make a thing greater with fine words than it is in itself; but with fine words you may deceive people into thinking that a thing is greater or better than it is; that find *verborum praestigia*, as the merchants and horse-deceivers and traders do. But if thou wilt do well, make the words correspond to the thing. So you will find that much greater heresies are found, neither would this be, if it were an error. You put too much in your mouth. But they blaspheme the holy sacraments, admitting to them that they have not, and admitting to the sacraments, which are nothing else, neither signs of holy things, that they are the holy thing itself; making the creature equal to the Creator, which is not only a blasphemy of the sacraments, but of God Himself, as is well judged from Rom. 1. "Out of these they will make vain bread and wine (you say) the mark or sign of thanksgiving of Christians." In the words thou makest thyself, dear Luther, so suspicious, yea, in all the book, that [it is] a wonder. For thou likewise complainest, as the popes do, of things that are

1) No. 20, § 11.

2) "verricht" will probably mean: brought out of the direction, wrong.

3) No. 20 in this volume, § 12.

4) tubs - swing in the feed pan to clean it from dust.

5) In the old edition: zerzaysen.

6) wond-mentioned.

7) d. i. Gear belts.

8) "full" put by us instead of: full.

9) d. i. Boobies.

you do not have, and have never been promised to you. For what are we promised if we eat the body of Christ in the flesh? But if you preach to us in a good papal way, how sins are forgiven by bodily eating, how faith is strengthened, and how the corpse is preserved in its original state, all without God's word, what do you do differently than the pope? He also says that the blessed oil made holy, took away sin and consecrated. And when you reversed his books, did he not also cry out: "They want to take away the holy sacraments! What do they take away from you, dear Luther, if they teach to keep the sacraments as Christ and the apostles kept them? Nothing else, neither that one does not accept your word for God's word. In this you do us wages and injustice, because we want to make vain wine and bread out of the sacrament. For inasmuch as thou speakest of the whole thanksgiving, we hold that this gathering is to be arranged in such a way that all who see the Lord Christ Jesus 1) to be their Savior give thanks here for the death which he suffered for us, and eat with one another the true sign, so that Paul teaches us that we are] to become one body and one bread. By this you see that we do not make it a vain common bread by custom. For it is a signifying bread and measure 2) than not we, but Paul teacheth 1 Cor. 10. Why then reproachest thou these words, tokens of thanksgiving, tokens (if tokens be taken for good), and emblems? Do you not hear that he says: "One loaf and one body are we the multitude; therefore we eat of one loaf"? But if thou wilt speak of substance or matter alone, whether it be bread, or the flesh of Christ, answer thyself. For you have taught that it is bread, and not the body of Christ, and that in so many places that it is not necessary to tell; but in the bread the body of Christ is eaten. So you have made vain bread and wine of it, not we; for if you look at the custom, you will hear that we do not use it and keep it as simple bread in the evening meal, but for a sign of truth and duty or unification. But if you look at the matter or substance, you have taught that it is nothing but bread. The other thing, when thou sayest: but in the bread is eaten the body of Christ, thou bringest from thine own, not from God; for he saith: "This is my body"; not: in the bread is my body. Why then dost thou lay upon us that which thou hast done? or dost thou measure us in the midst of evil, which thou hast done?

1) i.e. confess.

2) Measures meal. Cf. § 4 of this paper.

as they dream (you continue to speak) and like, they are called "dreamers" by the prophets, Jer. 23, "who speak the poem of their heart: which God does not commend to them, 3) that is what they speak". See now, who dreams more, you or us. You teach so many things without Scripture, and we cry out that you nevertheless teach a thing that we do not teach with honestly understood Scripture. That you teach without Scripture you cannot deny; for you may not present what you teach. See then, dear Luther, I have intended these mean words of yours to endure you to good, 4) only that you may see how all your veins in the book are only shameful and perverse words, and that you speak against yourself publicly. For that which you taught before, you now reproach others for. And saith Paul, Gal 2: "If I build again that which I brake before, I make myself a transgressor."

16 When you therefore pretend that we acted with such a stupid, despondent conscience that you think we want the beer to be back in the barrel, 5) you are speaking from a wrong mind. For our submission, which we have always made free to all Christians to consider and, where we were wrong, to inform ourselves, you have dragged us along in Carlstadt's recantation, as if it came from wavering: but in this (praise be to God) we have done much more Christian, neither you. For we wanted to leave all churches and every man free in his judgment, not to do violence to anyone's judgment with our iniquity; but you have taken a stand with such words: if it were a matter of your standing from your opinion, one should not be moved by it, but think that you have fallen from the truth. How then will it be possible for you to be told what you have already told? Shall it be so that a prophet does not let himself be instructed by another prophet, as Paul teaches in 1 Cor. [Chapter 14, then each one will say what he wants, and conspire to depart, which will be right in the church of the devil, but not in the church of Christ, in which also the prophets give and loose to those who sit and flare up, 6) if God has opened something to them. Instead of giving and loosing 7). Neither do we have repentance of the wine poured out. 8) We truly like it

3) emfiehl - commands.

4) i.e. to accept, to receive.

5) No. 20, § 13.

6) Resolvers - listeners; put by us instead of: "Resolvers".

7) d. i. listen.

8) i.e. we do not want the beer back in the keg.

for the good of the whole community. For we have enough of this, praise be to God, that is, we have enough of all kinds of advice, enough of weapons, and enough of heart. We do not want to take away anyone's judgment with our power.

17 You admit to the Germans, 1) "that they fall for new things like fools, whoever resists them, they only become more mad about it: but if no one resists them, they themselves become full and tired. That rhymes well, if they are such careless people, yes, fools, as you say, and fall so easily, then do not hinder them, so they themselves become full and fall from it. But I hear well, if thou knowest their ways, and warnest them, and knowest that they do nothing that thou wouldst like to see them do. Dear, how does this speech rhyme with your intentions, neither that you want to eat everything that comes into your mouth? What have the pious, simple-minded Germans done to you?"

18) You hope that no teacher of heresy will be converted. 2) Yes, you say that it is not heard that no one has ever been converted. Why do you speak such words, knowing that you speak falsehood? What greater heresy is it than to teach that we are saved by our own works? For heresy sheds Christ. Now you have taught and kept the same heresy, for you have been a monk for a long time because of it; but now God has pardoned you, and you recognize your error. How many are they? Or are you lacking in this example; then take Carlstadt, who first (when you were speaking) brought this error onto the path. He has openly recanted, and has turned back from the error. Probo; for you gave him an open declaration of this in an open print. If he has done so, why do you say that no one has ever been converted? If he has not, why do you give out an open lie about him?

19. Christ has not converted any high priests, but their disciples have; more are enough against you, but not against us. For you, compared to him, are the high priest who does it all, and we poor, unlearned, foolish, devilish little enthusiasts. For this reason God has given us foolish ones and small ones 3) to know and accept the truth, and has darkened you wise ones, "so that you see with seeing eyes and do not know, hear and do not understand," Isa. 6.

20. that you count us among the false apostles, recognize GOD; but that you have rejected the word of Paul:

"If you have warned a heretical, self-centered person the other time, you should avoid him," you should also know that it points to you. For you have testified that you will not deviate from your opinion, so we have always promised to take report as soon as we are instructed with God's word. In turn, you are sufficiently rebutted, but you do not want to give way; this is what Paul calls pushing. 4) But I realize very well what you want to reckon here for a heretical perseverance: anyone whom you warn, but do not desist; but that is too much. For he is heretical who is overcome, and nevertheless adheres to him, and does not want to take warning. Where have you overcome us? May we not say that you are heretical? because you do not want to be rebuked, you have also testified to this. But not so. Let us bring forth the Scriptures without deceit and wrath, and then let the church of Christians judge; it will well meet it, provided it has the united breath of the church.

21) The example you give with the painted glass 5) belongs to you. For thou hast the painted glass, that is, thy own design before thine eyes, out of which thou speakest what thou wilt, even that which is contrary to faith and scripture. But we have the Scripture, the unpainted glass, and what that pretends to be, that is as it pretends to be. But here we must see that our eye is not strained; 6) for if it is, it does not help that the glass is clear. For if the eye is dark, how great will the darkness become?

(22) Saying, if you do not convert any of the rebels, you will have washed your hands and done what you have done. You are right. Be calm now. I will surely assure you that God will not reproach you for it. Only let it be that you can give good account for the resistance.

23) Our writings (you say) made you strong and full of joys. 7) I believe that, yes, the truth is dearer to you than it should be, because we bring it forth strong with God. But if this is not the case, then you are as happy as that priest, whom the maidservant had roughed up, that he grinned, and when the neighbors came, he said: he laughed at the sausage, [which] the cat had stolen from the grate. I know well the joys who speak such kind, honorable, chaste words as you do in this book. I have read it with the Anabaptists...

4) i.e. avoid.

5) No. 20, § 16.

6) i.e. defective, damaged.

7) No. 20, § 17. This is said by Luther in a completely different sense.

1) No. 20, § 14.

2) No. 20, § 16.

3) Kleinfügen --- Geringen.

They're as happy as if they were at a wedding in hell.

You also put on us how we boast how holy martyrs 1) we are, how much we suffer, how patient we are 2c. and you go on with so many Alfanzian, mocking words that it is an effort 2) among Christian people to let go of such a dishonorable, lewd speech, which may offend so badly on all people's tongues. I am silent that you speak the untruth, that we ever make such fame of ourselves. Read all my writings, and if you find one of the boasts now counted, then I have spoken the truth. Much less Oecolampadius. And drive this hard and strong throughout the whole book, so that it may be seen that [the] proverb is true, since it is said: He who wants to speak and does not have the truth, must lie; for everything that you complain about, how you were scolded, [you] wrote. Neither my word nor pen hath ever reproached thee an idolater or denier of Christ. Say that you are not what some may say about you, and let God rule accordingly. But if any man say such things against thee, and do thee wrong, see now that thou do not that to any man which thou hast so disliked; so shalt thou not lie against us one lie upon another.

(25) Some have said, for the sake of peace, that this thing is not so great that it should be broken up. But they have spoken rightly for the sake of disruption; for not only the matter, but none in the church of God, shall cause disruption, but one shall loosen the other, and if the truth be heard, the erring man shall depart. As we had indicate from 1 Cor. chapter 14: "Let the elder also," according to Christ's teaching, "be as the younger," and "the forerunner as the servant." But where this is not done, the children of the flesh begin [to] quarrel, not wanting to be overcome. Saying, "Who hath written Zwinglin and Oecolampadium called?" 5) He who has preached to us, I hear well, we should not have written without your leave? Who has allowed us to write before? And since we have [to] write, we touched you ienen 6) unkindly? Yes, how long have we been silent to your secret and public scolding? You have an angry unfounded epistle to the von Rütlingen

written. A proud one, yes, so haughty to those at Strasbourg that they spared yours in it, that they did not let it go out. After that, Carlstadt's recantation, in which you singled me out by name. Fourth, the Swabian booklet with our great disgrace. To all of which I kept silent, but against others showed the reasons all the way, or vice versa, which you lacked, or forgave, and did not touch your name, so that you, first, may find no cause for quarrel. Second, that thy other doctrine, which thou hast well and rightly led, be not cast into suspicion or doubt. Have yet, so that the error does not break in, since you wrote for the fifth time the shameful epistle in Latin to the chariot 8), not in German, but also in Latin, written with quite a different discipline to you, neither you now break out in German. See now who is the wolf that has wanted to have peace by force, and who are the sheep that have sought nothing else but peace. For since we had known the truth, and opened [the same], who would have told us that Luther would neither report nor make peace with the divine truth, nor with the friendship of those who were so secret to him with writings? Helias does not make discord, but Ahab. For that one leads God's word, and this one gave nothing for it, 3 [1] Kings 18.

(26) Our work is not to learn to say wine and bread, but to learn to know that wine and bread are not God, as you yourself profess; otherwise they would become Ceres and Bacchus; and to see that they are not to be worshipped, as you have taught without any reason of truth in the book of the worship of the Sacrament. Also, when you complain that we do not consider anyone spiritual or learned who does not hold to our opinion, you look at me as if it grieves you that you are not considered as learned as you are. So long, erudite Luther, we considered you much more learned than you are, but God does not want to give us that, but thrusts our foolish rights 9) into our eyes 2c.

You put a curse on our love and say: 10) It should be a Lutheran warning. I mean, since you have stretched out your neck, no gentle thing should come out of your mouth, but

1) No. so, § 18.

2) In the old edition: "a Müy", probably a print".

3) In the old edition: "bygen".

4) No. 20, § 23.

5) No. 20, § 22.

6) d. i. any.

7) i. e. nowhere.

8) Herwagen, printer in Strasbourg. Luther's letter to him is found with the correct date, September 13, 1526, Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1962. In De Wette, vol. III. p. 201, erroneously placed in the year 1527. However, this error has been improved by Seidemann, vol. VI, p. 510.

9) i.e. foolishness.

10) No. 20, § 24.

the open grave should give such breath. But that you are so merciful to us immediately after that that you also want to lay the blame on the devil, you do this out of false presumption, because you have been pressing on us from the beginning, as we have a counsel: we are desperate about the matter, therefore we say that it is not a big matter whether it comes to danger, that it is only 1) a small matter 2c., with many fictitious words. He who calls this matter small does it for your sake, for since you have no promise of bodily food, you cannot complain that they want to counterfeit or take away the divine promises from you. And to make small is no other than to say, What do you complain of? What is going on with you? 2c. I do not estimate it small with myself, to pretend without Scripture, or to build on Scripture, wrongly understood. It will also be ring 2) for us to preserve our doctrine through all writing. For if the thirsty man 3) wants to hear God's word, we have overcome; if he does not want to hear it in this piece, he will not hear it in other pieces either; for, in short, no excerpt will help. He who does not want to hear God's word in this matter as much as in others, wants to use God's word only for his own benefit or pleasure. If it is true in one thing, it is also true in another. Yes, it alone shall decide everything.

28) And when you therefore dismissed the matter, that either they or we blasphemed God, you said: 4) "Now let every devout Christian see whether this matter is small, as they say. There you have the blasphemers and their spirit." Speak also to us, how we count God's word small: and do us violence in all things. For that which we teach in this, we do out of faithfulness to and magnifying of God's word; for Christ Jesus immediately said, "Again I leave the world, and go to the Father," John 16, and: I shall be no more in the world," John 17, 2c., -when he had said: "This is my body," 2c. Should we now leave the word: "I shall henceforth be no more in the world", and not consider what it wants and is able to do, because Luther is on the contrary? I mean, no! It is to be taken into consideration immediately as well as: "This is my corpse", and this immediately as well as that. So you note that we do not magnify God's word in one place and deny it in another, but you do. For what we say against you, you shout hard like a

Tauber: I remain on the meager words of Christ; just as if we indicated next to them, which are not also precious and Christ's. Is this a clean, Christian judgment? Is this a clean, chaste, Christian judgment? and although the saying of Jacob 2, "He who lacks in one is guilty of the whole transgression," does not reach where you draw it, nor is it that he who lacks in one place is therefore guilty of the whole faith. So Assa did not remove the altars 5) in the high places, was nothing less a friend of God, 3 [1] Kings 15 [v. 14] The Christians initially thought that Peter should not preach the gospel to the Gentiles. See if this is a small error, and were nothing less Christians, Apost. 11. 2c. The Scriptures are full of these things. So you speak into (the) air what the wrath states, but which is not according to the truth. Now this must not be; we firmly believe that the words of Christ, "This is my body," are his. But this we do not believe, that these words, spoken or thought, or, which way thou wilt, practiced, make the body of Christ a bodily food to us, as thou speakest openly; yea, let it be eaten with the mouth. For this reason we have no promise, but we have a bright word against it, "I leave the world," and "I will no longer be in the world. And so the chip is from the understanding of the words; not whether the words are God's words or not.

29 Therefore, when you speak of nothing, neither of a fanatic, nor of a reprobate, nor of a blasphemer, nor of a liar, nor of a devil, nor of a seducer, after your own manner, you do so only to stir up the fire with cruel words, and to incite the simple to reject, more out of temptation of wrath, the gathering together of Scripture, nor to discipline the invention of truth. You also say that with this error we bring many souls into the hellish fire. You must have a word of God about this, or else you will not bring us further into hell with your word, nor the pope with his. Now then, let him who does not eat the body of Christ bodily with his mouth be damned. Do you see now how you stand? Like the pope, you speak out of temptation, and if you are asked, you have no reason. Yes, God has said, "This is my body." Surely he has spoken it, who doubts it? But where did he say that we should make him for and for and eat him with our mouths? Where did he promise us salvation for the sake of oral and bodily eating? or, if we did not eat it in this way, condemnation? So your un-Christian

5) In the old edition: "Aelter" and "Höhinien".

1) "only" put by us instead of: well.

2) ring - light.

3) d. i. Pursuer.

4) No. 20, § 27.

1) and reviling alone on the ground of your poem, since you also promise life with food and deny it with non-eating; behold, who swarms the most ?

30. Accordingly, [you] come forth with such weak disorderly stuff that, while you bring forth God's word, you may not quickly say: Thus, or thus, shall the words be understood; but thou dost beforehand all along a long insult, that the simple may be introduced with thy authority or name, to which he gives much credence, to astonish thine adversaries, and with such contestation thereafter not baptize thine unfounded opinion, but with thy insult, as with a forest water, be accepted, and with thee also rage and cry: Flesh and blood, words are dry. Dear, why do you do this? If you have a good thing, why don't you do it stiffly and 2) in a triumphant way? Thou hast read in Tullio and Fabio that those who have good things should present them thoroughly and earnestly, and need no blasphemy or suspicion; but those who have not good things are apt to puff themselves up with blasphemy and suspicion. As you do here, you say: 3) "Now that we come to the meeting, let us take before us the saying of Christ." And you do not take it before you, until you have made your adversary more objectionable (than you think) with much disgrace and blasphemy, which is all an indication that you do not hope to gain anything for the cause, but you may well want to make the person hateful, you think. So the popes do to him, call the gospel Lutheran, and then reproach Luther for the greatest heretic that ever was, so that the simple church has an abhorrence of the matter, as if it could be nothing good, if it were handled by such a wicked man. And so you tell us how we are uncertain, how we boast, how we cry for peace, must also cry for peace and write unjustly; and you do this throughout the whole book, but everywhere with alfa or untruth. For how certain we are, you can well see from our words and reasons, for you yourself say that we swear that we are certain, which is also untruth. But that we do not want to infringe on anyone, nor do we want to distort the church's judgment with our name, 1) you turn that back on us.

per callumuiLm to Argem. Half of the boasting [you] have heard before, that you deny us sacrilegiously. So it is also a sacrilegious traffic, that we cry out for peace for fear alone. For, my dear Luther, what matter or doctrine is there in the whole voice of faith to which we do not speak with peace? Thus thou pressest the prophetic word upon us, "They speak peace against their neighbor, but evil in their hearts." And if you look at our work in the Lord, you will find by God's grace gold, silver, precious stones, and a goodly building, if only the tree can be recognized by its fruit. Why dost thou reproach us with strife, when our church is in great peace, as much as it should be peace, when perhaps not all churches are? But see thou what peace thou seekest. For an epistle is carried about under your name to a prince, in which it is written among 5) others: . Now it is time to strike. Dear, what else shall the word teach us, neither that thou wilt defend thy cause with the word, that is, that princes shall smite? Now see how you seek peace, and how we! Do you write such secret writings to the princes, and yet you write publicly that you want to fight with us only with the one word, my dear, how does this fit together? Have we not all taught from the beginning that one should not teach the papacy with one's fist 6) but with the Scriptures? And that is why I will henceforth generally transgress your invectives, falsehoods, falsifications, lies, and all such things, for they all come from impotence of mind and mistrust of the matter, and mostly rely on the thick, solid Scriptures, and in the well-founded 7) arguments. Until you, simple reader, also a simple dissolver and judge.

31 When you now, dear Luther, thus state that you alone want to take the precious words: "This is my body" and overcome us, you need an evil advantage under the guise of honesty 8) and security. For throughout the whole book you should never act on these words alone, but always add the words, "He who is given for you," as Lucas and Paul have. For two reasons. [One is that the two wrote after Matthew and Mark, and no doubt omitted words of theirs, which were more diligently kept together, that the thing might be the more truly judged what sin is.

1) Perhaps: Schalkheit treiben? In the old edition: Schelten. Compare in the next §: "Beschelkung" and "Schelkung".

2) In § 34 of this writing, "drungen" - close.

3) No. 20, § 33.

4) i.e. to tear.

5) So put by us instead of and".

6) In the old edition: Funst.

7) d. i. founded.

8) In the old edition: Redliche.

nes would have them. The other is that these words are as precious and bright as those: "This is my body. Therefore we may brightly judge that, if we should understand the words, "This is my body," to mean that the body of Christ would be there: so we should also by the: "Who is given for you," which are alike as light and barren as those, we should understand that we must ever eat the body of Christ as he hung on the cross, for he is visibly and sufferably given up for us; so we should eat him also. Yes, you say, just as 1) you want to benefit us, I do not want to take before me more than the words "this is my body", as Matthew and Marcus have them. How? Do Paul and Lucas count for nothing with you? Do you not know that even the scholars of the law have a rule, where they have two laws, and in the younger one something further, brighter or more narrow (*sic*) is understood, neither in the older one, that therefore the old one is not reviled, if one looks only at the younger and brighter one? but so it is to be considered that the time in which the old law was made, the customs and piety were still so simple, that it was enough for the pious with few words. But as the world becomes more and more cunning, and everyone takes the liberty of circumventing the law, it is necessary to explain for and against. The two holy evangelists Matthew and Mark did the same, presenting the words in a simple way, so that such words were understood by the Hebrews as "this is my body", for: "this is the memory of my body". But in the times of Paul and Luke it was seen that the gospel would also come to the Gentiles, and for them they took care that the words would not remain unrecognized to them, or be misunderstood, and they carefully added the word of Christ, which the others both omitted. Now see if you are not caught in an open alanza; 3) for throughout the whole book you take the words: "who is given for you" no more than in three places (unless I have overcounted), and yet in the same places, nor throughout the whole book, you do not speak a word of it, but exceed it in all places, and hear that we cry out like a bugle that the words "who is given for you" are the sign or handle by which one learns the meaning of the previous words, "this is my body.

32 So now, dear Luther, I want to ask you whether

1) i.e. as if.

2) ring -light.

3) In the old edition: erwütsche.

Do you want to leave us the words: "Who is given for you", and let the sign of Lucas and Paul be considered as good as Matthäi and Marci, or not? If you say yes, then we must not do any more work; but the few words as reported before indicate to us enough that the previous words, "this is my body," must be taken meaningfully; for if they were to be taken according to the dry understanding, then it must also follow according to the dry understanding that we must eat him as he hung on the cross for us and was given up. Here you all cry out (but you especially) that the believer should not ask afterwards how he is to be eaten. Thank you! But we sing after him. For he said at once, "He that is given for you," or he said, "This is my body. So I do not have to jump over the words, but I want to understand them as right and true, because they are the words of my God, as well as the previous ones. But they teach me that if it is the body of Christ that is given for us, and we know very well that it is given painfully and sensitively, then there must be two things: either that the body of Christ must be eaten visibly and sensitively, or else that the preceding words may not be taken in the sense that they are supposed to have in the first place. Yes, these words are capable of so much (that will first hurt you) that they force us to understand the previous ones in the sense used 4), and yet they remain in their natural sense: This is the memorial or meaning of my body, which is given for you. Behold, how our (yea, yours also) words also remain in their natural form and understanding in your proper sense. And have already overcome you, that you must understand them in a right sense, but the same in another form of words. And do not help shouting: Let not the anterior words, "This is my body," be changed; but let not the posterior ones be so grossly understood, that we eat him as he was hanged upon the cross, visible and sensible; for the posterior ones are very unwilling to suffer understanding, that we should say, He is there who suffered death, but unsufferingly; for he did not suffer death unsufferingly; or, He is there as he was after the original 5). For he saith, "He that is given up for you," not, He that is risen from the dead. For when he is risen from the dead, he neither dies nor suffers, and always says, "He who is given up for you.

4) d. i. tropical.

5) i. Resurrection.

will give you". For he is not given in death without suffering, and yet is without suffering after the original state.

If you say no, you do not want to have the words with you, then we could sing the song to you right away as a good thing and with the truth: Enthusiasts, Enthusiasts! as you do us. But we do not doubt that you will not deny them, but will gladly have them with you. For if not, We would compel thee with other places of Scripture, unless thou wouldest deny all Scripture. And the same work we will gladly have here for the sake of the simple, who thus note: **Of considering the Scriptures against each other.**

34 The word of God is therefore a perfect thing, not deceived, so that in it there is nothing inconsistent, nothing unintelligent, nor repugnant. For where we do not understand it, the lack is not of the word, but of the conceit and gloom of our minds. Now where words are not joined together, but have a form that is thought to be repugnant in the first sight to some other words spoken or written elsewhere, they should be set off against each other, and the sense of one place should not be taken according to the first sight, so that it may also suffer the other; but it should be understood and interpreted in all respects in view of what is opposed to it. Everything is made clear with examples. Arrius, a pernicious heretic, took the words of John 14, "The Father is greater, neither I," as a screen of his error, for he said that Christ was not truly the Son of God, and co-equal and mighty with the Father, that he himself had said, "The Father is greater, neither I." Then Arrius should have measured besides the words, John 3: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that every one" 2c. in which he calls himself the only begotten Son of God. For the Father and the Son must be of one nature. He should also have judged the same: "I and the Father are one thing", Joh. 10. Also: "All that the Father has is also mine", Joh. 16. Also: "He was well aware that the Father had given all things into his power", Joh. 13. If Arrius had looked at the places without number in the Gospel of John and elsewhere, besides those "the Father is greater than I," he would have found that he must have understood the words to refer only to human nature, that according to it he is less than the Father, not according to divine nature. Now this is an example of the places in Scripture that do not stand 1) next to each other,

1) d. i. near.

But they must be set off against each other. How much more should words not be divided from one another, which are opposed to one another, and if one part is separated from the other, the meaning is broken, made imperfect or obscure? Example: Christ says to John, John 13: "He it is to whom I offer the bread I have put in the oven." If we omit the word "to whom I offer the dunked bread" here, there is no more, because: "it is he"; then Christ would have shown him with his finger, and did not follow, which afterwards is written: "and when he dunked the bread, 3) he gave it to Judah" 2c. Item Matth. Cap. 1. the angel says: "Joseph, do not be afraid to take Mariam, your spouse, to yourself; for that which was in her is of the Holy Spirit." If we omit the following word, "for that which is born in her is of the Holy Spirit," the meaning remains imperfect, and Joseph is not made calm, although the birth is spoken to him, "Fear not to take Mariam thy spouse unto thee"; but if the following is added, all doubt is accepted: "for that which is born is of the Holy Spirit. Notice here, my dear Luther, that I am only telling you about the *relative* or *demonstrative* manifestations. Item John on the third: "No one ascends to heaven without the Son of Man, who is in heaven." If one should omit the word "without the Son of man," nothing would remain, for "no one goes up to heaven." Therefore it is necessary not only to speak of this, but also to understand what belongs to it. Item John in the 4th chapter, the Samaritan woman says: "Come and see a man who has told me everything I do. If I want to omit the following part, "He who has told me everything that I do," then nothing more remains than: "Come and see a man. But what miracle would it have been to see a man? Item John in the 6th chapter Christ says: "Not that any man hath seen the Father, but he that is of God hath seen the Father." If then "without him who is of God, he has seen the Father," nothing remains but that no one has seen the Father. From this it follows that Christ has not seen him either. But if you leave the words together, they will become clear, and the part that follows will give light to the part that goes before, so that it may be well recognized and understood.

35 So it is also with the words of Christ, "This is my body"; if you cut the one "who is for you," you will have the same thing.

2) d. r. near.

3) In the old edition: dünket.

If you leave them at that, then you see the natural, actual meaning that is in them, as the sweet kernel in the hard, unsweet shell, namely, that this feast or bread is a meaning or memorial of the corpse of Christ, which corpse is given up for us. Now consider, dear Luther, your insolent, uncouth words, überhinschnaußen, waschen, flatter (which I do not actually understand all of) and see who jumps over. You skip this word, which is so clear throughout the whole book, that you do not say a word about the understanding that is gauged from it, but you do not overlook a dirty word. If the same is called wash, flutter, snort over, 1) then see, wedre Part das more thue. Now you have, I hope, bright before the eyes, that one understands that you stand out from Alfan, not, from joyful confidence in the thing. Yes, I alone will take the dry words, and will pass them. 2) For the heretic Arrius also took the thin words, "The Father is greater than I." And yet there is such unity in these words that they cannot be divided. Mark, thou simple one, when I say to my companion, "Saw! he does not know whether I am paying him for a new meal, or where he should eat it in my name, or why I am giving it to him; but as soon as "you lent me" is added, he is already told that it is the six kreuzers that he lent me before for a night meal. So here the words "which is given for you" may not be left behind without our willful misunderstanding; for although they are the more subsequent ones, they nevertheless give the foremost understanding and light.

36) Accordingly you attack us, 4) I say, "is" is taken for "means"; and Ecolampadius says: "My body" means as much as "my body's sign". And you devil and defy that, where we are not armed against the words of God. Grace, [we] would cheaply flee. But we do nothing from the dust; we have been accustomed to break down idols and altars, which you teach that one should have, so that one may learn to kneel with both knees: teaching that one should not worship idols, and teaching in the midst that one should not worship the idols.

that we have just worshipped. What else can it be, neither can it be kept, if it comes to being worshipped again? Do not be angry, I must also agree with you in the middle, because you are so happy, but not so that it is to your shame, but to teach you, along with all those who do not yet recognize the wretched idolatry, blinded by you. Yes, if you attack the matter with many obscene words, this is the sum that you lead there: we wrote such things from distant heads, and then it should be enough. [You] also give such a pitiful example, 5) that I am surprised that such sloppy work comes out of your workshop. Namely, this pretending of ours is the same as if one did not want to believe that the world was created by God, and if one reproached him: God created the heavens and the earth in the beginning, he would say: "God" means a guggler, 6) "created" means eaten 2c. And the rest you say with many loose words. Look here, dear Luther, how much you forget yourself; since you think you are giving an example or a similarity, you are giving a dissimilar and inconsistent one. For perceive, we stand and bring many writings, in which "is" is taken for "means," so you stand alike as a drunken peasant, who also takes up the bagpipe, and lüderlet, 7) but which no measure sees alike. For where does the word "God" appear in the Scriptures, so that it is taken for a "Gugger"? So if you wanted to bring in a crooked thing, you should have indicated that the word "GOD" is also taken for a guggler in the Scriptures, and thus have first made such a crooked thing in another place, since it did not rhyme; but if you cannot do this, then you come in with such a reel. It seems to me that you can neither come out of the matter with equals nor with inequals, for all your parables are inequals. But you come to the last and say: 8) you do not mean to touch Zwingli with examples, nor Ecolampadium, to whom God has given so many gifts, but the mocking devil, who has deceived us. Dear, then write out the devil's unedited parables, with which you do not want to offend us, from this book, and send it to St. Bernard's Mountain, or to hell, so that they do not go around in the world under your name.

37. you also cry out, you want to cling to the simple words (for I will give you all the

1) The expression used by Luther No. 20, § 48, is: vorüberrauschen, likewise § 58; "überhinschnaußen" ----- to drive over with the muzzle.

2) insist fix.

3) The sense demands such an intervention.

4) No. 20, § 36.

5) No. 20, § 37.

6) d. i. Cuckoo.

7) "lüderlet" will probably mean: Songs whistles.

8) No. 20, § 42.

read your clumsy 1) in the piece zemen, and accordingly give clear answer about it). And as soon as we speak: Now therefore, let him say: "Take, eat, this is my body"; here this little word "this" points to the bread, so the pope is right with the transformation of the substance; for if [that] which he shows is the body of Christ, and he shows the bread, then the bread should be the body of Christ: then thou and thy multitude answer, This is not the sense of the words, but bread remains bread, and in the bread one eats the corpse of Christ; as Mr. Johann Pomeran, your pastor, speaks to you. Do you see that you are the first who does not remain with the simple words? For Christ did not speak: My body is in the bread, or, is eaten in it, or, This is bread and my body, when in some places you also speak out brightly. Behold, how thou dost dwell so prettily on the simple words! Again, if we say, "If it is necessary to keep to the simple words, do not take away from us the word "which is given for you," for it must follow that we eat in all manner and measure the body of Christ which is given for us," then you say, "We are fools, asses' heads, and foolish, and cannot understand that the words should not be so roughly understood. As if the words "which is given for you" in the natural dry way (as you speak) meant anything else, neither the very body that is slain for us. So we must also eat him as he was when he was killed. For when you say that we asses' heads do not understand, we, Lord God, well understand that you would like to understand it in a metaphysical way; but it may not suffer your pretence, since you say that we would like to remain with the simple words; for they bear the simple meaning that the body of Christ is given to be eaten, just as it was given for us in death. But this you deny, yes, all men, because we would have to feel him thus 2c. But here (as I hope) thou feelest a fault in thyself, that thou art unwise in declaring thyself to be willing to abide in the simple words, and abidest not in one thing, according to the simple sense. You cry out that we are mad and do not know it; dear, yes, teach us to know turnips. See how it would be with you now, if we had intended to hail you with evil words, as you do. Yes, you cry out, who does not believe the simple words, God punishes him

1) d, i. your inconsistencies. In the old edition: "one", probably just a misprint. - "zemen" == together.

2) i.e. sophistry.

3) Maybe: "want"?

of falsehood, he is an antichrist, a hypocrite, a murderer, a heretic, a mischievous man, a swindler, a show-off 2c. And do thou never speak of letting them remain in the simple mind, for if they remain in the simple mind throughout the bank, the pope has taught most rightly, eat the body of Christ here, how great and long he was in the manger and on the cross suffering 2c. For the pope can also cry out for it: Do not ask afterwards how it happened, you certainly eat him, even if you do not feel it. Is not everything possible for God? In short, you bring no other reason that the pope did not bring to shield his error. As you have so often told us that we asked God for His omnipotence, because it is well possible for Him; and in the midst of this you say that it does not apply to conclude a *possibili ad necessarium*, that is, from God's ability to be.

38 Therefore, simple Christian, for Luther may not learn from us that this word "is" in Scripture is taken for "means", we have drawn in many undoubted places, which Luther childishly taunts 4) and tickles some, but may not substantially affect them. For since Gen. 41. says: "The seven fat cows are seven fruitful years; and the seven withered ears are seven hungry years"; and since in both places "are" is taken for "means", they cannot say otherwise, neither it stands there in the interpretation of a dream or face. As if they wanted to take something away from Joseph's speech, because he interprets a dream; nor is the interpretation a perfectly true speech, and now all the more precious that it is an interpretation, which has become so true; nor is "are" taken for "means", they cannot deny, therefore they want to say a lame word about it: It is in an interpretation of a dream. Immediately as that one, to whom one raised, 5) he had eaten thirteen large pieces of fish, he said: Yes, only 6) carps. So their answer is, not that they could deny that "are" here is taken for "mean", but it is written in an interpretation of a dream. It was only carps. Nor did he eat the fish; nor is "are" taken for "mean" here. But with it Gal. 4. stands: "These are the two testaments", for: The things, or sons of Abraham, "signify" the two testaments. They have not yet practiced this. 7) Item, Matth. 11. stands: "He is Elijah", Christ speaks of John, for: That is written of Elijah,

4) In the old edition: pfätzt und kützlet.

5) i.e. interpreted, reproached.

6) In the old edition: well.

7) i.e. believed, split.

"means" John. We would like to hear here how the opponents would do to us if we would say: we would stay with the simple words, because Christ has said: "If you want to believe it, he is Elijah, who is hereafter. Therefore he must be the right Elijah, Christ has spoken it, therefore he must be it. For God is well pleased that Elijah should be born again of Elizabeth. Want to say something of the παλιγγενεσία or μετεμψυχώσει of the philosophers.

They would undoubtedly cry out: "Behold, what ignorant fools, swarmers, gushers! you know nothing in the Scriptures. In the first chapter of Luke it says: "He shall come before him with the spirit and power of Elias. Here you see that he is called Elijah by the spirit and power with which he was like Elijah, but not essentially Elijah. Answer: But God thanks you for bringing the truth yourself, not willingly, but out of unawareness, namely, that one should not be foolish about the simple letter 1) where there is something in another place that is contrary to it, much less where there are words that may be used to illuminate those that come before it. Still, here the word "is" is not taken for "being," but for "being like" Elijah, or that John is signified by Elijah's name, as Malach. 4. and Matth. 17. is more likely.

39 Item, that we have indicated from 1 Cor. 10: The rock was Christ," Luther storms with such arrogant words that, if he had anything to do with it, no one would think it unreasonable that he thus rages; but if they have no power, he creates as much as if one wanted to storm a strong castle with words. First of all, he makes interpretation into interpretation (I mean, he thinks of the song that God speaks in his mouth as one speaks); if it is done by turning right words into mocking ones, Luther has won far ahead of us, for he knows the art so well that no one will undoubtedly do it to him. But this may not make the matter different in itself, nor change the truth. For the great man does not become small, whether he is called little Hans, or the small man great, if he is called Hans. [Such a theologian should be far from such wanton: superfluous spittle. On the other hand, he charges with an open lug and speaks: 2) Since I should indicate to Mr. Johann Pomeran that "is" in Scripture would be taken for "means", I pretty to sing a song about my suffering. For in the whole booklet there is not one word neither about my suffering nor work. In addition stand in the same

1) perhaps: to quarrel?

2) No. 20, § 48.

Book three places on each other, since "is" is taken for "means". Ex. 12, Matth. 11 and Gal. 4 are drawn beyond the lists 3). Then I get into a delusion that Luther wrote this book solely on the opponents 4) since our books are forbidden to be read, he may lie about us as he pleases. For we are not released from our responsibility, just as a grocer among ignorant people sold goats for lorbs 5) lied a lot about what virtue they had 2c. Thirdly, he twisted my words, as if I had said that Paul said, "The rock means Christ," which is not so, but he said: The rock was Christ, and [now] I have spoken no other word than Paul's, "The rock was Christ," but much more than, "The rock is Christ. For if I had spoken that, it would not have served my purpose; but such things are written, that one might find cause for many words and enchantments, and that the book might grow large, that one might despair of answering it. Now these are the reasons for Luther to turn us around, so that here "to be" is not taken for "to mean. And then he adds: Christ was the real true rock, he was the spiritual rock, and the like; but all this is nothing, because the laborious and weak word fight is as Paul speaks. Therefore, notice that even if we deny all our lives that there is no *tropus* in the words "the rock was Christ," we get nothing else, neither that Christ was a natural stone 7) or rock; for in short, *petra* actually means a rock. Just as if one Luc. 15. made Christ out of the fattened calf (because he meant himself by it), he wanted to say: Yes, he is the right calf, which is killed for us; and did not want to give way by the word "right calf", but should not mean anything else to him, neither that Christ is meant by the calf there. Wouldn't that be a peculiar 8) boor? For even though Christ says, "My flesh is truly meat," or, the right certain food; still his flesh and the word food are taken tropically or otherwise, namely, his flesh for his death, and food for the nourishment of the soul. So here, Christ is the right calf, taken for, Christ is the right slain sacrifice, signified by that calf. And there:

3) Lists --- Edge.

4) Geginnen --- areas.

5) d. i. Goat droppings for laurels.

6) i.e. desecrate.

7) Rugged ----- steep slope.

8) i.e. more opinionated.

"Christ was the right rock", which was signified by the physical rock. For as soon as we recognize that Christ is not a substantial rock, the trope, that is, the other mind, is there from the beginning. But Luther says: "It is well known how Christ is a rock; he is the spiritual rock, for it says before it: 'They all drank from the spiritual rock'; so you can see that he is only called a spiritual rock. But for this reason I give him thanks that he brings back the brat like the fox. So, I hear, the tropical words, 'But the rock was Christ,' must again be opened up and made intelligible by the words that precede them, and it does not behoove me to make a rock out of Christ, but to loose what precedes it. So also go in God's name, dear Luther, and learn to understand the words 'this is my body' through the words that come after; for it is not a matter of whether the words come before or after, through which we see the meaning, so also through all Scripture we must lift up the senses against each other, which are not at the same time with each other. If one says, 'John is Elijah,' [Aas] is a trope; but if one says, 'He is like Elijah,' or means or names under the name Elijah, the speech used is uncovered and made clear. And when Paul says, 'But the rock was Christ,' it is a used speech; and when he says before, 'They all drank of the spiritual rock,' the used speech is made right. So, when we say alone: 'this is my body', it is a trope which we learn to open with the following words: 'which is given for you'. And so we speak: This is a meaning of my corpse, the speech used is uncovered, and still stands stiffly with Augustine: 'the rock was Christ' for: the rock signifies, shows, or means Christ; so that Luther does not think that we want to let ourselves be fooled with the word 'signifies. 1) But this is the most beautiful thing, that Luther forgets himself in the forefathers of his writing, and speaks these words, [in the arc D. 3. at the foremost part, at the 20th line: 2) 'We know almost well that the physical rock signifies Christ, and Christ is therefore a spiritual rock and is called; this they must not teach us: but whether interpretation would be in Paul's words, as Zwingel dreams." See, dear Luther, what a poor man you are. In eighteen words you have placed the word "means" before it yourself and said: you know well that the physical rock means Christ; and after that you charge me to prove that meanings (that I understand by your alphabets) are the same.

1) to corner == to drive into a corner.

2) No. 20, § 58.

The words of Paul are an interpretation. Are you nonsensical, or how has it always been with you that you are not aware of what you are saying in the midst of it?

40 From Genesis 12 we have the words: "It is the Lord's transgression. Which words mean: The feast, or the lamb that was eaten at the feast, means the Lord's transgression. Luther beats out this meaning with a very well-meaning interpretation, and speaks after a whole sum of useless words thus: 3) "For one soon answered, thus: Eat quickly, 4) it is the Lord's Passover. As we say in German: Eat meat, for it is Sunday; drink water, for it is Friday" 2c. Here I ask you, dear Luther, how you please yourself with this likeness? Have you then proved with this simile that "is" does not mean "means"? I think one should present some writing about it, so you present a loose simile, which is just not in use by anyone, and leave all the plots, which is why it is called the Ueberschritt, and mouth over (as you speak), when there are so many excellent places in the aforementioned chapter, which you should not exceed, which all serve the cause. Thirdly, if you call this remembrance by the Hebrew name, and do not translate it to the last, you give it an unpleasant German: "da der HErr in Egypten ging" ("when the Lord went into Egypt"), and if you had never seen the same place all your life, you could not speak of it more contemptuously, that is, more neglectfully. And yet you have translated the word Passover before: to go before you, which I understood according to our German: fürgehen für euch. But here in this book you say, "It is the day when the Lord went into Egypt." Yes, dear Luther, how do you please yourself, that you introduce such a cunning blindness? But we want to show you the reasons of the same chapter, so that you yourself may be ignorant of it, and the simple may know the truth through your fog and darkness.

41) After God had appointed the time, order and skill of the memorial lamb, He commanded the measure 6) and exercise thus: "And ye shall eat it thus: Your loins shall be girded or shackled, your shoes on your feet, and your staves in your hands; and eat it hastily: It is the transgression of the LORD. For I will walk in the land of Egypt by night, and will slay all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both of men and cattle; and I will avenge myself on all the gods of Egypt: I the LORD. But

3) No. 20, § 55.

4) In the old edition: "Esset, eilet" 2c.

5) unelich == unrecht.

6) d. i. meal.

the blood shall be a sign unto you in the houses wherein ye are, and [I] shall see the blood, and shall pass over you," or leap over you, "and there shall be no spoiling smiting among you, when I smite Egypt."

(42) Here you see by all the ability of the speech that it is not much talk that you should have translated this feast, Pässah, in Our language as the Ueberschritt; when in fact the cause comes afterward, in which God Himself says that He calls it the Ueberschritt because in the plague of Egypt He will leap over or pass over the Israelites, so that no harm will come to them. So you come and tell us that it is a sinful cause, just as if one said, "Eat meat, because it is Sunday. Who speaks thus? Why do you omit the cause that God Himself speaks? Why do you conceal it? Is this done honestly? Should I, as I am also in [the] pope's right hand, say to the Christians, Eat meat tomorrow, for it is the *resurrectio*; and not say to it what *resurrectio* means, namely, the primal states, and that one eats meat for this reason among all men, that Christ rose again on that day; would I not be a great obscurantist? And since I have come to this place, I will also tell you the other things that serve this cause,

43 Thus follows: "And this will be a memorial to you," Tell us, dear Luther, what does this little word "this" mean to us here? Does it mean the feast or the lamb? Yes, it means both together, or each one in particular, Weber's 1) you want, as will come afterward; and it applies immediately that you will put it to us, we juggle, as we want, with the Scriptures. But see that he now says, "And the feast, or lamb, shall be to you for a memorial"; so you learn that it is a memorial of the living transgression that has taken place, and not a transgression, but is called after the essential transgression because it is remembered in this feast or thanksgiving. It is still written: "it is the overcoming", and neither the feast nor the lamb is the overcoming; but a remembrance or meaning of the overcoming; so also our remembrance is called the corpse of Christ, not that it, the feast or bread broken at it, is the corpse of Christ, but that one remembers the corpse of Christ or death at it.

44 Then it continues, "And you will celebrate it as a feast of the Lord. What does it mean? The feast together with the whole act of lambing.

Food and unleavened 2) bread. Now you see that the whole feast is called memorial (are all *synecdochae*), that this feast is the feast of the Lord. And why do you make so much talk about a church consecration in the last part of your book, because I called it *panegyrym*, as it is?

that is, a coming together feast. I worry you don't actually know yet what *panegyris* means,

and think that it is only called a day of stuff. If you now tell us about and spit out the nonsense that goes on at church consecrations, do you know that it is a happy gathering of the entire congregation for the glory and thanksgiving of God, or of noble lords, or peoples, or special but great people? Yes, if you know what it means, and thus speak to us, you are well worthy to have the name made greater for you: from Theologo Mataeologus; for it is a courageous intercourse. So we have called it from the words of Paul, not a day of stuff, but *panegyrym*, that is, community meeting day, which speaks, 1 Cor. 11: "You do not come together for betterment, but for trouble" 2c. and the words more there; and from this place actually and well, yes, to a hundred times in all three languages, seen, and have not gone beyond, although I read of the transgression. Even those who do not yet actually see the thorough custom 3) in Christ's Supper will undoubtedly see that we are not dealing with fools.

45 Thus it follows, "Ye shall eat seven days of unleavened tents," or cakes, or bread 2c. Behold, of the Bread, which was not heblet, was called afterwards the feast also) as afterwards will come.

46. follows "And on the first day there shall be a holy convocation", that is, a general one, at which no one else shall do anything proper, neither to come there; as the *feriae*, or *sacrae epulae*, have also been among the Gentiles, by which you see that it has been a holy feast. So also our holy gathering of the saints, that is, believers, should be holy, not become holy with the meal.

047 And it follows, And ye shall keep the unleavened cakes: for I will bring your train out of Egypt at the hour of the day. If you look at the words here, you will see that he calls the feast the unleavened bread or cakes, which he had called Zichron, that is, the remembrance, and Pässah, that is, the passing over. You will also see that all this is done through the *synecdocham*,

2) i.e. without yeast, unleavened.

3) In the old edition: "after".

So that from one part the whole feast is called, namely, here from the unleavened cakes, which one needs at it, as the apostles also called, Matth. 26: "On the first day of the unleavened bread", which is as much as, on the first day, or on the memorial first day. You will also see that we do not teach out of imprudence that when it says, "and this will be a memorial to you," this little word "this" may indicate the lamb or the whole feast, together with all the action that you speak of here, that the whole sum is also named with one part, namely with the unleavened cakes.

48. Neither shall any man remember, Yea, the commandment is here given of the unleavened bread, and not the feast so called; for the commandment is sufficiently before and after, and so it is here at the feast of the unleavened bread: "For I will bring thy dukes out of Egypt at the hour of the day"; from which we see that the remembrance gives thanks not only because of the transgression, but also because of the performance; wherefore thou, dear Luther, wilt not be surprised that in the words: "This is my body," teach that the little word "this" may extend to the whole feast of remembrance to the sense: This is the remembrance of my body, or meaning; for: The feast or thanksgiving you shall do because I have given my body to death for you. For he says above, "Do this in remembrance of me." Or that this little word "this" refers to the bread or wine, as to the one part and sign of the feast, as is also indicated above (per *synecdoche on the* meaning: The bread or wine is the memorial or meaning of my body, which is given for you. Or (lest you say we did not remain on one): The bread signifies my body, which is given up for you. Likewise also, the lamb signifies the transgression, which is the very least 1) and most open sense, and to the simple the most intelligible.

49) But soon after this follows: "And the Lord will see the blood on the overdoor, and the two will be provided, 2) and will go over or for" 2c. But by this thou seest how loose is thy dissolute word, "Eat meat, for it is Sunday." For even if this were a cause why one should eat meat, there must still be a special event that happened on Sunday, for the sake of which we admonished to eat meat; and this would also be a remembrance. But if there were no other cause or story behind it, then this speech would give:

- 1) i.e. the lightest.
- 2) d. i. post.

Eat flesh, for it is Sunday, no more cause why I should eat flesh, neither if I say, Eat flesh, for the ass hath eaten the figs. I don't know what your language means by foul language, but if I understand it to mean foul, loose, dissolute, unfruitful, unfounded words, then these words of yours are not only foul language, but also utterly scurrilous.

50 Therefore it follows, And when ye shall come into the land which the LORD shall give you, as he hath spoken, then ye shall keep this service or feast. And if your children shall say unto you: What feast is this unto you? then ye shall say unto them, It is the sacrifice of the transgression unto the LORD, which transgressed the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote Egypt, and redeemed our houses." Behold, what brighter thing can be said than this? When your children shall ask, What feast is this? Says not Moses, Eat the lamb, for it is the day of reckoning; but, "It is the sacrifice of the transgression unto the LORD, which passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt." 2c. Why do you, dear Luther, disregard God's word, and do your thoughtless, loose thing? What may you say is such a speech, as if we said: Eat meat, for it is Sunday; if Moses himself teaches here what speech, feast, trade or ceremonial it is?

(51) You deceive throughout the whole book, as we taught without God's word, and do us wrong; for we allow you to show an opinion that we 4) taught without God's word; and not only do you teach here without God's word, but you omit God's word and present your impotent false word. If we were to draw the arrow to you according to your ways, what would we not have the right to say against you? So here we have that the lamb is called a sacrifice, but it was not really a sacrifice, for nothing was offered of it, but it was eaten; for the legs that remained of it and the impurities were burned, but not as a sacrifice; nor is the whole feast called a sacrifice from the beating or killing of the ram, lamb or goat. But from this you first learn, dear Luther, that the whole feast is called a sacrifice or slaughter, only of the one part of the feast; after this we all [learn] against the papists that sacrifice is also called, which is not a sacrifice, as here the feast or lamb; and whether Christ is his

- 3) "deaf" - to make deaf (by much talking). In the althey edition: trübest.
- 4) i.e. crooked, upside down.

If he had called the remembrance a sacrifice, which he by no means did, he would not have wanted more with it, because here, too, sacrifice is taken for remembrance.

52 Thus you, dear Luther, have places enough by which you are overcome that this word "is" is taken for "means," or "is a sign. But if I know that you will cry out aloud, "You see, this is what the enthusiasts do to him; they say they have proved a thing that is not so to him; it is not compulsory that here "is" be taken for "means" or the like, then I say thus: I doubt not that thou wilt be forced, though the truth be in the day: for thou wilt indeed take comfort in another sword, neither in the word of God, but the same shall no longer cut deeper, neither shall he that smiteth above, who also called Abraham kings 1) and delivered Ahab's hand, that he could no more bring it to him. For the sake of the simple, however, I will put everything that is said here about the paschal lamb into a small sum, and show how "is" is taken for "means," and how we take meaning here; thus:

The paschal lamb is first called the "crossing over"; therefore, the crossing over followed after it, and one gives thanks to this lamb for the crossing over that once happened. After that, the feast is called a "memorial", because there one remembered the good deed of God, proven to the children of Israel with their crossing over and carrying it out. Now the lamb could not be mindful, but means that, therefore they should be mindful. Thus "signify" or "be a sign" is not taken by us as you, dear Luther, present to us (per synecdoche): What does the bread signify? 2c., as if we want to say: It signifies something only in the future; but, the supper signifies the death of Christ, which happened before, just as the lamb signifies in the following time the passing over, which had happened before. And when once at the Ascension the idols were taken off, we children asked what this meant? we were told: It meant that Christ had thus gone to heaven; and the nuts, pears, apples, wafers, which were thrown down, meant gifts, of which it is written: "He has given gifts to men. See that "signify" also reaches behind, for: to be a sign, for: to be a memorial; as also *tropaea*, that is, erected stones, signify about a victory, about a death blow, about an

great kind man. Lug now, devout Christian, whether Luther is overcome, and forced that "is" in the speech "it is the transgression" is taken for "means", or "is a sign", or "memory of the transgression", if the text calls it a memory or meaning?

Third, this thanksgiving is also called a "feast" or "gathering" of the whole congregation. And yet it is also called the crossing. From this it can be seen that the words: "It is the passing over" mean: the feast is a memorial of the passing over; or the lamb, which was the most distinguished among the visible things, is a signification or memorial of the passing over. So also the gathering in the supper of Christ is a memorial of the body of Christ; or the bread, which is chiefly carried about therein, signifies and points to the body of Christ which is given for us. Fourth, it is called the Feast of Unleavened Bread; but this comes from a part of this feast, namely, from the unleavened bread used at it. Fifthly, it is called a sacrifice, because the lamb was slain, and yet not sacrificed.

55 Now put the names together: Passover, Feast or Gathering of the Whole Congregation, Remembrance, Feast of Unleavened Bread, and Sacrifice of the Passover; so we see that the Lamb's Supper was nothing else, neither that it signified to the whole congregation gathered together, nor that it represented and showed the Passover that God had shown to their fathers; therefore they gave thanks to God. Now you see whether "It is the transgression" means so much as: "It means the transgression", or so much as: Eat meat, for it is Sunday; and so be wise to whom God pleases. Read, dear devout Christian, the 12th chapter of the 2nd book of Moses yourself with diligence, so you will see whether we do the matter right or not.

(56) There are still some more proofs, which we have not brought up, that therefore "being" is taken for "meaning," but only that we indicated that there are several places, in which the words of the being must not be taken essentially. As: "I am the true vine", there "am" and "vine" are not taken essentially, but: I am like it. "I am the door" can be taken as much: I am like a door or a gate. But if you want to open the *tropum* in the grapevine or door, take for the grapevine the cloth, ground and fructification, the words of Christ will be thus: I am the right cloth and power, in which all things have power 2c. "I am the door", that is, the true entrance 2c.

1) So put by us instead of: "hear beat", according to Gen. 14, 17.- "erdarret" -- makes wither.

2) i.e. wooden.

Luther lacks childishness when he argues: He is a true right grapevine 2c., and is here no interpretation (as he holtzelg 1) speaks). For although there is no interpretation, there is nevertheless the taking away [*metaphora*] or being the same, so that the words of the essence may not be taken essentially, but for "being the same". This is also not to be omitted, that Luther counts [Oecolampadius'] interpretation of the words, and mine allways for two different errors, as C. 3. and C. 4. and but C. 4. he speaks thus: 2) "First of all, it is certain that Zwingel and Oecolampad are united in understanding." So I hope, be proven, that this word "is" and others, which are called senses and beings, are taken meaningfully in many places in the Scriptures; but I have only indicated the old places.

Here Luther raises two objections; one is that we are the most confused inference-makers he has ever seen; and the other is that we are more unreported than the children, so if we conclude that "is" is taken for "signifies" in one place in Scripture, it is also taken that way here. And even if we find that "is" is taken for "signifies," we must first prove and make certain that it must be taken in the words "this is my body. The other objection is that it is a devilish thing for us to say that these words cannot be understood in this way because they do not rhyme.

(58) To the first, let us give this answer: That we have shown by all our writings in every way that our opinion is not at all that in these words we want to interpret "is" as "means," that "is" in some place is taken for "means," but since faith and Scripture are against it, that it is taken naturally, these words may not have the meaning. For, as we have said before enough, the Scriptures must be held up against one another, and that which is regarded as repugnant to one another must be unanimously understood by the light of faith and Scripture. If this is done, it is found that even these words may not have the meaning that they present at first sight. And we do not speak at all of the impossibility 3) or clumsiness of the purely human understanding, but rather of the

but from the clear understanding of faith; therefore we have also always spoken with bright words: *absurdum esse hunc sensum, etiam fideli intellectui*; that is, it does not want to rhyme or fit even to the faithful understanding. That is why you, dear Luther, use so many useless words, when you so often reproach us, as if we alone had said, "It does not rhyme"; and we have always said that it is contrary to faith and the Scriptures, therefore it does not rhyme. Now if the first reproach hangs in the other, I will save it until we answer the other.

59) And say here first, that we have never argued a *particulari ad universale*; 5) but ye have put it to us all ways, not only without shame, but also without all reason. For who has ever said among us, "is" is taken for "means" in one place, so is it taken so in all places? But you have thus spoken upon us, though lyingly, and thus screwed: 6) Behold, they make such concluding speeches, "is" is taken for "signifies" something in one place, so it must be taken for "signifies" everywhere; so the word of the heavenly Father, this "is" my beloved Son, must mean: this signifies my Son; with other many examples. 7) As you, dear Luther, also do without measure in this book, truly, not without great suspicion, yet manly knows that we have not concluded so foolishly.

60 But now you realize well from where we are forced to this interpretation. But again you conclude, because you ever want to protect all words in which "is" is written, that it is essential that this word says; but this may not be, as enough is heard; for John is not Elijah 2c. But this follows well from the Scriptures, that where a word is taken in a strange sense 8) in one place, and the same word in another place must also have a strange sense; that one may be interpreted by another, even like the other, so that the occasion of faith and unanimity of Scripture may be indicated.

Example: This word "stone" is used in many ways in Scripture; some for material stones; some for hard people, as Ezek. 11 and 36; sth. for the excellent and noble, Klagl. 4; sth. for Christ alone,

1) holdselig (?). (Walch.) Should perhaps read "hutzelig"? Hutzel is a dried apple or pear. That the word contains a rebuke of Luther's mode of expression is clear. Carlstadt calls Luther and his followers "Hutzelprediger". Cf. No. 5 in this volume, Col. 258, § 148.

2) No. 20, R 46, 47.

3) Ungebe perhaps: incapacity? - Unskillful - inconsistency.

4) So put by us instead of: "half".

5) i.e. from the particular to the general.

6) For these statements of Zwingli, compare No. 20, § 47- § 57.

7) d. i. gespieen.

8) Marginal gloss: How to consider the other senses.

1 Pet 2. Which place I now take from the first three. And if I want to interpret the place of Peter, which is Christ alone, I am lacking. Why? The opportunity of faith is not right for this. But if I find one, since stone also means Christ alone, then one becomes clear through the other, and both are equal to each other. As it is written in the 117th [in Hebrew the 118th] Psalm: "The stone, which the builders rejected (understand by the doctrine of men, as the piety did), became a chief stone in the corner"; that teaches us Christ himself, Matth. 21, to be spoken of him. Now if we take these words, which are of one mind, together, and consider the occasion or similitude of faith, they all three become clear through one another, and therefore no one disputes that where stone is written it means Christ. Now consider the occasion and similarity of the two sayings, "This is the transgression" and "This is the body of Christ."

Another example: "water" is also taken in many other ways neither for the material water in the Scriptures. Nor do any see to the meaning of John 3: "Unless one be born again of water and the Holy Spirit," neither that since water is also taken for the grace of God, or the heavenly enlightenment, as Ezek. 36, Jn. 4, 1 Jn. 5, and many other such things. But now the baptizers, that is, those who give too much credit to baptism in the flesh, dispute this and say: John 3 is about water and does not belong to it, because it is about the bodily water of baptism. If we now compare the Scriptures, we find Matth. 3: "He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire. If now "water" is to read John 3 of the bodily water of baptism, then here also fire must be understood of the bodily fire; and do the Indians right (which is not) that they let themselves be drawn with the fire; which also comes from the error that they did not understand what John meant by the fire. Now the place of fire chases us to the place of water, and forces us to make water as well understood differently than fire. 1) Thus we see that water is often taken for the illumination and indulgence of God's grace. And if we consider the words of Christ John 3 correctly, we find that Christ speaks to us through water and wind, so that we must be born again, so that he can make us understand through the bodily 2) spiritual elements that the grace of God is not only in the water but also in the wind.

1) Marginal gloss: So the Scripture compels with open sense, not with the prasmisso.

2) "bodily" put by us instead of: "läblichen".

God or the heavenly knowledge, which alone refreshes the soul, no one accepts, neither to whom the Spirit gives, that he may be sure of the graces 2c. As 3) John, Ep. 1, Cap. 5, says: "There are three that make manifest: the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and the three are one", or with each other.

From this we may learn, dear Luther, that from one place to another it is right to go, and both of their minds are kept in mind, and he who is most conformable to the faith and unity of Scripture is to be chosen. And therefore it is not necessary to say, "This" is called this in the place, yes, it is called this everywhere; as is now indicated by the water and the stone. And he who does not hold this, errs much in the Scriptures. I will also show that this word "a fleshly heart" is not taken to mean anything good in Scripture, neither in Ezek. 2 and 36: "I will take out of your flesh a heart of stone, and will give you a heart of flesh." How do we do it here, since we have no place in which a heart of flesh can be taken for good? Behold, the heart of flesh alone must be measured out by a sincere believing mind, and be taken for good. So it is here also: Although we have no place in which "is" is taken for "means," of which we have no need; but from all Scripture, (the) faith, and the words themselves, it is found that these words, "This is my body, which is given for you," may not be taken essentially; so we have enough of the pointing light of faith, of other Scripture that resists, and of the words themselves.

64) To the other counter accusation, when Luther claims that we denied the bodily corpse of Christ here because it does not rhyme with reason, we give this answer, as we have heard: that we have always said that it does not exist for the believing mind, but rather is contrary to faith and Scripture. If God wills, we will bring this to light here, and speak of faith first, and then of the opposition of Scripture.

(65) To eat the body of Christ in the flesh resists faith. Cause: As man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from God's mouth; so also the soul may not eat anything or make anything sure, neither God's word. But this makes no one secure, neither whom God has drawn with his Spirit (now it must not be written, it is all

3) So set by us instead: Alsdann.

4) i. e. nowhere.

Believers in the pieces well recognized). But whom God's word makes sure, he now has faith, and that is, God's word lived. Now comes the error. If now I want to introduce under the name of faith and say: God's word teaches to believe that which it does not teach, then I miss nothing less, neither those [who] have sold man's teachings for God's teachings, because as soon as I attribute to God's word that it does not hold, then I have overlooked the commandment of Deut. 4 and 12.

Therefore, in order to believe the Word of God, we must have a proper understanding, or else we would believe, even think, that we do not know. Romans 10: "How will they believe him whom they have not heard? how will they hear without a teacher? So it must be that the teacher does not teach otherwise, neither does he know the word of God; or he teaches the doctrine of men, and is numbered among those of whom Paul says in Titus 1: "There are many unskilful men, vain talkers, deceivers of the mind, mostly of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; for they pervert whole sinners, and teach things that ought not to be taught, for the sake of shameful gain." Here we see that Paul indicates that one must have teachers, but we see that the teachers are missing because of the temptation of profit or other temptations of wisdom. Now if those who are taught are not to be presumptuous, 1) they must have so much light as to see which is of God and which is of men. For Christ says, "The sheep know the voice of the shepherd, and go after him: but they go not after a stranger, but flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers." So there must be a great light in the minds of the hearing sheep, if they are to judge the word of the teacher; as Paul also says in 1 Corinthians 14. The light, however, is nothing other than faith. As Isaiah says, "Unless ye believe, ye shall not understand." Thus it is sufficiently explained that neither the teacher should do more to God's word, neither should he keep it, nor the learner understand more; or else they do not go by faith and spirit, but by their temptations.

67. example: In Hebrews at the eleventh chapter it says: "By faith we understand that the world was made by God's word. Here is enough understood and believed, when I realize that the world is made by God, and believe that. Item, Gen. 1. says: "God has further spoken: There shall be lights in the firmament of the

and divide the day and the night. But it is enough that I realize and believe that the sun and moon were created by God. If now I would go to God's word and say, "I will also make the sun and the moon with the word of God, which he himself has spoken; for his word is almighty, he is able to do it," 2c., and say, "Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven," 2c., then let 2) see how much I would like to make the sun and the moon. I should probably want to make light, and would darkness. Why? God has nowhere commanded us to make the sun and the moon, although he has spoken the life-giving word, "Let there be lights," and the lights have been made; yet he has nowhere recommended or promised us that, if we speak the words, there will also be nothing 3). And therefore these are words of a simple history; and are not words, wherein we are commanded to do any thing; or wherein it is promised us, if we speak them, that we also shall make heaven and earth, or sun and moon. And it is equally wrong to speak God's words, 4) which it does not hold, as to withdraw from Him what it is able to do.

68. example in the New Testament. Christ said, "Go ye, preach the gospel," which is a significant word. Again, he made water into wine. If I then shall say the words, The water hath Jesus made into wine; and think that it shall be made wine, the words are able, it is also possible for God: then let no wine be given me, but water, and let me myself be made wine. And Christ saith, When ye are presented, seek not what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. Is a promising word. Now if I would fall from this on a word of command, and say, I will not work, I will not love my neighbor, I will not feed, I will not water the poor 2c. Cause, God has said, he will well instruct what I should say, so he will also well move me to work and other good things; he may well, he has promised 2c., so I have ever erred unchristianly; so I must ever keep difference in faith among the words that are not of one kind. In the words that indicate a true story to me, it is enough to believe that [it] happened that way; and I should by no means believe that I was commanded or promised that I should or might also do that way. In the

1) i.e. injured, contaminated.

2) In the old edition: let.

3) i.e. something.

4) i.e., to impose, to burden.

5) "not" is missing here in the old edition.

In the words of the commandment it is enough to believe that God has spoken it, and that we should do it, and that we know that it is right, if God has commanded it. In the words of the promise, however, we must believe that the promise is from God, that it is good and just, and that it will certainly be fulfilled, as it reads; of which I have written much more against D. Jacob Struß, now only show a brief sample.

69 If you now, dear Luther, take the words: "Take, eat, this is my corpse!" (I do not now want to overestimate you with those: "who is given up for you," which you hold so worthless that you do not speak even one kind word to them throughout the whole book), you see first that the two words "take, eat" are meaning words. Secondly, "This is my body," are words of history or action, and may as little make the body of Christ with your faith or speech, as you may make light, because he said, "Let there be light. And yet this has a better form, "Let there be light"; for this calls to light, but here it is not spoken, "Let my body be made" or "in bread." And if he had spoken in the same way, he would not have promised 1) that when we speak that, the body of Christ would be there. For if God also calls us to offer the other cheeks, we do not do it for that reason. Why? Because he never promised us that we would be so perfect that we would do it. But if we suffer thirst 2) because of righteousness, the kingdom of heaven will be ours; there is a promise about. So we have not yet found that we are 3) promised to make the body of Christ in bread, or of bread; let alone that we are promised that when we speak the words, he will be there; as little as we are promised that we shall make light, and fish, and fowl, and yet God also made them with his word, that is, power.

(70) Hitherto I hope not that any man can say that in the words of the Lord there is neither meaning nor promise, from which we may reasonably believe that the body of Christ is here eaten or made. "Take, eat" are words of good cheer, but they mean no more than they do. "Take" and "eat" may not be taken to mean make the body of Christ. "This is my corpse" are only words of indication and history, when

like Christ would have given his body. Nowhere does it say that we make him, or that he is promised to us. So now follow 4) the words: "who is given for you", let us omit for the sake of clarity; for above enough is said of them, that they are strong enough to sustain the whole mind, which we assume. And let us turn to the words: "do this in remembrance of me," and see where the two little words "do this" reach.

The pope with his doings has always taught that these two words: "do this", mean and point to the body of Christ, to the meaning: "do this", that is, make the body of Christ with the words 2c., but this is wrong for two reasons. The first is, that Christ did not signify or signify before to make his body, as is heard; from which it follows, that even the words "do this" may not be sufficient for "make my body," or else the words would come to such a loose sense: Do that which I first commanded you; and if one saw behind him, he would have commanded nothing at all but, "Take, eat"; so we shall ever command nothing else but to eat, and not to make the body of Christ, nor have any word of promise saying that he will come to it by the power of these words, or by God's doing. But you see, dear Luther, that the lack of the promise does not allow us to believe that the body of Christ is there, and so, as you say, 5) we also want to overcome unanimously in the words, even though we have no other Scripture against or beside them.

The other reason is the holy Word of God. The other reason is the holy word of God, which leads us the finger where we should point with the words "do this" 6). 1 Cor. 11 says: "Do this in remembrance of me. For as often as ye shall eat the bread, and drink the drink, ye shall glorify the death of the Lord," or proclaim, "till he come." Lift up thy finger, dear Luther, and see whither "this" reacheth, and whither "thou" doest; and till not unbelieving, but believing. You know well that Paul wants to express here and make clear what these words are capable of: "Do this in remembrance of me!" If thou sayest, "No," then look only at the *causa*/xxx, *enim*, that is, at the little word "for"; then thou seest well that the words that follow, "for as often as ye have

4) i.e. the words which now follow, "who is given up for you", we want 2c.

5) Perhaps: "as you suspected"? because Luther did not want to use any other words than the words of institution against his opponents.

6) Marginal gloss: This is the essential reason for understanding the words: Do this.

1) i.e. nowhere.

2) d. i. Pursuit.

3) ienen - any; "ienen" put by us instead of: "those".

eat the bread" 2c. so that the foregoing may be remembered; so that cause and clarity may be given as to why 1) the memory is, and what it is.

Now lift up your finger (do not be angry that I am teaching you so childishly; we must become as children, or else remain out of heaven) and put it on the words: "For as often as you eat the bread and drink the drink. Well, you got it on? Dear, what does the little word "the" in the words mean? Does it mean upon the body of Christ, to bring or make [him] therefore? or does it mean to eat the bread and drink the drink? Can you not deny that it means eating and drinking the bread and drink, when the words publicly read: eia, then only see in God's name that this word "do this" does not extend to "eat my corpse", but to: eat the festive and obligatory bread and drink in remembrance of me. See also, dear Luther, that we learn from Paul's words, in which he points with the little word "this" to the whole feast or to the noble signs, that also in the words: "this is my body" this little word "this" does not point to the bodily body of Christ, but to the feast, which is called the body of Christ; just as we call the birth of Christ and the ascension, but Christ stands and does not ascend; but the feast and remembrance is thus called of that which once happened; or it points to the noble symbols, festive and obligatory signs of wine and bread, that these indicate his body, which was given up for us. For Paul calls it so here, as it is most precious. For it must ever be most precious, since he wants to explain the words: "Do this in remembrance of me", what they are able to do. But there he says, "For as often as ye shall eat the bread," and not, "As often as ye shall eat the body of Christ," 2c.

74 Now it is about the words: "In memory of me". There you say, dear Luther, together with your crowd, that one eats the corpse of Christ here in remembrance of his corpse; but this may not be, as is now well understood from Paul. For he interprets the words "in remembrance of me" with those, "you will praise the death of the Lord," or proclaim, "until he comes." From this we can see that in this festive meal the prize is not "to eat the body of Christ," which should be the noblest thing to do when one eats it in the flesh; but it is primarily indicated here that we should thus celebrate the memorial of the Lord with praising and proclaiming, that is, giving thanks for the death of the Lord. And saith not Paul, As often as ye commit this memorial, so

1) i.e. in relation to what.

effect the body of the Lord; but, "as often as ye shall eat the bread, and drink the drink, proclaim the death of the Lord." Now there thou seest publicly [that] the proclaiming, that is, the thanksgiving, is the noble thing that is acted upon. The words "until he shall come" are not necessary to be acted upon; they are indicated beforehand enough that they extend to the future of the last judgment.

(75) So you, dear Luther, have not proven with tandmeers: first, that we are not to impose God's words 2) that do not contain them; for that is just as good as being pious, as not hearing God's word at all. It must also be that he who wants to draw from God's word, which it may not suffer, puts his word in the place of God's word, as he who represents his own invented word for God's word; for each is the word of man.

76) Then it is proved to you that these words, "Take, eat, this is my body; do this in remembrance of me," are not words of some promise, but only words of commandment, or words of explanation, and words of narration. And if we look at them actually with those: "who is given for you," and with those: "As often as you eat the bread and drink the drink, you shall proclaim the death of the Lord," 2c., then we see actually that the dry [words] "this is my body" may not have the meaning that you are hoping for at all. And therefore hear that it is contrary to faith that the flesh and blood of Christ are pretended to be eaten here; for God's word does not contain it, nor does it promise anything about it, which is why human, even believing, conscience will never calm down, God granting what is promised to it with precious words: the highly praised tender Corpus Christi will be eaten 2c.; if God's word does not have this, then it is contrary and unpleasant to faith.

And therefore, dear Luther, consider your words, how well they stand, since you thus cry out: "We have God's word, which neither devil nor hell, heretic nor heretic can take from us; there they stand! 2c. Of course we have them, who will take them from you? God's word is almighty, and brings with it that which it pretends. Who will take it away? We have still hard a faith. "And as the words are spoken, the body of Christ is there." Now you are missing. Now we say to it: Dear, so speak: let there be a light! For God has not spoken this word less than that. Say: Yes, he did not say that. Rather, say to the dead: Arise! or to the blind: "See, and make him see; this is what God has commanded. Do this, dear Luther,

2) i.e. impose.

1) this button; for you also have God's promise for the words, which you do not have here at all, Marci 16. And when you will speak: I am not commanded to make light, or heaven and earth; but here I am commanded to eat the body of Christ; thou hast already answered from the word of Paul, that "Do this in remembrance of me" is sufficient: "as often as ye shall eat the bread, and drink the drink, ye shall" 2c. So much of the resistance of faith, which comes from the lack of being able to believe, [that] being in God's word it does not contain.

Now let us prove that it is contrary to the summa of the nature and manner of the Christian faith. "No man cometh unto Christ, except the Father draw him: he therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father cometh unto him. Whosoever therefore trusteth in him (for this is coming unto him) hath everlasting life," yea, is a son of God: "For unto them that receive him hath he given to become the children of God." Now if trust in Him is the summa of salvation, faith does not inquire after bodily food, for what does it serve for conscience? "GOD is a spirit, and those who wish to worship Him must worship Him in spirit and [in] truth." So whoever wants to serve Him should serve Him by faith, not with bodily eating of His flesh. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth," so it must be the Spirit alone that secures our spirit to life. For that we may be sure "that we are sons of God, God has sent His Son's Spirit into our hearts, in whom Spirit we cry out to Him, Father!" It is by the Spirit that we are made sure that we are children of God, which God has put into our hearts; and it is not because we eat His flesh and blood bodily. Christ says, "If I am lifted up from the earth (that is, taken to the cross), I will draw all men to myself." If then faith looks to the death of Christ, and not to the bodily eating, to which nothing is promised, faith does not look to this, but is repulsed by everything that is given to it, because it does not have God's word.

79. Christ has satisfied all things in heaven and earth with the shedding of his blood, not with the eating of his body and blood bodily; for his flesh is only food for the soul, provided it is crucified, John 6: "The food that I will give you is my flesh, for the life of the world," understand killed, not eaten. "The grain, if it die (saith he), it yieldeth much fruit." Killed he is our life, not eaten.

1) d. i. first.

"With his own blood he entered into the holy place and gained eternal salvation," Heb. 9. "For that he died to sin was done once," Rom. 6:10. "He became a curse for us, for it is written, Cursed is everyone who hangs on the tree: Cursed be every one that hangeth on the wood," Gal. 3. Thus he ever put to death the curse that belongs to sin, to which all the testimonies of the New Testament extend. From this it follows, 2) that believing conscience does not find remission of sin in bodily eating, as you, dear Luther, teach from yourself. So also the benefit that you indicate is nothing at all in the bodily meal, since you say that sins are forgiven with it; and faith alone points us to his death, not to the bodily meal and forgiveness of sins.

80. Hebr. 9. Paul says: "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission. Now if the blood of Christ is not shed here, neither is remission of sin made in the bodily drinking of His blood. It is shed only once, and offered up only once, and has put up with sin, shed and offered up alone; so it follows (*de primo ad ultimum*): if in the bodily eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ sin is forgiven, that this eating is crucifying and offering up Christ again. 3) Unbutton the button, dear Luther; not with murmuring, as you speak, but show the lack, that it does not have reason in God's word.

81 Peter speaks epistle 1. cap. 2: "Christ bore our sin with his body on the cross," which I hope no Christian doubts. Now if the bodily eating takes away sin, then the bodily eating of his flesh must be a crucifixion of Christ and a sacrifice; for in this way the one sacrifice did not suffice. Resolve this also. In short, faith finds no remission of sin either in the shed blood of Christ. "So he must die, and so come into his glory," Luc. 24.

82. he who gives faith also increases it, Luc. 17: "Lord, increase our faith"; Rom. 5: "The love of God is poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us. [Here] you see the love of God being given through God's Spirit, not through bodily eating. Now faith and love are one kind and origin, yes, they are also one thing,

2) Marginal gloss: I. The bodily food does not forgive sin.

3) Marginal gloss: If the bodily meal accepts the "sin", it is a sacrifice: for sin is not accepted without sacrifice.

if you take faith to be the whole transaction of the human heart with God, as we do here. Item 1 John 4: "God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him." All suffice 1) that thou mayest see, give faith, increase, or be firm in the indwelling Spirit alone; not in the bodily eaten corpse, as thou pretendest without God's word.

But the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and make you remember all things that I have said to you," John 14. Here you see, dear Luther, that the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, not the bodily food. For where have we ever been more disconsolate, neither when we thought we were eating the body of Christ? The Comforter, the Spirit, will teach us all things, and bring again to remembrance what we are taught of Christ. From this you see that it is your poem, where you promise that these words: "this is my body", bring the body of Christ with them, and make present that which we believed before alone, as you speak in the sermon Against the Saints 2). For that which we believe and hope here is not given to us bodily here. "We see here only through a mirror and through a blind man, but we shall see face to face. Here alone we prepare the lamps and torches to go to the wedding feast of the Lord, on which we shall eat him, that is, we shall eat him eternally and have joy. Here [that] which we hope for is never given to us in any other way, neither with rest of conscience; which rest is nothing else, neither firm faith; which faith alone is of the drawing and enlightening God, who sends his Spirit into our hearts, through whom we see, to be sure of that which God has promised us. This is the purpose of Heb, the 11th chapter. But the essential joy and delight, which is separate from all sorrow and anxiety, 3) which is written in Romans 8, will only be there. For this reason 4) you are badly lost; for the bodily food does not bring the presence of eternal joy, nor does it bring the joy and security of the conscience that is of faith, as heard before.

84. Rom. 6. Paul thus says: "If we are implanted in the likeness of the death of Christ, then

we will also be implanted in the original state." Do you see, dear Luther, that eating the body of Christ bodily does not plant us in the original state, as you teach without the Word of God, nor do you understand the Irish era correctly, but that we have died with Christ. Item, Rom. 8: "If therefore the Spirit that raised up Jesus dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your deadly bodies by the Spirit that dwelleth in you." Here I know well what Paul means, namely: "If we have true faith, we also have the divine Spirit, who makes us alive, even though we are dead because of the deeds of our body: nor does it serve our purpose, since we want you to understand that everything that you add to the bodily food is added to the grace or Spirit of God alone by the word of God, so is also the state of the body. But other messages here. Paul says in Phil. 3: "Our dwelling is in heaven, from whence (notice the "from whence") we wait for the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our vile body, that he may look like the corpse of his glory, by virtue of power, that he himself may subdue all things to him. You see, 6) with what our bodies are made alive again? With the eating of the body of Christ? No; but with the power of Christ, whereby he may subdue all things unto him. Neither do our dead bodies rise from the hour of our death on the third day, like Christ, but remain dead and rotten until the last day. How then are they kept alive by bodily food? Will not Abraham's body also rise? Where Hai he ate the body of Christ bodily? See, what about your poem?

(85) So now, after the brevity that is also contrary to the nature of faith and nature, you have to believe that here the flesh and blood of Christ are eaten. For in short, trusting in Christ brings eternal blessedness; that is God's word. Eating Christ in the flesh takes away sin; increases faith; makes it essential that we believe; fixes the body for the original state, is Luther's word, and may make no conscience sure; for the Spirit of God, who gives faith into our hearts, yes, who is present in our hearts when we believe, as first heard from Romans 8, knows the voice of man well before his voice. But that there be many of them that are true believers, and yet believe that here flesh and blood are made...

5) i.e., first and foremost. Cf. § 77 of this document.

6) Marginal gloss: V. The bodily food does not come to an end.

1) Marginal gloss: II. and III. The bodily food does not give nor increase the faith.

2) In the paper No. 19 in this volume, § 19,

3) "Bangen" put by us instead of: Blangen",

4) Marginal gloss: IV. The bodily food does not make present that which we believe or that which we are taught.

and therefore may not err, 1) if faith be just 2) is not; for there is still a lack of many things in faith, first of all of knowledge, as Paul says in 1 Corinthians 13: "We know but in part, yea, we prophets 3) also in part." But what is "in part" is not perfect; and here Paul does not speak of the knowledge of this world, as against that world, as Luther made a gloss; but "in part" means imperfectly, 4) but as one increases daily. Even the early Christians, who had the first fruits of the Spirit, often lacked knowledge. God gives us credit for this, so that the height of revelation does not elevate us too much. But essentially, all our good and rightly done 5) faith stands alone in the things that God's word indicates to us; for if we are right sheep of God, we accept no other voice than that of our Shepherd.

You also see, my dear Luther, how unreasonably you have accused me 6) of saying that no one has ever believed that flesh and blood are eaten here. I myself have never believed it all my life, because I have shown a difference *between opinionem et fidem*, that is, between imagining and believing. Believing comes only from human appearance and error, but faith comes only from God. We all believed that flesh and blood would be eaten here; this is of human origin, he taught us this out of his lack of understanding; we gave him faith. Do you see now that this faith is only a delusion? For we have left ourselves to the word of man, who has not understood the word of God. Therefore we are also deceived with the delusion, as you are doing today. You let yourself be deceived by your delusion, and you put cowardly leaves in front of it, which grew in paradise, Genesis 3, that is, they are in God's words, but they do not serve that purpose. Yes, God is almighty, his flesh is a holy thing, 2c., is all true; nor does it prove that the corpse of Christ is neither eaten, nor eaten bring the fruits that you seal. And all this is but a delusion. For if the hungry soul wants to feed itself rightly with God's word, it will find here

nothing. Another cause I have indicated we learn that it is only a delusion.

We have always fled from this sacrament as often as we have thought of it. And it is not a piece of faith, if one wakes up about it in God's word, 7) that one does not desire to find the truth ever clearer and clearer in it. All of you are still called today by the words: "This is my body"; that one should not seek how the body of Christ is eaten here. 8) Why? Now it was proper for the most holy Mary to ask: "How will it be, because I do not recognize a man? Does God's word have anything in him that cannot be seen without suspicion? No, no. You speak in this way, because out of ignorance you impose a meaning on God's words, 9) which they do not have, and are afraid that if they were actually seen, they would invent your error and iniquity, and therefore you flee behind the word of Paul: "One should not know more, neither belongs to know," and the same word is spoken to you. You write subtle things, yes, real ravings: how Christ is bodily in heaven, and is eaten here with our mouths; and you want to show this with subtlety. Our doctrine is conformed to simple faith and scripture, and yours is the presumption of which Paul testifies.

(88) And now you have the one cause that compelled us not to understand these words, "This is my body," according to the first appearance of the form, namely, faith, which is neither of the heart nor of the doctrine, that is, neither directed by God's Spirit nor by the letter elsewhere, neither on trust in Jesus Christ, true Son of God, which is the whole summa, and perfection of faith. As Paul says in Romans 10: "This is the word (that is, the summa or ground in Hebrew) of faith, which we preach, that if thou shalt with thy mouth confess the Lord Jesus, and be assured in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Note here lately that by the original states the whole sum of the life, suffering, death and original states of Jesus Christ 10) is understood.

The other cause is the reproach or resistance of the Scriptures. As enough is indicated, that no scripture should be freely and without sufficient discretion of the opposing scripture

1) Marginal gloss: True faith still errs much in knowledge.

2) d. i. recht.

3) i.e. prophesy.

4) Marginal gloss: In Greek: xx xxxxxx.

5) Here, "verrichten" means to bring into the right direction, while it is otherwise often used for the opposite, e.g. in § 51 of this writing.

6) Marginal gloss: Steht m Luthers Buche, fm Bogens F. am ersten Blatt. [No. 20, § 86.]

7) awakened -- to make observations, to explore.

8) Marginal gloss: Against those who say: You shall not seek him.

9) i.e. imposes.

10) Marginal gloss: *Synecdocha est.*

are laid down. The first [scripture] is the words themselves, "This is my body which is given for you." For we may not stand together to eat the body of Christ here, and eat it as it is given up for us; and no sealing of words helps. The words are dry and light: "This is my body"; for these are still drier and lighter: "Who is given up for you." But here ye may say much, "Yea, it is not necessary to understand so grossly as to eat him as he is hanged on the cross: ye will make beef of it, and 1) of desolate words without number." Response. I understand that it is now called "desolate"; but if, on the other hand, it is said, "It is not the human custom (for only among anthropophagi, that is, people-eaters) for men to eat one another; much less shall we eat the Son of God: so you may boast and extol how good it is to eat the body of Christ, and what a comfort it is to the soul. And draw all things, if they speak of spiritual meat only in the Scriptures, to bodily meat; thus hear the simple, who are not quick to choose between the meat of the Spirit and the meat of the flesh. And if our doctrine, which is not ours but God's word, extends to this, that one must not seek whether the body of Christ is eaten in the flesh, let alone whether it is eaten as beef, then you come and say: we wanted to make beef out of it; and your error gives place to such desolate words and thoughts. Now you say it is not desolate; and as soon as we also insist on the words, "Who is given for you," then we are desolate 2c. But in short: If it is true that the words are barren, as has been sufficiently indicated, then these are barren for you; if you can find a *tropum* here in the words: "who is given up for you", 2) which has never been indicated, nor may it be; then let it also remain in the previous words "this is my body".

90. the other scripture is the words of Paul 1 Cor. 11. about the words of Christ: "Do this in remembrance of me! For as often as ye eat the bread, and drink the drink, proclaim or glorify the death of the Lord." In which we see that this little word "this" does not extend to eating flesh and blood, but to the significant and obligatory signs, wine and bread, which are in the supper when he himself speaks, and we have only indicated enough above. After that, the little word "this" here in Paul's words refers to the signs of the supper; so it is already established that it also refers to them in the words "this is my body",

or to the whole feast, in the sense: "These signs," or "the feast," "signifies," or "is a memorial of my body."

91. the third scripture is, "the spirit is he that quickeneth; the flesh is not profitable at all," understand, to eat; of which shall come after, according to the length.

The fourth: "For the time being you will see the Son of Man sitting with the righteousness of God and coming with great power.

The fifth: "The Lord Jesus, after he had spoken with them, was received up into heaven, and sitteth with the righteous of God. Of which also shall come afterward, Joh. 16.

The sixth: "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go unto the Father."

95. the seventh, John 17: "For now I will not be in the world, but they are in the world" 2c.

(96) I mean, we have enough of the seven testimonies, although we have to refute a perjury. These places, yes, and others more, which are so publicly written, have been the other cause and resistance, which has prevented us from understanding the words "this is my body" according to your sense, and we have looked at the Scriptures everywhere, whether they do not often interpret something else with such a form as the words have. Which you reckon to us as a falsehood, that we have invented a meaning, and accordingly searched in the Scriptures, in order to shield our poem; which we have not done, have also read before; yes, even before you, in Hilario, that such is a falsehood; but we have judged the opposing places equally well, as well as those, because they are nothing less than God's word. And if we look at them from all the grounds of Christian faith, they urge us to believe the Scriptures, 3) not our thought or thought, but that we believe the words as much as those. And it is a work of faith to have diligence to see and understand the Scriptures well, so that the unanimity that is in them, but often does not seem to us because of ignorance, may be well known to us.

97. and after all this, God has sent us the epistle Honii 4) of which you know well [that] it has not brought us into understanding of the matter, as the dear brethren who brought it to us know well, for they had special joy when they heard our sense in the hands; but has given us entrance, to the simple, the words

1) In the old edition: um.

2) Marginal gloss: In the words given for you, no tropus is contested.

3) i.e. accept, receive. Cf. Col. 633, § 104, and § 15 of this paper toward the end.

4) The Dutch jurist Cornelius van Hon (Hoen) or Honius.

1) to the right. And though we find many such sayings and words in Scripture, where "is" is taken for "signifies," or the sign is called by the name of which it is the sign, yet there is no place nor example in Scripture that gives us the same 2) understanding of the words of Christ, neither which are spoken in a like feast, having a like form. And on this we also want to prove, by similar occasion and likeness, that we have seen and heard Christ. 3)

First, he says, Luc. 22: "I have desired with great eagerness to eat this paschal lamb with you" 2c. From this we see that he ate the old paschal lamb with them in the last⁴⁾ and memorial meal, also for an eternal laying and last. From this it follows that, since the old feast or memorial was a figure of the new, and He laid down the old and instituted the new, He also used the same words, and spoke the same opinion and form. And this we do not say from an empty harbor; even if it were spoken without any ground of Scripture, nevertheless the analogy, that is, the uniformity of the thing and uniformity of the words, would lead us to understand "this is my body" by the words "this is the transgression."

But Paul, who in 1 Cor. 6. publicly alludes to the Lamb, which signifies Christ, and the unleavened bread, which indicates a Christian life, gives us to understand brightly that we should run to them with the words "this is my body": "this is the passover", that is, the overtaking, since he thus speaks: "Empty out the old lever, 5) that you may be a new dough or natzung, as you are the unleavened bread (but see here in the midst a tropum: We are not unleavened bread; but the unleavened bread signifies that we are to live innocently), "for our passover", that is, overtaking, 6) "Christ, is slain for us." Examine the words actually, dear Luther, so you see by all Pauli's suit, 7) whether we have you to the words of the lamb.

or of the apostles; they are allowed little interpretation.

100 Now follows there: "Therefore let us celebrate the festive" or wedding "supper; not in the old lever (that is, not in impudent unchaste pagan life, against which Paul there contends, and 1 Peter 4 also stands), nor in the lever of wickedness and mischievousness, but with the unsearchable bread of wholeness and truth. Here we see only by Paul's words that we understand the trade of our supper and thanksgiving, in contrast to the supper and thanksgiving of the Old Testament, 8) to be reasonable.

And so [I have] strongly proven to you, dear Luther, that neither faith nor Scripture allows us to have the understanding that you have; and that, in turn, yours is inadequate to the truth, and therefore comes either from denseness and gluttony of the flesh, or from self-correct 9) ignorance.

102) That you want to argue with lapps, 10) that Sarah is as well a virgin as Mary, and Pilate as well an apostle as Peter; as if we thus argue: "is" is taken for "means" in the words of Christ, for it is taken 2c. as well as the cow's doublet; 11) for where does the word "apostle" stand with Pilate in Scripture? But let us see if apostle means anything else, neither a messenger of Christ, nor a reeve in Jerusalem or Syria. Also show where the word virgin is found in Sarah, after she gave birth to Isaac; so let us see if virgin means something else, neither a pure maid. If this is not so, why do you give such examples? For we do not say, "is" is here taken for "means," because "means" is often found in Scripture; but WE show that "is" is taken for "means" in other places also. But you do not indicate that the word virgin is used for Sarah in childbirth, just as it is used for Mary. If YOU now shield so blindly, 12) I am completely persuaded that you are writing this book only to a people who have no other judgment nor attention than what YOU say, do not ask it further, and who do not see our books; as you are honest Xellen 13) because of this and because they do not let our books be read,

8) "lift", i.e. hold, compare, put by us instead of: have".

9) i.e. self-righteous, opinionated.

10) Marginal gloss: Stands in Luther's (Buche, im Bogm)D, [Blatt] 3. [No. 20, § 51.)

11) In the old edition: Wambist.

12) i.e. to make fencing strokes.

13) d. i. Journeymen.

1) i.e. puffing.

2) d. i. right.

3) Meaning: We want to prove by similar occasion and likeness (likeness - just the same) that Christ saw and spoke about it (saus the Passover). - "Similar occasion" put by us instead of: "Similar, occasion".

4) d. i. Farewell.

5) d. i. leaven, harvest. - Natzung - sweet dough.

6) Marginal gloss: Christ is our transgression. MetapkorL 68t, ab SILO, yiu Olim knessati tuit.

7) Suit Pauli - what Paul indicates.

and then overcome, yes, where your adversaries may not come. Does the truth, then, run behind the stove? I think it may run to the bare flesh. And would come to light, John 3.

103] Accordingly, [you] also throw a gusher, but scold with the truth; you would also not have been allowed the poem with the word *meum*, my. [I mean, let the whole book be an example; for greater enthusiasm has since Marcion's time, to confuse the two natures in Christ, never come on [the] track, neither thou ledest in this book. Do [you] yet think yourself to have raved so formally, that now you have done it too much good. Thou hast rewarded as good of thyself, 1) that thou shouldst not be silenced or acquired, neither with thyself. But if thou hast done too well, I know no other reward, neither that God give thee the kingdom of heaven.

You also ask Oecolampadium as a huric with the words: Where there, my beautiful love? 2) that I wonder from which old Thaide or Phryne 3) you have learned the chaste little word. *Haecce est viri, nedum theologorum omnium suo iudicio principis, gravitas? Sunt pleraque tua, non salibus sed scurrilibus diceris respersa, at istud, eum nobis refert, qui digito scalpit caput uno* [in German: Is this the seriousness of a man, let alone one who considers himself the most distinguished of all theologians? . Most of your things are not mixed with witty but with farcical sayings, but this shows you as one who scratches his head with one finger]. But this word suits you very well, neither Oecolampadio. You will speak for and for what you want, but will not find in him; that no pious scolds, is a righteous.

(105) Therefore, you have long been using a great deal of Alfenzian words, but with cleverer speech, as if we were asking out of impudence: what is the use of physical food? if we ask that you base your tandems on God's word. Since we know well that you do not like it, we want to attack you peacefully and amicably. So, you come in: 4) "I wanted to do just such a spearing and coking (don't know what a menester 5) is) against it." "I want to say about God: What is the use of him being a man?" and others.

Pieces more you bring, and with it you coke out and out through the whole book. Notice, then, that we have everywhere what it is good for us poor sinners that God is man. And whichever part of you or others is shown to be able to do this or that, we will believe it when we hear the Scriptures about it. There is no need where there is Scripture, but where there is none, we cannot be satisfied. But you must make such a miserable noise to your ignorant ones, to whom you write, as if we did not care at all about all things that have reasons in the Word of God, but tempered only with our reason.

106. and when you therefore begin to speak of the article: "He sits with the righteousness of God, Father Almighty"; but you accuse us of imagining the sitting of God, that he sits in a choir cap 6) 2c. Thank you for forgiving us of childish harmless thoughts! I thought you would have brought one from the *ganea* 7) or from the Huppen 8) Butten; but it has come to a choir cap, of which we have never seen one for so long that we have forgotten its form; they are still in use with you, that makes them presentable to you. You will find many who think that you still have a monk's cap on; and they are surprised that you do not have one of these in this example 9) , since the whole book is unflattered by it. Your lying poetry must also strike you a little. The image of Isaiah 6 has not yet slipped our minds: "I saw the Lord sitting on an elevated chair, and the whole house was filled with his majesty, and that which was under him filled the temple. Seraphim stood on it, each of which had six wings: with two wings they covered his face, and with two his feet, and with two they flew"; nor which Ezekiel saw, Cap. 1., and which are depicted or appeared in Apocalypsi and elsewhere, that we may not be allowed to your Hunz-, yes, Chorkappe (would have mier mißgeredet), GOD have praise! Now take it home again, and remember it to yourself.

107. But after that you put us as if we force the righteous hand [of God] into one place, which we do not do at all. For we recognize God's power to be everywhere; God's essence to be the essence of all things; God's presence to preserve and to be for all things. 10) Recognize also the

1) "vergüt" - missed (known). Cf. 'No. 20, § 68.

2) No. 20, § 70.

3) Thais and Phryne two notorious beautiful whores at Athens.

4) No. 20, § 88.

5) i.e. soup. The word comes from the Italian.

6) See No. 20, § 94 and § 95.

7) i.e. a place of drinking and whoring.

8) Probably: waste, garbage. Cf. § 149 of this paper.

9) Marginal gloss: So one needs "buzzing" in our language, if one models and drives something in a rampage.

10) i.e. preservation, protection.

Word Arati, which Paul, Acts 17, indicates: "We are of his generation; we live in him, we move or stir in him" 2c. well. We [know also well that where Christ is, that God is there; and where God is, that also Christ (yes, after the Godhead; there you give the simple one over the eye) is there. But we can see that you are either an evil theologian, if you cannot speak differently 1) of the two natures in Christ JEsu, of the divine and human, according to his own words; or if thou canst, but deceive the simple with the mixture, that thou spreadest out and makest broad the human [nature] after the divine, and compasseth in the divine after the circumscription or delay of the human; then art thou a greater deceiver and denier of Christ than Marcion ever was. I do not want to persuade you too much, but what I say must be superfluous with the true living word of God; but I would rather let it be an ignorance, neither make it a mischievousness. And then nothing else follows, neither that you have boasted lavishly: yes, your teaching must stand all. But if thou wilt persist, and say for and for, that where the Godhead is, there also is the humanity of Jesus Christ essentially and bodily: then we will either bring thee, with God, to deny the whole Scripture of the New Testament, or to fall into the heresy of Marcion; this we actually admit to thee. But we hope better; namely, that you will recognize yourself, and renounce that which you have done out of the heat of contention, and have spoken so clumsily of the humanity of Jesus Christ; for from your teaching it would follow that Christ would be put to death; and such may not follow from our teaching, which speaks with bright distinction of natures.

For (will now give two examples), if this word of Christ John 3: "No one comes to heaven, except he who came down from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven," is to be understood as meaning that Christ would be in heaven bodily after humanity, since he speaks this as you teach: then it must correctly follow that Marcion was right) that he did not have a real body, but only a fictitious one. It follows, then, that he was unpainful; for how could the corpse suffer, which in the bosom of the Father, to the righteousness of the Father, would be a delight and joy to all angels? Where then would be the painful

1) Marginal gloss: Luther wants to fence in divine nature with human nature, and spread out human nature according to divine nature.

Words: "I thirst!" "My father, my father, how have you forsaken me!"? Shouldn't all this be a loud poem? Or what would Mary have given birth to? What miracle would it be that she would have given birth without human help, and without violation of her virginity, one who would not have had a human corpse, but one who would have been with God in all places, yes, in heaven and hell?

109] Item: Again, the word John 14: "Philip, who sees me, sees also the Father," 2c., 2) the Father must have the face and formation of a man; for Christ not only has the image of a man, but was truly a man; from this it follows, secondly, that the Father also was essentially a man, just as Christ also took on a human nature according to the personal quality; and thirdly, that as the Father is from eternity and into eternity, so also the humanity of Christ must have been from eternity.

And where then would be: "The Word became man"? Joh. Cap. 1. Where is: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son, which was of a woman, which was under the law" 2c., Gal. 4? How could he have been of a woman, if he was from eternity (according to your saying), 3) even according to human nature? How could the eternal God be under the law, if the law was not yet? Yes, you will talk with your bunch: 4) The humanity of Christ has been present with GOD from eternity; for all things are present to Him from eternity; or something of this kind, so that you blind the simple ones, whom you now want to make highly educated, and pretend subtle things to them, like the body of Christ was also essential in heaven, when he was in Mary's body, or like we eat him now, but who is sitting in the righteousness of God; and whoever does not want to understand it, you quickly say that he is a foolish donkey's head.

111 Soon, when one wants to compare the Scriptures and see how they agree with each other, you cry out that one should not be wise, but believe the words (which are not understood) simple-mindedly; and there is so much spit and alfalfa, that I am surprised that anyone (except for the

2) to one - to the first.

3) Zwingli first brings this by false inference to Luther (in the previous paragraph) and then claims (here): Luther says this.

4) Marginal gloss: Cunning bifurcation and apostasy from one nature to another.

The priest) is so poor and lowly in mind that he does not grasp where woe be unto thee; for he that hath good reason may not of the reproach 1). It is true that the humanity of Jesus Christ has been with God from eternity, yes, by decree and knowledge, taking upon itself the Son of God, but in its own being it has not been until it was conceived and begotten by the Holy Spirit in the eternally pure body of Mary; just as the world and man have been in the knowledge and decree of God from eternity, yet have not been essential to themselves until they are created.

Therefore, dear Luther, or if it is too much for you to learn from us, notice how we teach the simple clearly from God's Word about the two natures in Christ Jesus. And where we teach wrongly, describe us openly.

Of the two natures in Christo and their counterchange (*de alloesibus*).

The Almighty God, who sent His Son into this world to take on Himself the whole true human, yet sinless nature, has joined the two natures, human and divine, so that each retains its own characteristic and works and suffers according to its own nature. This is what John 2 Cap. 1 teaches us: "And the Word (that is, He who is the eternal Word and Wisdom, spoken of from the beginning) became flesh (that is, man) and lived among us: but we have seen His glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth," or faithfulness. And Paul Phil. 2: "Let not every man seek his own profit among you, but every man his own: and let that be minded among you, which is in Christ JEsu. Who, being in the "form" or likeness "of GOD, neither committing iniquity or robbery, esteeming himself equal with GOD; having emptied himself, and taking upon him the form of a servant, became like unto men, and in walk" or likeness "was found to be a man; having humbled himself, was subject unto death, even the death of the cross." Behold, thou simple one, thus hast thou that he who according to the Godhead is like unto the Father, is also truly man, and was so, that for this cause he suffered death.

114. the two natures are in Christ, so actually that God also retains for them both their nature and characteristic, so that [it] can be seen in the works and bodies of each publicly em-

finds. And this is the miracle that God works before our eyes, according to the prophet's legend, Psalm 117 [Hebrew 118]. According to the divine one he has all things in his power, Matth. 28. and Joh. 13. According to the human one he is under the emperor, Luc. 2. According to the divine one he knows all things, Joh. 17. [16.]: "Now we know that you know all things." According to the human he speaks, Marc. 13: "But of the day, time, or hour, no one knows, not the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father alone." After the divine one he performs miraculous signs, John 5: "The works that I do testify that the Father has sent me." Item John 10: "The works that I do in the name (that is, in the power: *hebraismus est, nomen pro auctore*).

of my Father, which bear witness of me." There: "If you will not believe me, believe the works. All this is to make him understand that the works and miracles he does are of divine power. But according to the human nature, he says John 5: "I can do nothing of myself." According to the divine nature he teaches the words of the one life, Joh. 6. According to the human nature he speaks, Joh. 7: "My teaching is not mine, but His who sent me." And Joh. 5: "If I give an account of myself, my account is not true." According to the divine nature he is with the Father in heaven from eternity to eternity unchallenged and immortal, Joh. 3. According to the human nature he thirsts, hungers, fears, is scourged, put on the cross, dies. And are the two natures, both essential and actual in him, only one Christ JEsus, true God and Mary's Son, born from eternity, with his heavenly Father, without a mother; and in time from the bodily mother, without a bodily father.

The godly teachers have sought examples and parables of these two natures in him. Many of the Greeks drew a red-hot sword 3) there, as also Damascenus; for the same, when it strikes, also burns with it; thus in Christ Jesus also every nature's quality and effect was actually seen; which example you, dear Luther, recognize, that it was taken from them amicably; recognize it, that it was not stolen; and you have used it for an opinion, for which it was not used by the ancients, nor does it actually serve that purpose. Namely, that the bread is also bread and the body of Christ. Here you had to see that in the glowing sword there were two effects.

3) Marginal gloss: k'errum Huiäurn non intelliZunt pro Zlaäio aeoi.

1) i.e. chatting.

2) In the old edition: Jeremias.

burn and hew, and then you would have to indicate the same two effects in the bread that you speak, including the 1) corpse of Christ, with God's word. You indicate many effects, but all without God's word, which are also so that they resist God's word. But this comparison fits well: the glowing 2) means the divine power in Christ; the cutting 2) the human nature.

116. Others have given man as an example of the two natures; as he is composed of body and soul, two disgusting substances, and yet is one man, so God and man are One Christ, that is, Christ is true God and man, and yet the two natures are only One Christ, that is, One Person of the Son of God and Savior of men, and are thus agreed that the Godhead is not turned into mankind, nor mankind into Godhead, but both natures remain completely; just as in man the corpse always remains a corpse, and the soul a soul, not mixed or confused; but the humanity is accepted in unity of the person of the Son of God, just as our corpse, joined to the soul, is one man.

117 Thus Athanasius speaks of it in the Symbola, but it is all learned in the words of Christ: "My soul is sorrowful unto death." Indicates that he had a soul that retained its own nature; for if his Godhead had been a soul to him instead of the soul, as some heretics have wanted to talk about, how could the Godhead have grieved? But if the soul had been turned into the Godhead, how could the soul have mourned? But the soul has kept its own nature and essence (*de essentia animae loquor, non de existentia; ne et Neoterici possint offendi*), and therefore he says: "I have power to put away my soul from me, and to take it again to myself", Joh. 10. And are therefore not two, but God and man are One Christ.

After all this, when we have learned the unity of two natures in Christ through Scripture and example, we should now also learn from God's Word how to speak of the whole Christ, or of the two natures in Him. Know, therefore, that the figure called *alloeosis* (may be fairly rendered counterchange) is used innumerable by Christ himself; and is the figure, so far as it serves, an interchange, or

The two natures, which are in one person, as one calls the one and understands the other, or calls that, which they both are, and yet only the one understands.

119. example from the human being. When we speak: Man is nothing but dung, and becomes nothing but dung. Here man, who is called body and soul, is taken for the body alone; he becomes dung and is already dung, for the soul does not become dung, but is an end-sleodis, 3) which lives forever. Item, when one says: Man is like the angels; by the word man alone one understands the soul. Item, with the Hebrews "soul" is often taken for a living body of the cattle, as Gen. 2.

120 Thus, in the Gospel, Christ, who is one God and man, is often taken for the One Nature alone. As when he says, Luc. 24: "Was not Christ therefore to suffer, and so to enter into his glory?" Here Christ is taken for the human nature alone, which might suffer and die, but not the divine. In Gal. 2 Paul says: "Now I no longer live, but Christ lives in me." Here Christ reaches more to the divine nature, because according to it he is in all creatures, is also according to it the life.

121 Secondly, any nature is often taken for itself. As, Matth. 26: "And the Son of Man is betrayed," or given, "that he may be crucified. And Matthew 20: "And the Son of Man is given to the priests and scribes" 2c. Here the Son of Man is actually taken for the human nature, for the same might be given and killed, but the divine by no means not. The divine [nature] in Him is also taken for Himself without a counterchange, as John 1: "And God was the Word!" Here "Word" is taken for the living Son of God, and not for Christ, who was God and man; for John describes Him there from the divine nature. Item, 1 John 1: "We proclaim unto you eternal life, which was with the Father, and hath appeared unto us." Here the word "eternal life" is taken for the living Son of God, who was with the Father before the Incarnation, and thus appeared to us in human nature, as in a harness.

Thirdly, each nature is taken for the other; the divine for the human, and the human for the divine, all through the

1) "The" put by us instead of "the"; for the meaning will be: You should indicate such two effects in the bread, of which you say it is the body of Christ.

2) Glowing --- the glowing; hewing --- the hewing.

3) According to Aristotle, entelechia is a fifth element, from which the soul is said to have originated, the constant activity, striving power, as a form of the human soul. The spelling: endelechia is incorrect.

The opposite, that he who is true God is also true man, and again that he who is true man is also true God; not that therefore the divine nature is the human, nor again that the human is the divine; and nothing less will the natures be confused, nor our ears injured, if we hear such an opposite.

Example John 1: "The Word became man" or: "God became man" is to be understood correctly by the reciprocal, thus: Since God may no longer become anything at all, or else He would be imperfect; then this word may not be understood according to the first appearance, but must have the meaning: Man has become God; thus, that which is said of the Godhead, that it has become man, must be understood of mankind by substitution: Man has become God. Now again, as each nature is turned into the other, as has been heard before, this word: Man has become God, is not to be understood in such a way that human nature is turned into divine nature, but each remains in its own natural essence. As Athanasius also says in the Symbolo: "But Christ is One, not that the divinity should be turned into humanity, but that humanity should be accepted as God." So we well notice that these words: man 1) has become GOD. Again (per metalepsim²), ab adoptionibus transsumta; qui enim cooptatur, filius fit) no longer want neither, man is adopted to the unity of the person of the Son of GOD. And now we come again to the first, that this word: God became man, or: The Word (that is, the divine wisdom, the Son of God) became man, cannot mean anything else, neither, God's Son has taken human nature.

Do you see, dear Luther, how the most profound words concerning the eternal Godhead and true humanity of Jesus Christ must be sent through figures and tropes into the right sense, which is inviolable to faith? Why then will you not allow the tropes, or figurative speeches? Well, argue once: *verbum caro factum est*, "the Word became man"; the words are dry, it must be: God became man. Thus, ever who was God [before] must now be man. The water has become wine; so without doubt, that was before water, was now man.

1) In the old edition: "The Father", which seems impossible to us (even with Zwingli's metalepsis).

2) Metalepsis is a trope, as the following stands for the preceding.

Being, now wine, and not water; so also he would have to be man now, who was before God, and in addition no longer be God. Yes, if one should rage as you do.

But, devout Christian, do not let yourself be seduced by such folly. 3) They are fighters of words. They are word fighters, whose arrogance is easily broken, if one gets to the bottom of truth, and looks at the right meaning, and keeps the art of figurative speeches and tropes well. As here, I think, are probably more theurer words: "The Word became man," nor "Eat, this is my body"; nor must they be understood by figurative explanation alone, or else we would get into the greatest heresies that have ever been. And do not therefore the sayings hurt us: God became man; or: Man became God; but we must not understand them at first sight, but add the figures of the sayings as a measure, and thus understand them: God became man; God took human nature; man became God (*nam et hic sermo saepe apud veteres theologos invenitur*), human nature was assumed by God.

But before I leave this place, God became man, I must do one more thing with you, dear Luther. With your lack of understanding you lead yourself to the point that you cannot speak according to the theology of Christ as he himself used it, that you want to prove by force that the body of Christ is everywhere, as well as his divinity; and therefore you do violence to all the sayings that you bring in, which will come afterward. But here I ask thee thus: Is Christ's body everywhere, because he is made anew infinite; or because he is changed into the divine nature, which is infinite, immeasurable, and incomprehensible? For you must deny one of the two, since everything that exists must either be made anew, or be made of another. Only God can make from scratch without matter; the shoemaker can also make from matter. If Christ mankind is made anew infinitely; Dear! then say, if two infinite things may be? For, if two may be, the first must not have been infinite, or else, it might not have permitted the following; for that which is full before may not permit any more, and that which fills all things may not permit another, which also fills all things, for they are full before.

3) In the old edition: "Täuberey. That we have resolved this word correctly is evident from the preceding "Toben", then also from the marginal gloss to § 106 of this writing, where "Taubucht" stood for "Tobsucht".

From this it follows that not more than one thing can be infinite, immeasurable; that is the one Godhead. It also follows that the same infinite good must be eternal; for who would have given it the beginning? If there were another, then it would have to be the immeasurable good and the beginning of all things, and would not be what follows or what is made; but 1) from this it follows that everything that is made may not be infinite, that is, unmeasured, incomprehensible, infinitum, 2). Therefore infinite, incomprehensible, unmeasured, as also the theologi say, *intrinsecus modus divinitatis*, is the right inner quality of the Godhead. From this it follows that only One can be infinite good, and that is the only God. It also follows that Christ mankind may not be made infinite anew, for there must be only One infinite, which must also be from eternity to eternity.

But if you say, Now Christ is God Himself, why should He not be everywhere? as you do, but you are deceiving the simple. 3) God's right hand is everywhere; Christ is at the right hand of God: so also is the body of Christ everywhere. See how beautifully you close! 4) Who has taught thee so beautifully to discern between the two natures of Christ? that thou wilt, with so false a semblance, in the sight of the simple, introduce into the human nature that which is also of the divine, yea, of the divine alone? When you say: God's right hand, power, majesty and authority are everywhere, you are right, even though you think that we foolish heads have never known this. Ah! who is so childish in the holy scriptures that does not know this? Are these not the first beginnings, so one (τὸ θεῖον, numen) wants to learn to know God? Dear! examine our Commentary before you, and see whether we knew it or not. But it is one of your pieces. You have written the book only for the sake of the foolishness, otherwise you would have made it in Latin, in which language we used to have eight or even more writings (so that it would be inviolable). You would have to dazzle them, your foolish ones, along with the popes; just as the tile people, who can't quite stand the name-calling, submit to the village church consecrations and markets, their insignificant antics do enough for the simple-minded.

We are returning to the first thing. You speak rightly, God's right hand is everywhere. But when you say that Christ is at the right hand of God, you speak rightly; for he is at the right hand according to divine and human nature, but not uniformly. For according to divine nature he is at the right hand from eternity to eternity, so that he is everywhere where God is, for he is God himself, and is not only at the right hand by nature, but is the right hand itself. As well as the theologians from the right hand of God, well and rightly, make the Son of God in many places of Scripture *per allegoriam*. But mankind is not at the right hand of God, because it is not the divine nature, it is also not the right hand itself.

(130) Now behold how you so subtly deceive the simple! If you say, "Christ is at the right hand of God," you do not make a distinction, 6) as to how he is at the right hand according to divine nature and how he is at the right hand according to human nature; but you draw your conclusion on humanity alone, and place on it that in the saying, "Christ is at the right hand," it may be understood to refer to the Godhead alone. For if thou sayest, Is not Christ at the right hand of God? I will say: Yes, he is there; but he is not there equally to both natures; for to the divine half he is there, as the equal, eternal, unstruck God, who is everywhere, sustains all things, is and gives life to all things; but according to humanity he is there, as with the recently assumed nature, which may not be from eternity; or else there would be two *infinita*, that is, two natures, which would be uncaptured, but that may not be, because they are not three divine ones, of which it is unity to be everywhere.

(131) If then you must understand the inner capacity of the speech "Christ is at the right hand of God," why do you refer in the resolution to mankind alone, but which in the previous speech is understood only of the Godhead? For "Christ is thus at the right hand, that he may be everywhere" must be understood of the divine nature alone. Or what art teaches thee to speak in the conclusion: So is the body of Christ everywhere? If Christ understands the two natures, you should not have said thus: So is Christ everywhere, and not: So is mankind or corpse everywhere. Do you see how you are not ashamed to make false shillogismos? That's where you get it from, you can make jokes, but not subtly, and that's why [you] show off at the village church consecration, beseflest 7) those who listen. Here-

6) Marginal gloss: slsuek puruloZisrui.

7) i.e. defile. - In the old edition: "beseflest die Horchen".

1) but - again. - In the old edition: "gemachet" instead of: Gemachte.

2) Marginal gloss: Lt she üeret proesssus in inñitum.

3) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's [book in the arc] G. [No. 20, § 116.]

4) Marginal gloss: xsraloKism ^Fallacy).

5) d. i. Boobies.

if you would tell me about the noble question: Whether Christ was made infinite anew? Yes, he is infinite; as you also do, but more untruthfully than any theologian has ever done: so you speak falsely, and should judge in the words that I ask only on human nature, if I even call Christ, and speak: Is Christ made infinite? For it is not necessary to ask about the Godhead, since we all know that he is incomprehensible, immeasurable, infinite and unbegotten from eternity to eternity. Nevertheless, it must be shown to you, otherwise you would think that they are all roses, on which you tread, and could walk in lusts.

Now let us return to our question. If now it turns out that Christ mankind may not be made infinita, that is, infinite or immeasurable, and you say that it is immeasurable: then it would have to be that it would be transformed into the infinite Godhead; but that may not be. To one that God is an immutable good, therefore it may not be turned into other things, nor other things into it. 4 Mos. cap. 23: "God is not like man, that he should lie; nor like the son of man, that he should be changed." Malach. 3: "I am the LORD, which am not changed." And if the human nature be changed into the divine, [would] ever be change and innovation. On the other hand, it may not be; for if the humanity of JEsu Christ [had been] turned into the divine nature, he would not have suffered, for the divine nature may not suffer, Apost. 2 Therefore it stubbornly remains with the old right theology, that the two natures are not mixed in Christ, so that the divine becomes the human, or again the human the divine, but that each nature remains in its essence and nature, and yet both are only One Christ, Son of God and Son of Mary. So now your error falls away, since you teach anew that the humanity of Jesus Christ or his corpse is everywhere, like the divinity.

133) Now you have an answer to your words, 1) Luther: "It is our faith, as Scripture teaches us, that our Lord Jesus Christ is an essential, natural, true God, and that the Godhead dwells in him completely bodily, as St. Paul says in Col. 2, so that apart from Christ there is no God or Godhead"; 2) this is what your words are. But with these you assume three dishonest, false things: the first, that you

You speak in the same way, jumping from one nature in Christ to the other, like a monkey that jumps into the kensserlein and onto the pole, as it pleases; as if one should not notice which of the divine nature and which of the human nature is to be understood. And you do not need the counterchange, like Christ, who, while he calls one nature and wants the other to be understood, does not want to say anything about the human nature that is only divine, nor about the divine nature that is only human; 3) as bright will come later. The other is, that thou wilt by words comprehend and end the Godhead according to mankind, 4) when thou sayest, Outside of Christ there is badly no God nor Godhead; for by words thou speakest rightly, when thou wilt by Christ alone understand the divine nature *per heterosim* or *alloeosim*, that is, by the counterchange. For Christ Himself, true God, can be nothing at all outside of Himself, nor can anything be outside of His God; but you want to be understood by Alfanx as if the Godhead according to its nature were contained in Christ, that is, in His humanity. From this then the third error may follow, namely, that you want to extend the humanity of Christ, 5) in which the Godhead is whole, so that it is as wide and infinite as the Godhead.

And so you do two very dishonorable, falsifying, harmful things of the whole holy scripture, that for the sake of your quarrel you want to circumscribe the divine nature with the humanity of Jesus Christ, and say: Outside of Christ there is neither God nor Godhead; yet you secretly want to understand His humanity through Christ; and God, even outside of the humanity of Christ, is in all creatures and was so before Christ became man. And secondly, you hope, when you have thus comprehended and aimed the Godhead in the humanity of Christ, that after this, according to the infinity of the Godhead, you will drive out and extend the humanity, so that it will be the same everywhere.

Dear, don't you know what it means to swarm, to swarm, to swarm? This is what I have to do with you, that you learn to speak without measure of the two natures in Christ; for if you can do it right, and lead such a raving, then not only is the devil, as you speak to us, but also the she-devil is with you. But, as reported before, I would rather make it an ignorance for you.

3) Marginal gloss: äoiu8 (deception).

4) Marginal gloss: Luther fences the Godhead with the humanity, and the humanity he expands after the Godhead.

5) Here lies the pus.

6) i.e. unharmed, not contaminated.

1) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's sBuche, im Bogens G. [No. 20, § 110.]

2) Marginal gloss: In the completely lies the deception, as if the divinity is closed into the humanity.

But be wise, and let yourself be taught, and know the error of your ways.

Now we return again to the mosses, or alternate speeches. First we heard how we must understand the word: "The Word", or God's Son, "became man. Now he speaks John 5: "I may do nothing of myself." Here "I" and "of myself" do not apply to both natures in Christ, but only to the human nature; to which he says that it does nothing at all for itself, nor can it do anything, but "what the Father is called" (here the Father is also taken for the Godhead by the counterchange), that he does. Behold, so much Christ's mouth itself extracts from his humanity; and thou, dear Luther, goest to it, and puttest it in all rule, power, to be, to be able, and to do, which after all is of the Godhead alone?

137 John 7 says: "My doctrine is not mine. How could his teaching not be his? It was his, as the Son of God; not his, as man's. The Jews regarded him as a mere man, and therefore rejected his teaching; so he says: his teaching is not his; understand, it would not be his humanity. Behold, he hath taken away the power of his mankind, and here the doctrine; and thou givest it all to them, against his own word.

John 12: "If I am lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men to myself. Here "if I be lifted up" is spoken of human nature alone, for he alone may die according to it. And "I will draw all men unto me" is understood of the Godhead alone, for according to it he draws the hearts into knowledge and gives them faith. So "I" stands in both places, as if it were to be understood of both natures, but each extends to the one nature by the counterchange; and it does not hurt us that he says, "If I am exalted," as if the Godhead were crucified, but we see in all his words from the beginning which extends to the divine nature and which to the human nature.

139. John 3 says: "No one comes to heaven except the one who came from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up," that is, crucified 2c. Here we have the Son of Man: in either 1) place for the two natures in Christ,

1) "zwürent" - twice; "twederem" - neither.

but in one for the divine, in the other for the human. When he says, "Without the Son of man, who is in heaven," the Son of man is taken for the divine nature in him, for he was not then in heaven bodily after the human. But when he says, "So must the Son of man be exalted," the Son of man alone is taken for the human nature. Which, dear Luther, if you do not realize, you will fall into two great [openly] bearish errors, through which you, not we, would forcibly introduce the Marcionian heresy, if it were left to you.

For one thing, you say: 2) Now, according to the divine nature, he may neither ascend nor descend; therefore, this place will be understood by his humanity. And in doing so, you are describing Oecolampadium, whom you, nor all those who act against him, are not half like in Christian discipline and doctrine; and you are worthy of the highest help, because you do not understand the ethopoeia 3) of Christ's words, and you rage in front of the ignorant in such a harmful way that not enough can be said.

Therefore notice, you pious simpleton: It is a kind of speech, called ἠθοποιία, *ethopoeia*, that is, common morality poetry: and is used when one imputes a morality to someone, which he does not have by nature; but the same morality is common among those, before whom one presents the same morality poetry, for the sake of understanding. And there is a great deal of this in the Scriptures, for in them we impute customs to God that are customary and known to us, but are not so customary with him, but give us some understanding of his clarity, majesty, or action.

142. example. We have indicated before how the prophets have seen visions and appearances of God sitting in heaven, as Luther suspected us of Mr. Tillman's 4) chorus cap, which is a morality poem, for otherwise neither God nor His chair has never been seen by anyone 2c. Joh. 1.

143 Another. In the first book of Kings, at 22, a custom that kings and lords have of sending and acting in the counsel of messengers is attributed to God, as he counseled with his angels to disturb Ahab; but God has no need of the counsel of angels, but all things are eternally present to his knowledge, all things are obedient to his power and ability.

2) Compare No. 20, U122 and 123.

3) 'U-Son-otta, depiction of customs and character.

4) Till Eulenspiegel (?).

Still such pre-paintings of the sealing of the customs benefit our small mind.

144 Another. In Genesis, in the first chapter, God devises to create man with such words: "Let us make man in our likeness and image", but God does not need long deliberation nor consideration; nor does he devise in the Scriptures, as it were, a great bountiful good Lord.

So also this is a moral poetry, since he says: "The Son of Man came from heaven", for: The Son of God came from heaven; and John 16: "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world" 2c. Not to press the words to the effect that the Son of God has left the Father, or has diminished Himself; for He is the eternal God, who must be everywhere, and cannot be diminished; but that, speaking after our manner, He has made His action clear and well known to us. And again thus: "He came from heaven", and: "I came forth from the Father", spoken according to human manners, for: He took on Himself human nature on earth 2c.

146 Which moral seal Paul needs even more crudely from Christ, Phil. 2: "He poured Himself out", or emptied Himself. How can God empty himself? But he imputed to him the manners of pious kings and lords who put their majesty aside and come to the aid of the needy. When the great Alexander departed from the fire in a great frost, and put an old honest man of war in his place, that was emptying himself. So here "empty" is taken for "graciously come to the aid" of the poor meager race of men; for He may not ours.

147 Behold, how it shall befall you by and by, that ye know not the figures and the tropes, and then with such ignorance ye preach, and deceive the simple.

148) For the other, you say immediately this word) Luther: "So that" (by the words, the Son of Man, who is in heaven) "he shows that his body is in heaven and on earth at the same time, yes, already ready at all ends. So you want to show that his body was here on earth and also in heaven; so he is also everywhere.

I ask you this: What was the condition of Christ's body here on earth when he spoke these words? Did he not suffer thirst? Yes. John, chapter 4. Tell me, my dear, whether he also thirsted, hungered, and was glad in heaven? 2c. And since he feared death, did he also fear it in heaven?

1) No. 20, § 122.

and when he wept over Jerusalem on earth, did he also weep in heaven? You cry out: "Enthusiast, enthusiast! It is not answered for, as soon as thou art lost, that thou canst not answer, that thou wilt do it all with the reproach of the swarms; for if that were so, then would a scapegoat 2) now have one foot in the bucket, and overcome thee and all the swarms with all the Scriptures. Answer: whether the body of Christ is in heaven as it is here? Are you silent? Stop! Add this also: Was not the body born of Mary of flesh, bone, veins, skin, marrow, nerves, nails, hair, teeth? 2c. I mean: Yes. So tell, dear Luther, whether he would be the same in heaven? If he was, who gave him food up there, or who trimmed his nails and hair? And only when he was crucified. Who crucified him in the heavens? And when he rose from the dead with his body clarified, did he also rise from the dead? And when he went with the disciples to Emmaus and interpreted the Scriptures. Tell me, did he also go to Emmaus and teach the two disciples?

150 Here, I know, you will say: O you shameful mockers! O you miserable mocking devil! And our intention is not at all to mock, but only to make you understand your error. Sayest thou: As he is in heaven, he has no need of the things that require bodily need, or that are wrought in the flesh. I answer, I know this well, now after the primal state and the ascension. But I am talking about the state when his body was not yet explained here 3) before death. You will have to say that you are also talking about the same; for you use the words: "The Son of Man, who is in heaven," to mean that he was also bodily in heaven before all explanation.

151) Do you say: Yes, just then he was in heaven, and had none of the defects or troubles 4) up there; then I cry out to you: Resist, resist! Luther, resist! Marcion wants you in the garden. For if his corpse in heaven has been unleavened, then he has also been unleavened here; and then Marcion is right: he has had a dense 5) unleavened corpse, Responde. Or

2) Holhüpper - Holhipler, a meanly scolding lotterbube. Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 1253, note 5. "Holhüpper" are the people who fetch the "Huppen" [i.e., the excavated material]. Cf. § 106 of this writing. Zwingli also uses the word "huppen" for: meanly scold.

3) d. i. transfigured.

4) In the old edition "troubles" probably a misprint.

5) d. i. fictitious.

If you want to say: The corpse, which was sufferable here, but not above, it must have had two corpses. For, in short, his corpse, which was only one, must have had only one kind. 1) If in heaven he is unpleasant, as you will undoubtedly speak, then he must also be unpleasant here; then welcome to God, Marcion and Marcionin! But if he is suffering here, as we say from God's word (hope you also), he must also be suffering in heaven. Or thirdly, [he must have] two bodies; one on earth, suffering, and the other in heaven, not suffering. Tell us, then, whether Mary also gave birth to the one above, or how he came to be here? What does it matter that we are impotent enthusiasts?

I have had to point out so many inconsistencies to you, dear Luther, which come from your misunderstanding, so that you can see where one comes to when he only wants to act against the evil enthusiasts with a polite little lie. Into which you would certainly not fall if you could walk in the Scriptures according to the custom of all scholars who have ever been. For even the papal doctors have never fallen into the grave error of putting Christ's body bodily up into heaven, since he had not yet risen from the dead and ascended to heaven; But they called this kind of speech, where one is called nature and the other is understood, *communicationem idiomatum*, that is, the communion of attributes, since that which is proper to one nature is also imparted to the other, which we have called, according to rhetoric, the antitype of natures. As here "Son of man" is taken for the divine nature in him, and has the sense: No one comes to heaven without him who came down from heaven; that is: without him who on earth took human nature to himself; that is, he whom one esteems a son of man alone (*ut sit mimesis quoque in alloeoisi* [d. i. so that also in the alloeoisis is a figurative expression]), but who is also a Son of God, who is in heaven above, and has never left him according to the divine nature. So understand this place Augustine, who speaks thus: He was here of the corpse or flesh half, and was in heaven according to the Godhead, yes, half of the Godhead everywhere, and Cyrillus, who speaks with many words equally of the two natures, as we have shown before also from God's word, and Chrysostom, and all who have ever diligently looked at the contrast of both natures.

153 John 14 says: "The Father is more" or greater "neither I." Here "I" is referred to the human nature alone; according to this he is inferior, and according to the divine equal to the Father. Athanasius in verse 2) of the Faith: "He is equal to the Father according to the divinity; and inferior to the Father according to the humanity." I only indicate that Luther learns to know himself, that he speaks of the two natures in Christ in a new way, 3) against all fathers, even papal teachers, contrary to God's Word's ability; that is where the quarrel brings him. He may also learn here that he is mistaken, if he gives Christ's humanity equal authority with the Father; for according to that he is neither the Father, although we know that God and man are One Christ, and the speeches do not hurt us: "Christ is rich, 4) Christ is equal with the Father"; for they are divine and true, but only half of the divine nature; neither do they injure us because the two natures are joined together with the highest unity in Christ, and with the highest wonder each retains its quality and nature.

154. John 10 says: "That you may believe that the Father is in me, and I in the Father. Here "in me" and "I" refer only to the divine nature in Him, according to which He is in the Father according to His inner being, and the Father in Him from eternity. Not that Christ's humanity is excluded from the Godhead, but that it is One Christ with and with Him; but by that Christ is in the Father according to the Godhead, and the Father in Him, the humanity is One Christ with the Godhead, thus that His Godhead is the essential thing by which His humanity has come to the Father.

155. Joh. 12. he says: "Father, deliver me from the hour". Here "me" is taken to mean human nature alone, for according to divine nature he was not allowed a redeemer. This indicates the weakness of human nature, which would not have been able to speak truly, even if it had been essential in heaven; or else, if he himself had been like him above and here, he would have had to be fearful there, as he was here, or else there would have had to have been two corpses. All this is not only heretical, but also foolish, as it is shown above.

Matth. 26. He says: "You will have the poor with you everywhere, but you will not have me everywhere. Here "you will not have me everywhere" refers only to human nature. Here you will no doubt cry out once:

2) i. Confession.

3) Marginal gloss: Luther's teaching is in the case against Christ and all who have ever taught right.

4) reichsnet - governed (?).

So you say that it should be understood in human terms alone, but not in this way; you must force it to be understood in this way. Well then, if you do not have peace because of friendly teaching, we also want to force you. Tell me, may God not be in one place? 1) I mean, no. I mean, no; but it is his inward attribute to be everywhere. Why then does Christ say, "we shall not have him everywhere"? If he is not God, we have good reason to believe that we shall not have him everywhere; but if he is true and undoubted God, it is not possible that he should not be with us everywhere. But set against this his true word, "Me ye shall not have universally"; and tell me, whether thou wilt understand the word to mean the whole one Christ, or the Godhead alone, or mankind alone? If you want to apply it half to the one Christ of both natures, then you are taking it from us according to divine and human nature. Who then will establish your faith, and feed your corpse to the original state, 2c. which you attribute to bodily food? But wilt thou understand it in the divine, that we shall not have it? we enthusiasts 2) leave thee by no means; for we have his word of promise, saying, Perceive, I will be with you unto the end of the world.

157 So you are now, I hope, forced that these words extend to human nature, that we will not have them with us in the flesh all the time. But I doubt, you will say like Faber, Egg 3) and the miracle animals: one should understand the words now thus: You will not see me everywhere; I will be with you everywhere, but you will not see me. Answer: You want to put glasses on Oecolampadio, but you don't need them; but you need them very much, because you don't see that it says "have", not "see". You think it says, "You will not see me all the time"; so it says, "You will not have me all the time." Yes, we understand by "have" "see." Thank you, dear Luther! So I hear, the words no longer have to be dry, nor do they mean that their nature is? If you do not want to be forced, then he will force you who forced that [possessed] one to run in the caves and tear all things. Luc. 8.

158. in the 16th chapter of John he says: "I tell you the truth, it is useful for you that I go away (understand to the one who sent him), because if I would not go away, the

Comforter will not come to you; but if I go away, I will send him." Here it cannot be good that he should leave us after the Godhead, or that he should go away from us; therefore the word, "It is profitable for you that I should go away," must be understood as referring only to the humanity of Christ. On the other hand, the Comforter would not be sent if he remained bodily. 4) So it must be that he is not here in the flesh, nor eaten, since we feel the divine consolation in our hearts; for the Spirit would not have come if he had remained in the flesh. But you see that the consolation comes from the spirit, not from bodily eating, indeed, the spirit does not come, because the corpse is bodily present. Dear Luther, remind yourself of this word: "If I do not go, the Comforter will not come," and boast of your faith accordingly, if you wish.

159. There he says: "Again I leave the world and go to the Father. He does not say, 'Again I remain in the world, but invisibly;'" but "I leave the world. Which is a word of the one who goes and leaves behind him; and may not be sufficient, neither to some mankind.

In the 24th chapter of St. Matthew, he says: "If anyone should say to you, 'Behold, here is the Christ,' or, 'It is not so,' you must not believe it. For false Christs and false prophets shall arise, and shall shew great signs and wonders; so that, if it were possible, they shall deceive even the elect. Take heed, I say unto you." Here you speak: Christ does not speak here of the sects and the masters of the sects. Answer: Yes, you seek escape, you also give God's word the understanding it does not have by nature. Although I do not reproach [that] the sectarian error may also be denied here; but not that [such] is the noble sense. For the noble meaning is: it will come to such a misery for the Jewish people that they would like to have Christ only one day, as Luc. 17 is clearly understood; but he may not become theirs. Then 5) Some will be prophets of Christ, but where Christ is shown to them in the inner chamber, or in the field and wilderness, they shall not believe, nor go out. "For as the lightning ariseth from the going forth even unto the coming down, so shall the future of the Son of man be." Do you see that he speaks of the future

1) d. i. about.

2) Marginal gloss: Lareusruos est, gusher.

31 d. i. Eck.

4) Marginal gloss: *Syllogism*: If you have faith, you have the Spirit. If you have the Spirit, Christ is not here in the flesh, for he has spoken 2c.

5) Marginal gloss: Is again [from here on] Matth. 24.

See also that before this he speaks of himself, saying that where he is shown, let no man go, and there are false prophets who will show him here or there. Go now, take this rod, and measure thyself, whether thou be a false prophet or not, if thou show him not only bodily in the bread, but also admit that the body eaten bodily lie; 1) which is now proved manifold to be the work of the Spirit alone.

161. to this belongs that he speaks Matth. 26: "But I say to you: For the time being you will see the Son of Man seated with the righteous of God's power." (See here, dear Luther, that we are not allowed to have many foreign teachers who taught us the righteous hand of God to be His power; so Christ Himself gives us here an exposition of the righteous of the power of God; as if He said: "The righteous", understand "the power of God"). Behold, behold, dear Luther, where he is! Do [you] know where the word "forhin" reaches? Without doubt to the time that is after his death and ascension until the end of the world. Seek him bodily elsewhere, and show him not elsewhere, or else thou shalt come in the number of false prophets. Consider now how well it may behoove thee to say, Christ hath given himself bodily to be eaten in this sacrament, that we may know where to find him. Dear, why do you show him, since he does not show himself, and since he has shown himself, you say nothing about it? I can almost guess that his word is no more pleasing to you than it was yesterday. Dear, let us recognize (that is, see) that he is above! I do not believe that he deceives us: he himself showed us where he was, and Stephen also saw him there. For when you say, "He was not allowed to lift up his eyes, but he saw him in his mind," you are speaking out of a forgetfulness of Scripture: for it is written in the 7th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, "But Stephen, full of the Holy Ghost, looked diligently up into heaven." We also know well what he saw in his heart before he appeared to him; nor did he see with his bodily eyes the vision that God opened to comfort him. Therefore I urge you to leave him up there, and show him there, when he has shown himself.

162. John [in the] 17th chapter he speaks thus: "For the time being I will not be in the world; 2) but they (understand, the disciples) are in the world." But here you see clearly that he does not say, "I will be with you invisibly for the time being, but still bodily;

but: "I will be no more in the world for the time being". How can he speak more theologically, and how can it be understood differently, neither from his corpse? If we had no other word, neither this some, would you, dear Luther, oppose it? What castle can [thou] give him? Do you not see that he rejects his humanity, that he will not be here, in that he speaks above of [the] disciples, "but they are in the world." Now they were indeed bodily in it; so he must not be bodily in it nor according to human nature, because it is *antithesis*.

Soon after that he says: "Father, when I was with them, I kept them in your name" 2c. "But now I come to you" 2c. Dear Luther, when have you heard enough proclamations from Christ's own mouth alone? Or do you want to reject all of them with cross? If you see that neither faith nor Scripture can suffer that he is here in the flesh, let alone that one would want to eat him only if he were here? Yea, [thou] speakest much, how we ought to esteem it so delicious, that he hath given himself to us for meat. Yes, if we had to eat human flesh in the custom, as is said of Scythians and Anthropophagi (people eaters). Therefore also we are not Capernaïtes, if we will not eat him, but disciples of Christ, who said, 3) "We believe that thou art the Son of the living God." But you are like them, because you want to understand his words, which are only significant, carnally, as they counsel.

164 One more customer, and we will add up the total. Apost. 1: "As the disciples watched him diligently going up to heaven, behold, there stood by them two men clothed in white, which said also unto them: Ye Galilean men, what stand ye gazing into heaven? JEsus, which is received of you into heaven, 4) so shall he come, even as 5) ye have seen him go into heaven. "2c. Do you see that he is received from them into heaven? He is from them; he is received. Now the Godhead cannot comprehend or grasp heaven or earth, but if Christ is conceived in heaven, as also Marc. 16. says, then his humanity alone must be the comprehended one, for the Godhead cannot be comprehended. Do you also see that he will return visibly, as he went up? Do you say: But he cometh into bread, which is not spoken of here, but these words are for the future at the last day. It is true;

3) Marginal gloss: The sewing is salutary.

4) d. i. recorded.

5) Marginal gloss: üv T-^ōn-or-.

1) i. e. good, useful.

2) marginal gloss: ianturn potest graze veritM: öüx

He says only about the future on the last day: but if we have no other future of his body, you will not bring us there with any word of God, because you have none (but if you had, we would already be brought there), that we believe that he is 1) bodily, neither up in heaven, until he comes as visibly as the disciples have seen him go up. For, in short, your seal is from the coming of God, not God's promise; for you have no promise at all, of which enough is said above.

Now add up all the sums. Christ says: "Let him do nothing of himself; let not his doctrine be his doctrine; if he be lifted up from the earth, that is, be put to death; let the Father be greater than he; let him pray the Father, Deliver me out of this hour; ye shall not have me for ever; it is profitable for you that I should depart; again, I will leave the world, and go to the Father; if any man shall say unto you, Here is Christ, or there is he; ye shall not believe it: If any man shall say unto you, Here is Christ, or there; believe it not: but now therefore ye shall see the Son of man sitting in the righteousness of the power of God; for the time being I am not in the world." He speaks all these words to his humanity. From these it is evident to everyone that it is not possible, because of his word, that his humanity should always be bodily present in the world, for he has rejected it; nor does he go against his word.

It follows, then, that your conclusion that Christ's body is everywhere is not only untrue but also unchristian, for that must ever be unchristian which publicly disputes the word and teaching of Christ. So then you say: Christ's body is everywhere, even and coextensive and equal with the Godhead; and Christ says, "I leave the world," and, "Hereafter I will not be in the world," and other words, first counted, 2) which must apply to mankind alone (for the Godhead is everywhere): then your word in short is 3) false, and will never receive that the mankind of Jesus Christ is more than in one place. And even if I also devil here, and say: Against this neither devil nor hell is able! In spite of enthusiasts! Blast the hypocrites! 2c., the truth is not greater because of it; and your error has brought nothing clearer to light, neither with counted proofs of proper reasoning from God's word and proclamations of God's own mouth.

167 And therefore the humanity of Christ is not

everywhere, where the righteous hand of God is. But Christ is everywhere where the righteous hand of God is, not according to both natures, but only according to the divine. It does not yet hurt us to say that Christ is everywhere where God is; and when you say that outside of Christ there is no God, nor any divinity. Although we understand it by the contrast of the two natures only according to the divine, and not according to the human. And now we want to prove this even more clearly to you.

168) When the angel said to the women, who were looking for him on the 4) stands, "He is risen and is not here", I ask you, whether the righteous hand of God was there, when the angel was and the women? 5) You cannot say no: or else, this, *media*, 6) the righteous hand of God is everywhere, would not be true; God does not want that! But if it was there, and Christ was not there, which must be enough for his humanity alone, then it is insurmountable that Christ is not bodily everywhere, since the righteous hand of God is. Behold, we present thee with so many strong knobs, and thou shalt not undo any of them. Nor wilt thou be turned aside.

He says Marc. 13: "But of the day (understand, of the last judgment) or hour no one knows, not the angels in heaven, not the Son, but only the Father. See here, first, how the word "Son," which is, after all, a proper name of the divine person, is taken by the antitype for the pure humanity, for his divinity knows all things. On the other hand, see that Christ here, with one word, of foreknowledge, completely cuts off from his humanity everything that belongs to the divinity alone. For if he does not know, according to mankind, when the last day is, he is not all according to mankind, where the Godhead is; for the Godhead has the last day present. And if his humanity did not know it, it was not equal to the Godhead in knowledge, much less in being everywhere.

Here, devout Christian, do not let the cries of the people lead you to think that we want to destroy the humanity of Christ; not at all; but we proclaim by knowing faith that the living Son of God, true God and man, conceived and born of the pure handmaid Mary without sin, are only One Christ. And that the two natures in him are of such a quality that each of their properties

4) i.e. at the resurrection.

5) Marginal gloss: Determine whether we conclude correctly or not.

6) means here: the middle sentence of the conclusion.

1) i.e. somewhere; "ienen" put by us instead of: "jenen".

2) d. i. narrated.

3) d. i. shortly. - "dennen" --- from then/ to, set by us instead of -, those.

The divine remains eternally equal to itself in all power, knowledge and holiness; likewise also the human. While the corpse was dead, it retained its dead nature; since it rose from the dead and was explained, 1) it retains the nature of the explained corpses into eternity, as you also recognize, dear Luther. 2) Now the declared corpses retain the re-designation or re-writing, according to the kind and quality of the person. Now, if his humanity before being declared is a finitely circumscribed person, it also remains so. But we carry out this doctrine so diligently from God's Word solely so that you may see, devout Christian, that the humanity of Jesus Christ may not be infinite; and that this may not be more actually established, neither with Christ's own Word. We also agree with all believers that no one should shy away from the words of the other, if Christ Himself has used them. But let no one by quarreling appropriate the other's nature, which is of the one alone; for Christ actually distinguished them, though he often spoke of both in common, which was of the one alone; as has now been sufficiently shown.

Now learn, O simple one, how the humanity of Christ is finite and circumscribed to the righteousness of God, when the righteousness is by no means circumscribed or circumscribed. The humanity of Christ is a true creature, therefore it may not be infinite, as has been heard enough before; and in addition it is a model of our origins, 1 Cor. 15, so that where it has come to, we will also come to. For he saith John 12, "Where I am, there shall My servant be also." And John 14: "I will take you to myself, that ye may feast where I am." Now his Godhead is at all ends, but since our souls are not, nor corpses declared; for the creature would then be like the Creator. So it must be, that the aim, which is proper for us, understands only his humanity, that such a measure is drawn in, that our souls and corpses will also be there. For he also says John 14: "In my Father's house are many mansions." Which he would not have said, if the company of the Son of God had not been included, but there would be only one dwelling place for all, as God is. For this purpose Christ teaches us to pray: "Our Father, who art in the heavens!" It is not that God is not universal outside and inside the heavens, but that he is

This is to indicate the measure and form that God holds, in opening up the joys and pleasures that he shows to his own who are fenced in, but he is not fenced in. Therefore it is evident that, as God is universal, and yet the elect are with Him, and yet are not universal, so also the humanity of Christ is not universal; and the humanity of Christ is nevertheless in unity of person, as we shall not be. Just as the queen alone is a consort and queen to the king, and the other virgins have joy with her, but are not queens. The queen herself is in the king's majesty, but she does not have the king's power and majesty. So-it is also about the queen, 4) the humanity of Christ, as is sung in the 44th [45th] Psalm. For Paul speaks 1 Cor.

13: "We shall see him face to face." And John Epist. 1. cap. 3: "We shall see him as he is." But if we are not infinite nor universal, how shall we see him who is universal as he is? So it must be that he who is universal 5) gives himself so abundantly to those who are not universal that they lack nothing at all. When Peter desired nothing more, when he [Christ] was fashioned otherwise before them, but said, "Lord, here is a good place to dwell!" So it will be for every man, where God shows Himself in such a way, whether on earth or in heaven; and therefore the one who sees does not have to be everywhere, since God is, according to the essence.

Here belongs the example 6) of the soul, which is whole in all the body, the hand has enough of it, the head and feet: and yet is only One soul. So also the humanity of Christ is not all-embracing, like the Godhead; nor is it One Christ with the Son of God, essentially having, possessing and eating the Godhead, as a sent creature, yet in unity with the Son of God: so we do not eat it, for he is the natural Son, we alone are *cooptati*, adopted children.

But that you also misuse the saying of Christ (7) John 4: "Philip, who sees me, sees also the Father," is good for a child to see and to answer for: for if this word were to apply to mankind, then the Father would have to have a human form, kind and nature. So it reads

4) "Queen" put by us instead: Queens.

5) Marginal gloss: He, who is everywhere, delights you in one place superfluously.

6) Marginal gloss: Luther childishly misused the example in the little sermon against the enthusiasts, which went out long before this book. [No. 19 in this volume].

7) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's sBuche, in the arc) G. [No. 20, § 110.]

1) i.e. transfigured.

2) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's [book, in the bow] H. [on] 1st leaf. [No. SO, § 121.]

3) i.e. nowhere.

not on mankind, but on the divine power; and Christ wants to say, "Whoever sees (that is, recognizes) the miraculous works that I do, recognizes the Father; for he says immediately afterwards, "If you do not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in me (*hic potuisses ex personali proprietate non hallucinari* [that is, here you could not have spoken from the personal quality]), believe it for the sake of the works." Behold, as He willed nothing else, neither to show that He is like God, yea, according to the One nature, with the Father, which they may well know by the works.

174 Thus, dear Luther, all your enthusiasm is conceived in the fog, since you first wanted to fence God in with the humanity of Christ, with the saying of Paul, Col. 2: "The perfect Godhead dwells bodily in him"; since you also left "bodily" unexplained for the simple-minded, so that they might think that it is with the Godhead. "The perfect Godhead dwells bodily in him"; since you also left "bodily" unexplained for the simple, so that they might think that the Godhead is enclosed with the corpse; yet you must not say this publicly; so "bodily" essentially means that the Godhead was, and still is, essential, but not enclosed in Christ. Accordingly, you wanted to extend the same humanity of Christ to the immeasurable breadth of the Godhead, so that the righteous hand would be all-embracing, but you did not realize that his humanity is not all-embracing, like his Godhead. Or if we will be with him, according to his promise, we should be equal to all, as well as his humanity, where it would be all, because he says: xxxx [that is] "just where I am, there will also my servant be." And so you have done nothing but useless talk, so that you have given to understand that you cannot yet understand or write about Christ, who is of two natures, and about each one in particular according to its quality. For if [you] could not and would not do it, nor forbear, when others speak rightly of it, [you] would be a great ... But I will not call you so. You are a human being, and so am I. God forgive and enlighten us all!

(175) That thou therefore also refuse me to understand the words of Christ, John 3: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," thus: if anything 1) is born of the flesh of Christ, eaten in the flesh, then nothing but flesh must be born; thou doest well to be unreasonable, as last 2) and arrogant thou hast set thyself. For thou turnest not back my reason, which is, that Christ hath here spoken one that is, common sense. This is invented with the other part of his-

1) i.e. something.

2) i.e. upside down.

in his speech, when he says: "And that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. How do you think that these words do not mean anything else, that what is born of the spirit is spirit? Do you want to deny it? Now, contrary to all truth, you also make the humanity of Christ to be spirit, because he was conceived of the spirit; 3) however nonsensical and Marcionic; for you should have considered that he, Christ, was conceived of the spirit alone, and was nourished and bodily born in the virgin corpse; and came into this world as a true bodily man, not as a spirit, and walked. And such birth and conception befit the one who was sent by God into the flesh (so that he might receive from the flesh the condemnation of the flesh, Rom. 8.), that he might be conceived by the spirit and born of the immaculate body of Mary. So let him not be a spirit, if the true human nature was in him, which is not a spirit at all, or else you are the true Marcion.

176. I have had to indicate this, so that the poor sheep led astray by you may see with what peas you are walking. And stand firm, "that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." Christ is not born of the spirit alone; if you make "to be born" mean to conceive, then he is not only spirit, but God and man together. But if this is so, then the other part, "that which is born of flesh is flesh," must also remain rigidly upright in the manner of a common sense: that [the] flesh, if it beget, begetteth nothing but flesh. And that thou bringest before thy village church, if I eat buns, I should also give birth to buns. Of this [yet] Christ nor we speak, but of birth of the spirit and flesh. And that is why your Badryberian spittle should not have been used at all; if the counter-accusations had been resolved with it, Egg 4) would have done it long ago. When Christ will tell us what will be born of buns, we also want to learn. But the mind is still unconquered by all flesh; for even Christ, in that case, does not take out his flesh, but speaks in the common: flesh gives birth to flesh, and spirit gives birth to spirit.

From the word, "The flesh is not useful at all."

177 After such a long time of loose talk, you, dear Luther, come to the place: "The flesh is not useful at all"; and you keep yourself so informal with it.

3) Marginal gloss: Luther makes being born: being conceived.

4) Corner...

and impious, that I regret to say. I would rather you had covered up the mischief, for you commit three quite dishonest acts. The first, that thou speakest against thyself without recantation. The other, that you falsify the words. (Behold, this grieves us so much that you cannot believe it enough; for it does not indicate to us a justifier, which we have never provided for you; but you are in God's hand). The third, that thou prescribeest false rules how "flesh" should be taken in Scripture. Now I will briefly state these things and hasten to the end.

That you speak against yourself is indicated by the sermon 1) you preached on the words: "My flesh is the true food" 2c. in which you speak these words.

Luther: "For thus he himself says afterwards: The flesh is not useful. And again: My flesh gives life. How do we separate these things? The spirit separates it. Christ wants the bodily eating of the flesh to be of no use, but to believe that the flesh is the Son of God, come from heaven for my sake, and his blood shed for me" 2c. Likewise you also understand this place; as is indicated to me in the postill, Sunday Septuagesimä about the epistle. 2) Behold, dear Luther, these are your own words, in which you publicly recognize the right meaning, that the flesh is of no use at all to eat. And you do wonders 3) in the book, how much it, eaten in the flesh, brings. Benefit bring; scream: It is a holy meat, which makes holy even by touching alone, how much more eaten? Fix it with the sick woman, 4) who touched the hem of her garment and got well. And it is of no account with thee that Christ saith, Thy faith hath made thee whole, and saith not, My flesh or my hem hath made thee whole. Neither seest thou that they which defiled him in Caiphas' house with strokes of the cheek were not made holy, nor Judas that kissed him; nor art thou ashamed to pretend such dishonest false things. We know well how holy he is, how much good he has done us poor people; but we know that he has not given himself bodily to us to eat; so that his flesh is not profitable to eat, as also thou hast confessed.

180. that thou also shalt cry: Should he be born, scourged, crucified, and not be useful when eaten? are you like the priests who also cry out: Should this or that not be useful to me? Then we could give them a good answer: Every thing is useful as much as God's word indicates usefulness, and we taught that what God's word could do would be upright, what it could not do should not be given. But now you have turned the page, and do not doubt that your own conference is sufficiently stunted in this. So turn back, and learn that you can and have taught before, that such cries are not able to do anything; for they have no divine promise. For if they should be able to do anything, I would give the body of Christ to him that hath the tan in his mouth to eat; for thou sayest that he is eaten with the mouth bodily; and wouldst cry out, Should he that is so holy not receive the tan? and let it be seen whether it goeth or not. So to the lame, the blind, the leprous 2c. Do you say: Yes, bodily health is not promised. It is right. Then say: Where is spiritual health promised? It is promised to a lesser extent, as it is shown above that all healing and comfort of the soul comes to our hearts from the spirit alone, and not from bodily food. For this we may indicate more similar things for the sake of bodily health, if here one eats the body of Christ bodily, as you, Paul says: "For this reason there are many sick among you.

181 Thus you speak against yourself, and lead yourself into loose impotent teachings, which we do not allow any. We do not allow any priest. You should justly put down the previous ones in the new writings, or answer for them; but it is not proper for him to speak: I have erred! who before so arrogantly pretended that everything he taught must be just; just as if it must be so for him, even though he taught without God's word; and now proves himself, if he would teach another, one should think that he had fallen from the faith. Behold, that thou trustest thyself so well, that thou shalt yet fall from it; but we shall abide in error.

182 Similarly, you have questioned the meaning of Paul's words, 1 Cor. Cap. 10: "The drink of thanksgiving, that we may give thanks; is not this the church of the blood of Christ?" Well and rightly preached and written some years ago, when [you] wrote in the sermon of the brotherhoods and sacrament 5). And in the other part, against the Carolstad, you immediately write that

1) Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XI, 2248 ff. The passage cited is found (in somewhat different words) in Col. 2253, § 8.

2) Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XII, 403, § 13 ff.

3) d. i. aberwitzige; "aberweise" put by us instead of: "aber weisst".

4) No. 20, § 180.

5) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XIX, 426 ff.

Contradiction; as in *exegesis* 1) is well given to you to understand, along with other things that you teach against yourself. Is this a right spirit, to teach against oneself, and not to recognize the wrong part, nor to have erred?

Secondly, you falsify God's word when you take the article [that is] "THAT" from the flesh, just as the Marcionites and Arrians have scraped something out of the Scriptures, which was contradiction. Notice, you simple-minded one, what I mean. The Greek language has the custom that we Germans have of putting an article in front of every word where it is to be clarified, as: Das, der, die, dem, den, eins, ein, einer, eine 2c., as: Marci 6: "Isn't he the carpenter?" Here the trailing "the" is a superior article, and may be used as much, as: The carpenter, who was known to all the people of the craft half well. And the speech is much different, neither if one would say: Is he not a carpenter? because if the Greek wanted to say so, he would say: Is he not a carpenter? without the article "the". These short superior articles (loquor enim de praepositivis articulis tantum [i.e., for I am speaking only of superior articles]) have so much force with the Greeks that they are capable of more in many places, neither the subzunctivi, that is, neither those placed in subsequent speech, as: which, which, which, which, which re.

184. example. Joh. Cap. 1: "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God. Here the following little word "that", only an article, is able as much as: the same word, of which is first said: "THAT was with God." Now all Greek teachers have said much about this, especially Cyril, Chrysostom, and in our times Erasmus. The quality of the language is also able to do it. Since Luther should have interpreted from the words: *σαρξ οὐχ ὠφελει οὐδεν* "the flesh is not at all useful", he left out the little word "THE"; so that it did not point to the certain flesh, of which Christ spoke before and still speaks of. And Luther says, "Flesh is not useful at all." [But the superior article "THAT" is able to do as much as if the words themselves were there: The very flesh of which it is first said. This I will make clear not only with the understandings of the Greek language, but with the self-words of Christ to one, and in addition with other places in Scripture. We will deal with the following first.

185 John 1: "In him was life, and the life was the light of men. 2) Here the little word "that" means as much as if he said: "The very life, of which it was first said that was in him, was the light of men. So there it says: "And the Word became man". 3) Here "that" can be interpreted as much as: The very Word, of whom so much was said before, became man.

Now see here, you learned preachers who praise this Lutheran book! If Luther is to do the article to them 4) in the discourse: "The flesh is of no use at all"; and say: "Flesh is not useful", and is to count for nothing that it is attached to the previous discourse: then Marcion will also no longer read: "The Word has become man"; but: "Word has become man"; and will say: John is not speaking here of the word, which was spoken of before, but of a common word of God, which made a man. And what you dare to say against this does not help, because in both places the preceding speech is thus appended to the succeeding speech; and the succeeding speech is preserved with the article, so that in one it is just as proper to do the article to them as in the other, that is, by no means without great falsification.

Item, Luther in his translation of the New Testament thus interpreted: "The flesh is not useful"; and now he speaks: "Flesh is not useful"; so that it may serve that Christ has spoken the mind, meaning and nature of the flesh. See, dear Luther, how you stand here! as an open criminal and falsifier of Scripture, which you cannot deny before any creature Yes, how do we stand, who have exalted you without measure, and experience this in you? But we cannot agree with God's judgment, but we want to ask Him that He, by His causeless mercy, will help you up again, who have fallen so badly through strife, and forgive us 5) and humble us so that we do not fall in such a way that we subject ourselves to anything without God's word to protect us.

188) Secondly, it is evident from the very words which Christ spoke before and after, that He also pointed to His own flesh with the words, "The flesh is not useful. [So before the words, when the disciples murmured, it is written, "When therefore Jesus perceived that his disciples murmured of it." Dear, of what did they murmur? Against

1) in 6X6^681, by which Zwingli means his writing: 6X6AS8i8 st". in which he also sought to refute Luther's writing against the heavenly prophets.

2) Marginal gloss: "al H

3) Marginal gloss: "at ö

4) d. i. away.

5) i.e. herding.

the mind of the spirit and flesh, or against the bodily food?

After that Jesus says: "Are you angry with this? Dear, where does this "this" point to? Does it annoy you that he had spoken of the chip 1) and the nature of the flesh and the spirit? Now he had not said anything about that. So they are angry that they thought he had spoken of his flesh, eating bodily; from which it follows that Christ speaks for and of his flesh, when he takes their speech from them and answers them.

190. thirdly, he says, "When ye therefore shall see the Son of man going up, then was he before." Dearly beloved, what rhymes this word with the carnal and spiritual? Therefore he will say to them, "I teach you to trust in me as the true Son of God, who will give my body for you, that is, eat my flesh; so you will not believe that I am the Son of God, and will grumble as if I had spoken too harshly or roughly; but when you see me go up to heaven, you will see that I am God, and that you did not have to eat me.

191. fourthly, he speaks a word that takes away all the mist that is before our eyes, saying, "The Spirit is that maketh alive." Behold, this is brief and good: that which makes us alive is the one Spirit. In this word all that you attribute to bodily food falls away. For bad: "The Spirit quickeneth." And if we love Christ, we rejoice that he goeth up to the Father, Joh. 14. Behold how he cuts off from us all the joy which thou promiseest us in the bodily meal, saying, 2) "If we loved him, we should rejoice that he goeth from us to the Father." So again it follows that those who want to have him here in the flesh do not love [him]. Do you see now where your seal stands? You want to give him to people to eat in the flesh, and you promise much sweetness if they eat him. Who has ever eaten his child because he loved him? Much less will we desire to eat the Son of God if we love him. But where one teaches untruth, one must bring such flowers as if it were true. Although all things that God does are proper, he has not ordained them, and therefore they are unseemly to him and to us. 3) The spirit alone makes alive; and the very flesh, of which you first murmured much, is not at all useful, [and] indeed to eat bodily, to which they thought they had spoken it.

192. After the words he says: "The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life. Which words are spirit and life? Those: "My body is the true food"? Now he no longer speaks of the former opinion according to your mind; but has lifted up another from the nature of the flesh. Therefore it is evident from these words that he still remains in the former opinion of speaking of the gospel; from this it follows that with the word: "The flesh is not useful," he also answers to the opinion of the erring 4) ones.

193. sixth, he says, "But there are some among you who do not believe. For he knew from the beginning which believed not." Dear, where does this go? To understand that carnal mind is of no use at all? Then he would have spoken like this: There are some who understand nothing at all; for they all undoubtedly believed that the way of the flesh is not useful but harmful, even from the prophets. But from this it follows that here no new opinion is put on the way, but he teaches for and for the gospel; and if those do not understand the figurative words, he gives them an answer to their misunderstanding, and does not raise another.

194 To the seventh Peter says: "Lord, to whom would we go? you have the words of eternal life; this we believe and know, that you are Christ, the Son of the living God." Here Peter should have spoken: We understand you well that the carnal way is harmful. If not, it is clear that Christ remains for and for in the teaching of the Gospel and answering for their misunderstanding. And thus it becomes clear that the words "the flesh is not useful" have the meaning: the very flesh of which the hearers murmured is not useful to eat at all; and that you, dear Luther, so unjustly and dishonestly cut off the little word "dqs", because it does not serve you.

The third dishonest thing that you do 5) is that you prescribe the wrong rule: Where spirit and flesh are opposed to each other, flesh is called the old Adam, not Christ flesh. Short answer: So also spirit there is not called Christ spirit; or else they are not opposed to each other. 6) Therefore note, dear Luther: I freely indulge you, that where spirit and flesh are opposed to one another in Scripture, but which include our spirit and flesh, that there-

1) d. i. dispute.

2) "Speaks" put by us instead of: "speak".

3) unzām - unseemly.

4) In the old edition: erring.

5) Randglosse: Ist in Luthers sBuche, im Bogens L. sNo. 20, § 191.1

6) Marginal gloss: LrZo uon "st kmMüsis.

even flesh is taken for the old Adam; but there spirit must not be taken for the spirit, which is God, but for our spirit, which has some enlightenment from God, as it is written in Galatians 5: "The spirit seeth against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit." Here flesh is taken for the sense and nature of the flesh, and spirit for the sense and nature of the spirit, even of man; although the same spirit is touched or enlightened by God's spirit, of which way it also says in Romans 8. And Paul has the meaning: The human spirit, which now recognizes God as being drawn by God, eternally contends with the flesh, as Rom. 7. Now, I hope, you understand the connotation, that is, the inclusion: where flesh stands against spirit, and the fleshly kind means, that also again spirit, which stands in opposition, means our spirit, but which is enlightened by God, as well, as flesh means our fleshly kind.

196. Then I ask you, what is the meaning of the spirit in the word: "It is the spirit that gives life"? Does it mean God's spirit, or man's spirit, which is enlightened with God? If you cannot deny that it means God's Spirit (for no matter how holy man is made by God, the human spirit cannot make him alive), then the spirit there must be called God's Spirit. If this is so, Christ does not speak of our flesh, but of his own spirit and flesh next to each other; or else it would not be *antithesis*. As he does not add the word "my" to the word spirit, and yet his spirit alone is understood; so also in the word "flesh" his flesh is understood, without adding the word "my," and has the meaning: I make alive according to the spirit; the flesh is not useful, indeed, eaten, to make alive. Against this, dear Luther, do not speak a word, or we will show you that you have never understood the eighth chapter of Romans.

197 Hear the message now. John 1: "The Word became flesh. Doesn't "Word" here mean "Son of God"? Isn't he a spirit? so the meaning should become: The Word became an old Adam, according to your rule. How do you treat the word 1 Peter 3: "Christ was killed in the flesh and made alive in the spirit"? Does "killed in the flesh" also mean that he was dead in the old sinful Adam? How then can he say, "Who will punish me for sin? Item, 1 John 5: "There are three things that make manifest, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and the three are together," or find one. Is blood also taken here for the fleshly temptation?

Now it is a judgment of flesh and blood, Matt. 16: "Flesh and blood has not opened it for you"; item, 1 Tim. 3: "God has appeared in the flesh, has been justified in the Spirit. But here they are opposed to each other. Now, according to your rule, is "flesh" to be taken here for the sinfulness of the flesh? Where do we come to with your foolishness? When wilt thou see what it is, "They teach doctrines of men and commandments"? Now thou, as thou art contrary to thyself, as thou breakest and counterfeitest the scriptures, and as thou teachest false precepts. And remainest stiffnecked: the flesh is not at all profitable to eat. And didst thou burst thy head with it.

Accordingly, when you want to draw the teachers to your mind, 1) you commit nothing less dishonest; but I will let the same Oecolampadium answer, and show here a small sample, how you forge. When you indicate Augustinum ad *Januarium*, in the 118th epistle, you use the dishonest one, that you have not taken the words (which stand at the beginning and give well to note, that he alone calls the signs the body of Christ and blood by the after-naming, and does not consider that they are the things, but alone signify) [omitted]. And these are his words: "First of all, know that the most excellent thing in our business is that our Lord Jesus Christ has put us under a gentle yoke and light burden, as He Himself speaks in the Gospel; and for this reason He has bound together the company of the new people with a few sacraments, which are also to be kept ring 2) and in meaning 3) excellent; as 4) in baptism with the name of the Trinity is sanctified the church of His body and blood." See, devout Christian, the words of Augustine in fact, and you will see how it was in his time about the sacraments, and how he so publicly indicates that they only mean, but signify excellent things, namely, the great deed that God has forfeited in this world through His Son, and the unification of the Church, that is, of His people.

200) Accordingly, you falsify: for when you indicate from Augustine, 5) how with the ancients this sacrament is called a sacrifice, from the sacrifice that only happened once, 6) so that it is the post-nuptial, of which we say, you omit that he says the corpse of Christ, so also that it is called the sacrifice.

1) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's sBuche, in Bogens N. sNo. 20, § 215 ff).

2) d. i. light.

3) Marginal gloss: The sacraments mean. You see here, Luther, interpretation, as you speak.

4) So put by us instead of: alsdann.

5) No. 20, § 309.

6) i.e. only once; put by us instead of: "now Einist".

which is but a sacrament; and not otherwise the body of Christ, than as we call the primordial states of Christ, which is but a likeness or signification of the primordial states which have been. How may you do this? Indicate the one thing from Augustine, and omit the thing that stands just before, after, and beside it? Is this honest, since it all belongs to the matter?

Item 201: You bring yourself to this point by not understanding Augustine to call the sacramental signs the body and blood of Christ, 1) saying that Christ's body and blood are received bodily in the mouth, like other visible bodily food. So say to your erroneous opinion: If the body of Christ is everywhere, how will it be received into the mouth of man? If the mouth receives it at all, it is not universal; for the mouth is not universal. If it receives it in part, it is not Christ in body, soul, and blood, as he was born, died, and is in heaven. Behold, whither thou goest!

You torture Tertullianum, the dearest, half of both languages, of all Latin theologians, so miserably, because you want to reverse that he calls this sacrament a figure of the body of Christ, that you say: FIGURA is taken there mathematice. Do not see that it is taken per imagine, simulacro, aut repraesentatione (that is, for an illusion, similitude, or representation); which way Lucretius, Catullus, Juvenalis, and Ovidius also take it.

It is also evident from your writing that you have wasted little time in Tertulliano; but you would have seen for what he uses this word FIGURA, namely for a meaning; for he, lib. I. contra Marcionem, thus speaks: He also has not swallowed the bread, 2) so that he means his corpse. You see that he takes figure for a meaning and sign or unformation. Nevertheless, you say in your book: 3) it is truly the meaning of Tertullian; just as if Tertullianus was so well understood and known to you that one would believe you.

204 You treat Irenaeus in the same way; you do not see that he speaks only by allegories, in which he nevertheless touches the Marcionites. And speaks on such sense as also Tertullianus: that Christ had true human nature in him; for he suffered death in it, and redeemed us, and left us a thanksgiving of the same redemption. In which thanksgiving we are given-

that our corpses will also be resurrected when he is resurrected. And all his teachings extend only to the inner eating, which he speaks of as the eating of the body and blood of Christ, as also Christ himself, John 6, which would take more time to explain in German, neither is it here; nor is it so important, even if they are not with us. For God is more than His apostles, John 13, let alone the teachers, even though they are truly with us; but it will be better to explain in Latin than in German, so that the simple will not be troubled with unnecessary things.

205) That you warn the pious of Strasbourg and Basel against the sacramentalists, you do him justice; for one should beware of mobs. 4) But insofar as you make their faithful teachers and preachers suspicious, as if they were stirring up, you are doing more dishonestly than is proper for any pious person, for only male nutalame 5) has learned whether they are rotten or not.

206. 6) [You] dishonor the pious, well-learned man, neither to him nor to yourself; yet do [you] right to him after the manner in which you are now proceeding. Christ teaches that one should give good for evil: so also 7) the Antichrist teaches to give evil for good; this you do faithfully; for you unkindly thank users for diligent work, had in your books. And he has not done anything unkind or dishonorable to you or to Pomeranus; for it has been the custom and freedom of all interpreters from time immemorial [ab omni saeculo] for your sake, where they have violated something in a teacher or book, they have added their warning to it. Since now user (wanted, he would have spared it, and the more I hear your writings, the more I wanted it; had warned him also, but it was too late) turned your books into Latin language, and found however, which was not according to the truth; should he not indicate such? In advance, if he has done so with such modesty that one can see which is yours, or which is his. Pomeranus half, he has given him the choice to increase and decrease in his book, yes, to make according to his sense. So now you rage without need. Behold, which act more Christian?

Here you also learn, devout Christian, what anger and rage are. Throughout Luther's book, I have thought: Oh God, where did you find

1) "that he name" put by us instead of: "name".

2) i.e. spurned.

3) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's *^Buche, im Bogen* N [No. 20, §§ 227. 232.)

4) i.e. to guard, to take care of.

5) "nutalame" stands for: "nun talame" (compare Col. 1128, § 1), i.e. now already.

6) A game with Butzer's name. Use - clean.

7) mitding - against (?).

you, or Oecolampadius, boasted of holiness or suffering? Finally, Luther himself indicates that users of Strasbourg praised us in special letters that he sent to him for the sake of peace and unity; yet we did not have any knowledge of this, nor do we know it today, because we have only heard so much. Behold, it cometh to pass, that we lay upon innocent people things which they have not done, 1) If we hate them, and see them. 2)

And as this whole book is nothing else, neither an open disgrace and darkening of the undefiled evangelical truth and light, which, as I hope to God, is now strongly brought to light, we must not answer for all your intemperate scolding. Our innocence answers for it in part, in part it bears it patiently. And these are the errors that you turn in this book:

I. The body of Christ is, as it were, 3) of the divine nature, everywhere.

II Let Christ show Himself to us in this Sacrament, that we may know where to find Him.

III Christ's body, eaten in the flesh, put up with sin.

IV. Let Christ's flesh be an entirely spiritual flesh.

V. Christ flesh, eaten in the flesh, preserve our bodies for the primal state.

1) Marginal gloss: So blinded and perverted the hatred. 2) pursue (?).

3) i.e. "as if" he had divine nature.

VI Christ body, bodily eaten, give or increase faith. Is everything spoken by you Against God's word.

Therefore, my humble request to you, dear Luther, is that you do not rage in the matter as you have done so far; but if you are Christ's, then we are also his. Now it does not behoove us to act against each other, neither with the word of God. Therefore do the same with Christian discipline, [which] we also want to do; for we should not ever fight against God, nor shield our error with false trang 4) of God's word. God grant you the truth and your knowledge; and that you remain Luther, not become - "67-/) 5) Luther! But if you ever want to disobey, we carpenters will first cut good chips. The truth conquers. Amen!

God, praise be to you, who make us victorious in Christ and make the smell of your knowledge known to everyone through us. 2 Cor. 2.

4) i.e., urging, forcing. Otherwise also written "urge". Cf. § 340 of the following text.

5) dirty water. - unpaste - mischief

make.-The following: In annotationibus in Genssini a I.6ON6 et Nexunäro eornportatis ulieubi scriptuin 68t: 7^ä<7/zad

i.: In

the notes to the first book of Moses, which are brought together by Leo and Megander, somewhere "ein grobes Gebilde" is written for: "ein feines Gebilde" - will probably be a marginal gloss of Zwingli to this play with Luther's name. In the old edition these words are at the end of the writing without a mark.

24 Ulrich Zwingli's response to Luther's confession of the Lord's Supper.

*)

Started July 1, completed end of August 1528.

Before the pious Christian princes Johansen, Duke of Saxony, and Philippe, Landgrave of Hesse, Huldreich Zwingli, a simple preacher of the Gospel of Christ, has received grace and peace from God through Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord and Savior!

1) Therefore, I will first of all indicate the reason why I, writing to Your Grace, do not hold the titles: "Highborn,

Sublime" 2c. Namely, that it seems to me that there are many who are "highborn" according to the world and the respect of the flesh, but, measured against God and righteousness, are very far away here; and transparency, which is also inherent in the stained-glass windows, 6) has only in new times been applied to the princes by the flatterers.

6) Luther commemorates this hopeful letter in his Tischreden, Cap. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 676.

*) This writing appeared in German in 1528, but was later translated into Latin by Rudolph Gualther and added to Zwingli's Werke, Iom. II, p. 416, inserted. Zwingli also included in his answer the answer of Johann Oecolampad to the confession of Mart. Luther's confession of the Lord's Supper". At the end of the letter is

(2) But of the pious Christian princes [find] so little that God's judgment justly decrees that few bear the title; but rather take pleasure in the obscure shininess that is said of them, neither that they would be clear [clar], that is, highly renowned of faithfulness and piety. But so herewith one commonly

where you are recognized, praised as pious, God-fearing men and princes 1) of the Gospel of Christ, I have no doubt that you will receive no displeasure because, according to the custom of the apostles, I call you "pious" and "Christians" for "Highborn" and "Illustrious"; for when the apostles called the Christians, they did not want to understand anything else, neither "pious", by the word.

3) You pious princes know well what Spanes holds, the night feast of Christ's heaps, between the excellent man Martin Luther and us, in which so many books and letters were written, until it finally came to the point that also the book, called "Martin Luther's Confession", had to come out; which, with what breeding or fugues, yes, with truth and Christian spirit, it is written, we command God and all believers. Now without God's order, without which our hair does not turn black or gray, the book is not brought to the world. So he also wants to do good with it, which is why we have become quite comforting [fiducialiter] and bold about the Scriptures; so that we see publicly not only by the words that he has no reason to save himself, if he subjects himself to reproach, snorting and scolding 2); but also by the senses and powers of the Scriptures (for he brings forth many such impotent senses, and also wants to rely on the fact that, if he were so, all knowledge of God would be obscured) all Scriptures would be put in doubt, and he would have to throw himself back in all his teaching; But we lead our testimony against him, which will surely be incumbent upon him and will be victorious, for his book is like a scattered, discordant heap, where one group wants to go out here, the other there, which thereby emits much shouting and dread.

4 You will see, pious princes, if God wills it! that when the day is bright, how Luther, with the book, not only contradicted his before opened

books, but against himself in the book. Therefore, I cannot pay any attention to it other than that it is like someone who leases some money or stuff in the night (as in

and must search for it again without a light; for just as he reaches around and gropes where he would like to find something, so Luther reaches around for what he would like to find that would help him. And soon he has forgotten himself, and sets that which he denied before, or denies that which he set before; not only does he make his very first doctrine suspicious, but also gives the popes cause to reproach it most highly, if he is called in the present matter (in which, however, he is forced by divinity and humanity to deal) to go only over the books which he wrote in four or five years. For who will not say: If one remains five years, he will also be suspicious of the books he has written in the next five years? Which we verily care for 3) neither all dishonor and reproach, done unto us. Not that one should not recant if he errs; but that it is a laborious. It is a pity that he comes to this out of quarreling, that he will not let the things he has taught before fall, nor give way; though no one may overthrow them, where they are founded in God's word.

(5) Therefore, pious princes, we are compelled by reason to order and form our Scriptures to you, knowing well to what ridicule this may be measured to us; for we note well in Luther's writing that our Scriptures are not read in your lands, if he puts upon us that which we have not taught; and in turn denies that which we have truly taught; so that the truth may suffer great harm. The apostle Paul teaches that one should prove all things and accept what is right [1 Thess. 5, 21]: so Luther denies that our doctrine (which is not ours, but God's, as will be found out here and on the last day) is not read, but maligned before it is heard.

(6) Now it hath been found from everlasting, not only among the faithful, but also among the Gentiles, that they which knew the truth, and were faithful in it, suffered not that their spirits should be changed.

1) i.e., headmaster.

2) i.e. to snap at.

3) i.e. worse (rvorss). In § 220 of this writing it is written "wirß".

4) So put by us instead of: "the right".

Why then, pious princes, should we let your pious people, who are dear to us with all our hearts, as those who cheerfully accept God's word, yes, who are One People and One Church with us, our and we their members in One Body, proceed in error? How could we ever more justify this against God, that for the sake of Luther's not peeling us so inhumanly, we would give way to him in the matter of truth? provided we know that we may overcome him with all understanding, if they consider the matter with an open heart and faith. Why should we let the dirt [insult] turn away from us, since everyone can speak: You prove yourselves right, Luther speaks otherwise; yet we see daily that (if Luther's opinion is read in cities and places alone, and our writings are not tolerated) the truth that stands with us nevertheless increases? and again, since his books are accepted with great pomp and splendor, ahead of the papists, and read freely without any prohibition, nevertheless the truth does not weaken, 2) but increases, neither before? so we see that Christian peace and unity become much greater, since the truth in the article may be freely sought and accepted without danger, neither since it is resisted? Christ, our Saviour, directs us to such pre-fighting, as he says: "He who trusts in me, from him shall flow living rivers." [John 7:38?]

(7) It matters not what the adversary says; we must see that we do not put down truth with falsehood. It shall be eternally enough for us, if we please him among whom we are enrolled; he knows us well, he also knows our conscience well, whether it fights for our name's sake or for his, against a truly not childish hero: for if we traveled for honor's sake, we would have to fight in other articles, neither in that, since we now do not fall the papists, but also have to have Luther and all, who have been taught nowhere else, neither in his books, as opponents. Who, after all, can extinguish the light of truth? or shall we put the light under the measure? Let all our adversaries be so fresh, and let our writings walk beside theirs, and see to it that their doctrine is the first to be accepted by all who understand the law! Or are we so weak in faith that we think, even if our doctrine were false, that God would therefore accept his own?

1) d. i. light.

2) weakens - becomes weak.

Or, if it is just, that one may reject it? It is not such an unjust, incomprehensible judge on earth, if one were to tell him of two parties, one of which sought no advantage at all, nor suppressed the writings of its opponents, but the other did so; he would at least put the advantageous party at fault.

We, pious princes, do not want to act against Luther as he did against us, but have now freely forgiven him before God all fancy words, 3) lying, cursing, condemning and banishing, and have not burdened him with any *convicio*, scolding and reviling; he shall have the same freely before; even though he does not consider us to be Christians alone, but also not human beings. But here no one can say, if we are compelled to speak: Luther does us violence, he speaks the untruth, he speaks against himself, he falsifies the Scriptures, or himself; that we blaspheme him with such words, if we bring this to light publicly; for without such words no one can carry out a cause against his adversary. Such a good invective *in loco*, as I say: Luther does the same as the weak fencers; if they are overcome, they say: the adversary cannot; or, the conquered one seeks a quarrel, 4) and the like, we also hope that no one will blame us; for there is a great difference between *jocos*, risus et *maledicta*, between invective and reviling. Therefore, we do not want to make fun of them, we are serious. But let us temper infernal, angry, quarrelsome, inhuman words, and thus cheerfully and kindly carry out the bargain with God.

9. Since Luther has written in such a mixed way, and has put it together neatly for us in previous writings, he has divided it according to his meaning, and has, however, added something erroneous in all places, we want to answer first about his book, how great it is, in the shortest way; and then, what is not sufficiently explained in the refutation of his errors, in the other part we will explain and strengthen; and lastly, what he has poured out wrongfully in his faith, we will indicate brightly; all from God's word, for his honor alone, and good to his neighbor.

(10) But if you, pious princes, cannot be expected to read this scripture to the end for the sake of the great business with which you are burdened: Is it not our humble request that you will

3) i.e. words of shame.

4) Marginal gloss: *lasso rixa Huasritur*.

Let them be read by unquestioned, impartial, God-fearing scholars and advise them to 1) record and send to us everything they think they do not have reason to know from God's Word; we will always give good information. And is also much weger, 2) the things are discussed and endured among the scholars, neither with unkind open writing. In the hope that the almighty God will hear our knocks and pleas and make all of us, who desire nothing more earnestly than to have peace with one another in truth (as far as we all speak), united; for as far as we face the truth in these articles, so far will we be able to speak the truth in truth: For as far as we look the truth right in the face in these articles, then all quarrels are over, half because of outward things, and the papacy is only more panned 3) and corrupted.

11) That Ecolampadius' writing and mine are printed together is due to brevity and convenience; no one should take it otherwise.

May the living true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, preserve you, pious princes, together with your lands, and grant the common Christianity the unity of His Spirit! Amen.

Dear reader, know that both of us missed business because Ecolampadius only started writing [on] the day of St. John the Baptist, and I on the first day of the month of July 4); nevertheless, in addition to the administration of our daily texts 5) and sermons, we had to hurry to the autumn fair in Frankfurt, which is why the numbers are not actually recorded everywhere; but scholars will see what is written. Given on the first day of July at Zurich 2c.

The book is called Confession and is the answer of Huldreich Zwinglius.

When now Luther renounced for the first, 6) he did not want to write anything more, so that Satan would not become even more foolish: is it unequal, since he defies long afterwards, why he should not call the devil his enemy, as thick 7) he wanted? Here he wants to spare, there he wants to rush. But not so! but where we see that the untruth grows,

We are to stand up against them always undaunted, according to the saying of Paul, 2 Cor. 4: "We are afflicted, but not imprisoned; sorrowful, but not desolate; thirsty, but not forsaken nor falling away; cast down, but not destroyed." But it seems from these words that he would be in the right place with joy; which joy we want to leave him so faithfully that we do not want to give him a word for further strife; for he does not want to let himself be led astray in the open errors that he introduces here.

2. that he had said 8) before: No master heretic can be converted, is answerable enough. We are not heretics, but stand on the insurmountable rock of Christ. Whoever allows himself to be led astray 9) by them goes astray and becomes a heretic by persisting.

(3) Since he asks, "What kind of supper is this, which has no certain text or word? 2c., 10) he often asks such a question and makes such an impression, as if we were to present him with another text, which we have never accepted. Yes, we consider it an abomination that someone should dare to put his word instead of God's word. But our work is to speak from the right sense, not to make other words. So it was also proper for Luther to speak of the sense and understanding of the words: "You are a rock, and on the rock I will build my church," against the pope; but not to completely dislocate the words in their order, form and essence. Therefore, it would be spared to grimace so often in this piece, as if we were going to innovate the words. If you look at our actions, you can see whether we have changed the words or not. Even our churches, when they hear the words read aloud, will not understand the opinion that Luther and the Pope hold; but will hear that the bread is a signification of the body of Christ, who was given in death for us. Yes, if other words were made of it, they would be hurt. But they know whom they trust; not man, not food, but the one God who has their heart in his hands; and they have him 11) in present consolation and assurance of conscience, which is not brought into man by any bodily food or exercise; but he gives himself after

8) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's (book, in the bow) u at the third plate. (In the writing No. 20, "that these words of Christ 2c. still stand firm" 2c., § 16. In No. 21, § 3.)

9) i.e. from then on.

10) Marginal gloss: (Luther in the bow) a on the 4th panel. (No. 21, § 6.)

11) Marginal gloss: So the body of Christ is in our supper.

1) i.e. command.

2) i.e. a better way, more profitable.

3) weakened (?).

4) d. i. July.

5) Lections (?).

6) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's book, in the arc a at the 2nd plate (or leaf). (No. 21, § 3.)

7) d. i. so often.

his free will, as abundantly as he pleases, into the hearts of men. 1 Cor. 12.

4) "But we (says 1) Luther) have a certain text, and are not divided about it. Luther is complaining to the King of England that he calls clear that which is not clear in the minds of the faithful. So it is true: only men know what this word "that", what "is", what "my", what "body" means. But that bread is the body of Christ is never clear; for even Luther says that one must not let reason loose here. Without doubt that reason may not understand it. How then can the text be clear? But if it points us to faith, it cannot prove that God has ever recommended to us that we should believe that this bread is his corpse, or that his corpse is in the bread, or that it is with the bread, or that it is eaten with the bread. And if this is nowhere recommended to our faith, why does Luther point us to faith? are we also guilty of believing what God has not recommended? If he himself recognizes against the king of England that it is not an article of faith, as the king of England speaks of it, then it is also not an article of faith, as he speaks of it.

005 And when he saith, Christ hath commanded us to do this in remembrance: now let all his words be obeyed, and believed. Answer: These words are called eating bread and drink in remembrance, not making his body or eating in remembrance of his body, which shall come abundantly afterward. But if we ever hear our faith, he believes all the words of God alike, so that he recognizes each one as true as the other. And if two words of the first standing are contrary to each other, faith guards that one should not therefore think God false; 2) and says: "All men are false, but only God is true. Therefore the fault is in you, not in God's word; in your mind, not in the divine intention. And if faith then remembers rightly with the fear of God, God gives the light of His Spirit, which teaches that either the word must have a different meaning than we had intended. And thus it is found that the words are not contrary to each other, but unanimous.

6) So then, in addition to the words, this is my body, faith also considers these: "The flesh is of no use at all"; "For the time being I will no longer

I will leave the world and go to the Father"; "You will not have me forever"; "If we have known Christ according to the flesh, we no longer know him according to the flesh"; "This is my body, which is given up for you"; and others like these: so he finds that they cannot stand with one another. For thus he also sees that the words, "This is my body," may not have the sense which is also contrary to faith. For having promised before that "he shall be no more in the world," which must be understood of his corpse alone, may never suffer that the words "this is my corpse" be understood according to the sound of the letter. For therefore we have no promise, but insurmountable resistance of God's own word. How can they be understandable or clear to the sense of our opponents? What is it that one cries out so much: The words are clear; since not only is not clarity, but God's words are an insufferable sense?

We do not disagree about the words, but they are more disagreeable, [1] The Popes (who would have gladly dug themselves out of the book, if they had not been so quickly restrained, and they themselves wanted to think that the inhuman scolding would not be followed) say: the bread is changed into the substance of the corpse of Christ. [Luther says: Bread is essentially bread and essentially the body of Christ with each other, and calls it a carnal bread (would that we had such a word!), which is quite against the Popes. He also says that the body of Christ is eaten with the bread. [3] The fourteen Swabian pastors say: he is in the bread, or under the bread; to which Luther contradicts so publicly, he never taught "in the bread", he probably let him like their opinion. 5)

(8) Although I do not want to tell you, Christian reader, in any way that Luther taught it, but in a little sermon that did not go out four or five years ago, but within three years. Now consider the opinions next to each other: no longer bread, but bread changed into corpse; still bread and corpse with each other, yes, one flesh-bread; bread and corpse with each other, corpse under the bread, corpse in the bread; whether there are not three opinions here, 6) which Luther himself counts as three? He does not hold with the popes; so he does not hold with the [Swabian] priests; for they do not hold that the bread of the corpse is the same as the bread of the body.

1) Marginal gloss: Is fin Luther's Confession, in the bow u at the 4th panel. fNo. 21, § 13. End.)

2) Marginal gloss: With what harnesses one becomes recognizable in God's word.

3) d. i. nothing.

4) d. i. more discordant.

5) For this statement by Zwingli, compare No. 21, §§ 11 and 12.

6) Side note: Luther's crowd is not of one mind.

Christ's name, but in the bread. And has a special opinion, as first reported.

9) These three opinions are also not to be made one with any words nor Schweytzen 1). The popes leave no bread there; Luther leaves bread there; Luther makes the bread itself the corpse of Christ, and still remains bread; the priests also leave bread, but not that it is the corpse of Christ essential, but the corpse of Christ is eaten under or inside. I reckon, well like the pillule 2) in an egg. Let the man come forth who can say that these opinions may be agreed upon some way! Where do you fine grommets fall here? 3) Luther truly does not hold it with them.

(10) But he puts it to us that we are not one, since no understanding has ever been born that can say that our words do not have one meaning. For that Ecolampadius speaks: This is a meaning of my corpse, following Tertulliano; and I: This means my corpse, repeating Ambrosio; cannot give more than one sense: This means my corpse; and: This is a meaning of my corpse. Who is the one who understands two things here?

But we want to hear Luther himself from both of us! who speaks in the capital E at the first tablet thus: 4)

Luther. "Where Ecolampad makes signs, Zwingli makes interpretations, and is one opinion without other words" 2c. So it goes, if one deals with God's word out of quarrel, and it goes right for us; for this is nothing else at all, but to seek the honor of man, not God, nor the truth.

How well is it now, in the beginning of the book, to make such a long and broad one, as we are in disagreement? (for he speaks of me, I do not leave Ecolampadius' speech, but deny it; which he cannot indicate with one letter) and at the end himself recognize that we are of one opinion? And this describes him not only in this place, but so often that we (if God wills!) want to reverse all his errors from his own words without need. But the fact that Carlstadt's opinion of] the words acted differently stands with ours does not indicate disagreement; Carlstadt himself is also not in dispute about the words. But the opinion is unanimous. In substance and essence, it is nothing but bread and wine; in sacrament, it is glorious bread, a

honest bread, which is to be eaten with cultivation and remembrance of conscience. But they [Luther and his followers] are not one even in the present, as has been heard before.

Luther has evil 5) for good, that we teach how a dina may be taught with various meanings, words and parables, as if it did not serve the cause. But behold, godly princes, if this serve not, if he reproach us, that we are divided into many opinions; but we say no every way. For other words and other words do not need to be proven to be a conflict of opinion; it is ever necessary that we indicate where an opinion is spoken of and described with various words.

He teaches how not to use different words in the night meal, but outside of it. Do we teach differently? Or where have we ever meant by one word that the words should be changed? Why does he put it on us? It is a fact that our books are not read in Saxony; he may freely say what he wants to us; we hope that our books will not answer for it.

15) "Zwingli and Ecolampad (he says) 7) have never made it certain with one letter that 'is' is so much as 'interprets', or 'body' so much as 'body sign'." Read our writings! Yes, pious princes, we again humbly request, for the sake of God and truth, that you recommend to your scholars to read our previous writings diligently: then men will see whether our meaning has been made certain or not.

However, we want to give a short introduction here. We prove by opposing scripture that the words may not be understood as they naturally read. There is no doubt that their opinion is broken. According to this, there is no thing either in heaven or on earth, if it may not be in the place where it is shown, but is shown in another thing, it must be signified by that other thing alone. So, the elect mother of God and all the elect may not come down, Luke 16, until the last day. Now if Mary is shown at Cloret, 8) Einsiedlen, Nach, Oettingen, since she may not be essential: then her sign, meaning or image alone is shown, and not Mary or the elect. So now Luther

5) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's [book, in the arc] a at the 6th plate. [No. 21, § 9 and 10.]

6) Marginal gloss: [In Luther's book, in the arc] b on the first panel. [No. 21, § 12.]

7) Marginal gloss: [Luther in the arc] b in the 2nd panel. (No. 21, § 15 at the end.)

8) Perhaps St. Loretto. (Walch.)

1) Perhaps: chatter. (Walch.)

2) Maybe: yolk.

3) Marginal gloss: xxxxxxxxx

4) No. 21, § 485.

shows the body of Christ in the bread or at the bread, which may no longer be on earth, except for the judgment, which is not yet here; so it follows that everything that is called his body is not his body, but means him alone.

(17) For this reason his defiling of our minds is valid as much as it may be, since he says: 1) "If our minds were right, we would not only deprive our adversaries of their minds, but we would also prove ours. To which words I am completely offended, so that I think that he writes what he wants, but his conscience sees that their sense is overturned. But be that as it may; would it be useful, 2) if we alone had reversed their reasons? But this is not alone; but we have fortified our minds thereby with grave proofs of the Scriptures.

18 But his speech serves strongly against himself. For he then teaches how "to break" in the words of Christ may be taken for offering and breaking forth, "to be poured out" for pouring out, and says, after much shaking and trying, that he does not want to indicate anything certain in it; although he, forgetting himself in three leaves, builds on it, as will come afterward. How, that he does not teach the sense certainly? or, if he is uncertain, that he teaches it? Accordingly, he thinks he has stated the matter correctly when he says: he knows that the body of Christ is there, but he does not know how? Yes, in previous books he 3) wickedly says: he lets him take care of it, how it is there. Why does Luther not teach this clearly? Or is the spirit false, which does not teach this; how is it about his? although we have fastened our doctrine without deception. To this all theologians have always said: We may well know what God is not, as that he is not a plant, stone 4) or animal; but what he is, we may not know. *genus est, non essentialis distinctio, sive differentia, qua species constituitur et cognoscitur* Why then is he angry with us, that not we, but he himself does variously?

19) When he therefore begins to go to the matter, 5) he relents that John is not Elijah; but denies that we have ever proved that "is" may be taken for "means." For

1) Marginal gloss: ^Luther's book, in arc b on the third panel. sNo. 21, Z18.s

2) i. e. nothing. It will probably read "nützig". Cf. A 6 of this paper.

3) Probably as much as: to speak nefariously.

4) In the old autotypo sOriginals stands: a planting stone; probably a misprint. (Walch.)

5) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's book, in the arc d on the 4th panel. sNo. 21, § 2S.s

It is a rule that one should not easily step away from the old interpretations and accept new ones: "unless the text and the understanding compel, or are proven from other places of Scripture. 6) Although Luther sets many rules in this book that overthrow his own presuppositions, as will come later, we gladly leave them to him, because we have kept them intact in all parts. We accept new interpretations alone, because the text and the understanding compel us; not our understanding, or the dead letter, but the understanding which we feel in true faith, which also the spirit that makes alive teaches. We accept new interpretations alone, since other places of the Scripture force us to it. As also in this trade insurmountable words force us to understand "This is my body" not according to the first appearance of human reason.

20) But that he confesses that John is not Elijah, this is right in conflict with the rule which he subsequently sets [in the arc] o 7) in the 4th tablet with the words: Luther: 8) "For this is a certain rule in all languages: Where the little word 'is' is used in a speech, one certainly speaks of the essence of the same thing, and not of its interpretation."

How does Luther keep his rule when he confesses that John is not Elijah? Is this taught with earnestness and truth? Yes, he says, John is not Elijah, but he is like Elijah. This is also what we say, that "is" in Scripture is not taken all essential. Which we show by the words: Elias meant John; or: John "means", that is, is like Elias. As when we call a *counterfactual* a meaning 2c. However, we see for once that Luther's rule, placed in the [bow] o, may not stand, and he separates himself, if he confesses that John is not Elijah.

22) But there he uses 9) a nice little trick, where he teaches how the words are changed, so that the same words become many words. And he takes the innocent *Horatium* to his aid, and speaks thus: Luther: 10) "From this it is seen that one word becomes two or four words, when it gets another new interpretation over its common interpretation. As 'flower' is another word when it is called Christ; and another when it is called the natural rose.

6) No. 21, § 36.

7) No. 21, § 240. A similar passage is found in the same § 28.

8) Marginal gloss: Lx guo penn prolats. est liaeo rsgüls? sFrom what secret place is this rule produced?

9) d. i. cleans. "Hüblerlein" perhaps: Püppchen?

10) Marginal gloss: [In bend b on the 7th panel. [No. 21, § 30.]

and the like; item another if it is called a golden, silver, or wooden rose."

23. Watch here for God's sake, pious princes, where it comes to us poor people, if we do not want to be overcome! Who has thus spoken: One word becomes four words? It is true that they have said this: One word may be called four; but that the word should become more than one is not so.

Example 24. I want to take Luther's "rose" right away. Rose means actually, essentially and naturally the flower, which is recognized to us all. If I then also call a wooden or paper rose a rose, Luther says that it has become a different word. Here I would like to ask him to spell the new word for me; then it would undoubtedly be, even from his own mouth, just the previous word: "rose. Why does he then speak, of which words are many? Oh God, so that he can argue how the formed rose is a true rose, and yet the natural rose is also a true rose. So also here, if the bread is called the body of Christ, he may say: It is the right corpse of Christ, and the natural corpse of Christ is also the right corpse. For if he did not want this, it did not serve his new seal, nor did he make so many words of it.

(25) But how well it is, we will show with childish examples. When the children in our country flake 1) or doll, the pennies are florins to them; the pails are bread to them, and the water in the little barrel is wine to them. Here also the sensible take it after them, and say: This is their bread, wine and gold. So lead the children over Luther's purse, take away his florins, and put their florins in his place (so that he does not have so many of them to talk the Carlstadt out of; 2) that is a well-salted insult, pious princes, not disgrace), and if he complains about it, say: The pennies are real florins, because it is written in your rule: 3) "where 'is' stands in a speech, one certainly speaks of the essence of the same thing.

(26) It is also written in your other rule that the word is a new word, and you want to make with the word also the thing that is called the word. Yes, you say that the wooden rose is also an essential rose, because it has the name rose.

1) i.e. to play godfather.
2) This refers to the gold florin that Luther gave to Carlstadt at Jena as a sign that he would allow him to write against him.
3) Marginal gloss: Is [in the Luther, in the bow] o on [the] 4th panel. [No. 21, § 240.]

has come. Eia! so also the penny is a real guilder. So one would also like to give them [the playing children] bread to eat and their wine to drink.

(27) But all mockery aside, this is the matter in this transaction: Every word is but one word, as also the logicians speak of univocis, aequivocis, and denominativis, and are called but many things; which many things may not make, that therefore the one word be many words. Thus one speaks; and not that one word becomes many words, but that [it] remains one word, and yet many things are named with the same one word. And if Luther indicates the lovely HORATIUM, as he speaks of innovation, I will say with leave that he does not understand horatium; for the word that is used differently does not become new; but it is used anew, and remains the old word. 4) And thus Horatius gives χα^Λ* ὑπα, λαγην [i.e. according to the ver.

changel the word that [which] is of the custom alone 2c. As, if I called Luther Cato (*ut esset tertius Cato*), I would not call him a new name, but the old one; I would not make a new word, but to a new man I would give the old name, which would be more suitable to me than the sow's fur.

But in this there are so many differences, why one word or name is given to many things, that it would be too long to talk about it here. But Luther speaks of it neatly, just like that physician who could not do more than one recapitulation, and speaks [in his book, in the arc] d in the eighth tablet: 5) Luther: "And so henceforth the Scripture is full of such speech, and is called tropus or metaphora in the Grammatica, when one gives two different things the same name, for the sake that there is a likeness in both."

29 Behold, is this not artificially spoken? It is all tropi metaphorae to him. Now it is no wonder that the feast-day preacher in Caesarea, who carries the silver dagger tied on his buttocks, says: he is now fully informed by Luther's book that there must be flesh and blood; or else we are Nestorians.

But we want to hear Luther further. Luther just there: "And then the same name according to the letter is one word, but potestate ac significatione plura, according to the power, custom, interpretation two words, an old and a new one, as Horatius says, and the children know well.

4) Marginal gloss: novan dicitur, euro so
novo ino<1o utimur.
5) No. 21, § 31.

(31) First of all, consider the one word; for he may not speak one word, but must do so, lest he mistake "one word" and make it seem as if it were a new word. Therefore let me understand that he first says that the one name is one word according to the letter, but according to the ability, use and interpretation it is two words. Then he should say, "But according to ability, need, and interpretation, it is able, or needed, and interprets two things;" then he comes with such words, "One word becomes two or four words," since he should say, "One word is used variously and yet remains only one word (*quorum nomen est idem*), but means, or interprets, many things that are not one (*res autem diversae*).

32) On the explanation (note, you pious princes!) we speak thus: John is Elias. Here "is" is not taken essentially, because John is not Elias, as also Luther recognizes. So also the rule becomes false, since he says: "is" means the "essence"; for here it does not mean the essence, but only the likeness, as Luther himself recognizes: John is like Elijah. If one says, "He is a right dog," one does not mean anything else, neither that he is as selfish and unfaithful as a dog. So by all the examples he drives out with many words.

Christ is a right vine. Here Luther says: 1) "Zwingel does not look at the word *vera*; Christ is the right vine. For no language nor reason suffers it to be said that Christ signifies the right vine." But we well see that Luther can well disguise the word *vera*, or "right," into an unright place; for since he should thus say, Christ truly or rightly signifies a vine, or according to his language, Christ is like a true or right vine; he does not rightly reverse the [i.e., confusion], and say, Christ signifies a right vine; therefore, that in his language it does not read. But there is little in this; we argue with the two proclamations: John is Elijah, and Christ is a true vine, not exactly that "is" must mean "means," but that "is" must not be taken essentially; but that here Luther wants to have both and not have them, as is indicated enough.

34: "The seed is God's word, the field is the world, the reapers are the angels" 2c. Here Luther speaks: "Acker is the world", and must not speak: The field is the world; for he sees that, so "is" should be taken essentially, the kem

1) No. 21, § 35.

Farmer believes that a field is the world; so I will desire no more of him than that he make the words "field means the world" Latin to me. Have I no doubt, he will have to say: *ager significat mundum*, the field indicates the world. world. For there is not a *metaphora*, actually to speak, in interpreting. Well, before that, in the presentation of the likeness, I let [a *metaphoram*] be taken from the sowing, to mean the word of God; but after that, in the presentation, Christ will not say that the word of God is like a seed, for he had already spoken of such an opinion in the presentation, but the disciples had not understood it; therefore he puts to them what he meant by the words: field, seed, reaper, and says: "The field is the world" for: The field means the world 2c., and is this an insurmountable place, since "is" is taken for "means"; God grant how ill Luther lies with word fever.

(35) Seven oxen and seven years are called one thing, saith Luther. But [times] he says: "heißen," *hoc est, significant*, and should prove that they would be one thing; for we have attracted the same clientele, that "fine" or "are" stands in it, and is taken for "means. But if Luther wants that where "is, are, his" and the like stand, [such word] should be taken essentially; so he would have to speak: Seven oxen are essentially seven years; 2) but he speaks: They are *metaphorae*. What metaphors? What likeness have seven dreamed ears to seven years? But not so, dear pious princes! do not be blinded by words! the seven ears mean seven years, and were alone appeared 3) by God, that they should mean; were essentially nothing at all, *ne σχις δναρ*, but a pure dream, And also Luther may not deny this place, that "essence" is not taken for "mean".

(36) That he now often speaks thus: it is not possible for us to prove from Scripture that "is" may be taken for "means"; has as much force and glimpses as other speeches more. As when he says: we have never yet brought forth Scripture, which forces that these words may not have his and the popes' understanding; and may put down none of those of all that we have brought forth, as will come. So here, too, if we had no other evidence, neither the two next indicated, [it] would be enough. For that he

2) Marginal gloss: vn Konil yuaeiANorantiavonarum litterarum.

3) i.e. shown in a face, apparere taetae.

Nay speaketh, and grappeth therein: Yea, the seven do?" So the Greeks have it; but Jerome speaks clearly ears "are" seven years; soon, the seven ears "are called" thus: Why do you not show us what the things mean that seven years; which hath no force, because he thus you do? Oh God, how should one do to Luthern? If you denieth: but all the faithful must open their eyes, whether look at the texts, you will see that we are telling the truth. it be so unto him that seven ears are seven years. And if he does not know this, as I am concerned, he would do there is no one who does not see that it is not so, then well in many things; if he knows it, why does he not he must see whether seven ears are seven years. And if deviate from the truth? Shall not the spirits of the prophets he finds that here the ears do not "mean" years, but be obedient to the prophets, and loose even the lowest in "signify" (for God appeared this dream because he the church?

wanted to signify seven years with seven ears), then he (39) This we have not shown (as we all do), that we finds that Luther wants to drown, and does not know should mean that "if" something is taken for "signified" in where he should swim to or from. one place, it must also be taken for "signified" in that

37 Therefore it is to be noted that these Hebrew words place, but that it might be seen how mean it is for the "the, the, the", and their like, are taken by the Hebrews Hebrews to speak thus. Thus it is also irrefutable that for "the is, the is, the is" 2c. Accordingly, that they use Exodus 12, "This is passover!" is spoken as much as, the same words so commonly for "that means, that" "This signifies," or is a signification of the passage; 4) and means, that means", that it is a wonder that Luther does therefore let Luther point the little word "This" to the lamb, not see this from himself without indications; for it is not to the protection, to the shoeing, to the staff in the hands, good to walk in the Scriptures without such a decision. to the hurried eating, to the thanksgiving, all with one Jesaiä at the 9. chapter stands thus: "The HErr will from another; then he does him justice. For per Israel head and tail ausreuten, stick and Binz. 2) The old synecdocham, that is, by the assembly or and honorable 3) is the head, and the prophet who comprehension, the word may well; or, if it does not teaches lies is the tail." But here we see that the prophet please him, let it point to the lamb alone; but so then the wants to say: That I have spoken, head and tail shall thus paschal lamb may point to all commerce and be understood by me: The head "signifies" the ancient

and honorable superior, but the tail "signifies" the thanksgiving, but $\chi\alpha\tau\alpha\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\delta\omicron\chi\eta\nu$. Same flattering prophet. In the same prophet one finds when we call the supper of Christ, only of one part of the innumerable that "is" is taken for "means", ahead in the outward sacrament, the breaking of bread, Apost. 2" and visions or revelations, since he says what the visions yet understand by this the whole supper of the Lord, the meant; as in the 22nd chapter he speaks: "This is the gathering of the faithful, the giving of thanks, the breaking day of the Lord"; and does not want to say differently, of bread, and the drinking of drink 2c. Therefore, there is however, than: The visions, which appeared to him, no need to argue whether the word "this" in the supper would be a meaning of the day of the Lord. refers to the bread or to the whole action; for even if it

38. the same in Jeremiah. In Ezekiel still much more. refers to the present bread, by the bread we understand When, in the 5th chapter, he says: "This is Jerusalem", the whole action, that is, the whole act of thanksgiving, as for: The thing that I have appeared unto thee is is first proved in Acts 2 and as we have sufficiently proved Jerusalem: that it shall be so unto her. At the 17th in previous writings and books.

chapter it says: "Do you not know what these things 40 When Luther thus takes the word of Christ "who is are?" here the Hebrew has the xxx, the Greek the xxx given for you" in hand, 5) and so boldly and surely is, but Jerome finely turns the "is" into "means" and says: proceeds that he also "gives praise and thanks to God that nsgoitis, quid ista significant? Do you not know what the he could see us so masterfully in our own words," there is things mean? for: Know ye not what these things are? no doubt that it is not without God's order that it comes to Ezech. 24: "Do you not tell us what these things are, light, first of all, that Luther, in this which you

1) d. i. also.

2) Binz -Stump.

3) Isa. 9, 15.: "The old honest people are the head."

4) Marginal gloss: xxxxxxxx, soraprsüsnsio st ool-
Issio.

5) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's [book, in sheet] c [at the] 5th and 6th plate and thereafter. [No. 21, § 43 ff.]

The second is that he misuses them more mockingly and unwisely than the Sophists did before.

41. first he says: this word which is given for you, or which is given for you, look at the substance or essence, and not at an accidens, that is, not at the importance; as, to be seen is an importance 1) 2c. Here I ask him: whether the body of Christ, when he spoke the words, was undeemable 2) and invisible or not? He cannot deny that it was deadly and visible. Secondly, I ask him: whether the deadly body was given to the disciples of the same time, or the non-deadly one? Let him gladly admit that Christ's body was on the cross, and that he was resurrected as one body according to the substance, so that he could not complain. If he says that the deadly body has been given to them, it certainly follows that it has also been given to them in a sensitive and visible way, because it is not deadly in an insensitive and invisible way. But if the unkillable body is given to the disciples, it was then killable and unkillable together, which is contrary to each other; for the body of Christ became unkillable only after the primitive state.

42 John 7 says: "Jesus was not yet declared. 3) But I have to put a stop to this, so that Luther does not break out; John 13 says: "After Judas had gone away, Jesus said: Now the Son of Man has been declared. Here Luther would cry out: He has already been declared, therefore the corpse was undead. But we say no to this: for Christ there mentions as having happened that which has not yet happened, but was near to happen, of which more will come hereafter; which, however, the words following make clear, as he says: "God will declare him in himself, and will declare him soon. Dear sons, I am still with you for a little while" 2c. After that he says, John 17: "Father, the hour is here, declare your Son" 2c. And soon after: "And now, Father, declare me with the clarity that I had before the world was created by you" 2c. These sayings I have therefore set all, that wheresoever a man striketh from, he should always meet with armor.

(43) If anyone would say, "He speaks here of explaining, when the disciples have preached him in the world, and have named him, and have made him famous, and have made him clear," it is contrary to this, "God will explain him in himself.

That is, with him, with himself. From this it can be seen that he does not speak of preaching. But if any man should say, He speaketh of the Godhead, which he desires to be declared; it is not fitting, for he was declared according to that, as he saith there, before the creation of the world. From this it can be seen that he desires to be explained according to humanity, which was not yet explained, but was only explained through death. As Paul also says to the Hebrews in the other chapter: "We see Jesus, who was a little humbled among the angels, crowned with glory and clarity through the suffering of death. And Philippians, chapter 2: "Christ emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, and becoming like men, being in all likeness a man. 4) He humbled himself; he was obedient unto death, and the death of the cross; and therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name" 2c. Luther should have looked at such statements, and not have let himself be taken in by the old 5) tidbits, then he would have seen that the corpse of Christ was not once 6) declared and deadly, God gives what he says of substance and 7) importance.

44) It does not help to say about the miraculous explanation that happened to the disciples Petro, John and Jacobean, because this explanation was not the explanation that he gave after the first rites 8) nor a lasting one, but happened more because of the disciples, to give them a *gustum* or Bitz [bite] of his and our future glory and joy. The same explanation has no contradictory scripture, but that Christ's body may be mortal or immortal in the sacrament does not leave his own word, as it follows.

45) Although it would not be necessary to continue to deal with Luther's philosophy, because it is not only childish, but also badly Christian, to leave it at that. 9) But that the weak, who do not count his word higher than God's word, do not think that he is speaking God's word here; so note, pious princes and all 10) Christians! Luther overlooks here *ampliationem* and *restrictionem*, that is, the time hanging and explaining, and that makes him wrong. The speech, according to

4) marginal glosses: been, L^Ali-kts, Ksdruwo mors, pro fuit

5) d. i. Patchwork.

6) d. i. at the same time.

7) d. i. Accidens.

8) d. i. assumed.

9) i.e. to rely on it.

10) In the old edition: elle.

1) Importance - ueeiätzos.

2) unkillable ----- who cannot be killed. - mortalis, mortal; but mortal, istalis. (Walch.)

3) d. i. transfigured.

The following is the form of the *ampliatio*: It often happens that we speak of a thing that is no longer so, or that is not yet so, and yet is present in our understanding, whether it is no longer, or not yet. As when one says: Adam is as well a man as Christ. Now Adam is 1) not a man, but Christ is, for Adam's body and soul are not together; now man is of 2) body and soul. Let no one be mistaken here that the dead are called men! It is known that the body sleeps and the soul lives, and for the sake of life and nobility 3) the soul is called man, as all philosophers say. Still, if one says in a speech: Adam is a man, we understand that one wants to say of the being that he once was, but now is not; still, he is in our memory or understanding so that we can think that he was composed of body and soul, just like us. And while he was still alive, it was as true: Adam is a man, as now Luther is a man, although he is a great, great man. While Adam was still alive, it was proper to say: Adam is a deadly man. But now it is not proper; for though we speak thus, yet now we understand: Once, when he lived, he was deadly, as we are now; but now he is no longer deadly.

46. of the future. "I have commanded you to eat and drink at my table" 2c. Luc. 22. Here the disciples are ordered to be fellow measures 4) of Christ in the kingdom of God, and at the same time each of the disciples could rejoice that he was already a meal companion of Christ. But how was he a companion in heaven, who was scourged, beaten and beheaded daily? He was a fellow-measurer only in mind, spirit and faith, but not yet in the essential work and ingestion. Yes, it is not possible that he may be present, because man is in this time [Zeitkauf, saeculo]. "For man shall not see my face, neither shall he live," understand bodily, Exodus 33. Here we see that man is indeed presently a table-sitter of God, according to his substance and nature, but that he essentially sits at table with God in the Kingdom of Heaven, that is not at all. Now Luther would like to say: They are essential and substantial.

Table-sitters of God, and may well speak: This is Peter, who will become a meal partner of God in heaven; for the very Peter who is still alive will also sit at table with the body in its time. I would say: Thank you! But tell me, whether Peter (whom we write here in life) is now [yamjam] in heaven above,

and have the heavenly joy or not? He will have to say: No. So also, if I show and say: This is Peter, the table-sitter of God, who is in heaven (for we speak for and only of Peter, who is still on earth), it follows that I speak falsely and wrongly.

(47) So also when Christ says, "This is my body, which is given up for you," it is necessary to leave the meaning of Christ's body: Who also is risen from the dead in substance and essence; nor does it follow that his body is already there, as it was after the resurrection; nor does it follow that Peter, who is here, is above, though he will come up in his own time, body and soul, and have joy with God. And therefore the word is: To be given up for you is to die for you. That "to die", therefore [that] it is an importance of his accidens, which attaches to the substance at one time, and not at another; for ever Christ may not die after the manner of the body declared, Rom. 6. "After Christ is risen from the dead, he dieth no more": so the word "die" bears with him, that (since he was deadly when he spake this, and spake not in time to come, [or else the disciples would not have eaten him, as mine], but in time present: "This is my corpse, which is spent for you"; 6) and being deadly does not befit the future declaration), 7) - that the deadly [mortality] must be attached to the corpse, so that they must have eaten the deadly corpse, and we still today; and if he were deadly, he would also be sensitive, not only with seeing, but [also] with grasping, hearing 2c.

This becomes even clearer if we also add the past time to the declared corpse, thus: This is the corpse of Christ, which is given for you. It was probably appropriate to speak according to the original: This is the corpse of Christ, which is slain for you? for it may then no longer be slain, and what is then spoken in the present time must befit the same declared corpse, or it is not present, but

6) Marginal gloss: 8ic moliluur Participium

7) These round brackets are set by us; the parenthesis in square brackets comes from Zwingli.

1) So put by us instead of: "is", which, as we assume, is a misprint instead of "itzt".

2) d. i. consisting of.

3) d. i. because it is the most distinguished.

4) i.e. table companions.

5) i.e., the one who sits at table.

The only thing that is understood of the corpse is the way it was before. Thus, what is spoken of the body of Christ presently, because it is still deadly, which does not befit the body that is declared, must also be understood according to the manner of the deadly; and what is spoken of him presently, because of the body that is declared, but because it is still deadly, must not be the body that is declared presently, but must be considered in the mind alone.

Now it comes into a summa. As I understand [the words] "Adam is a man" in no other way, than that Adam, when he was here on earth, was a man, and is no longer a deadly Adam, so I understand, when Paul says: "Christ does not die for the time being"; that the words are true only according to the original state, and not before, because he died. And again, "This is the body which is given for you," must be understood of the body alone, which was deadly, and because it was deadly; for the risen body is not deadly for us. Now if the deadly body of Christ had been given to the disciples to eat at the time when it was still deadly and could not be declared, it would also have been given to us to eat; and if we ate it in this way, it would not yet have been declared. Such a pretty thing comes from Luther's Zürlimürli [parrot language].

50 But if the mangy sophists (so that their humps are also itched) want to say: *Hoc est corpus meum, quod est vel erit clarificatum*, that is: this is my corpse, which is already clarified "is", or is clarified "will", here the substance and essence remains, and may nevertheless be understood by the corpse, which takes on the importance of the clarification [transfiguration] only after time. Answer: Well, the little vixen comes before March, brings the bellow itself again. But if the restriction or explanation of the declared corpse does not stand here, but the explanation of the deadly one, which rightly disputes the explanation: Dear! then say, do you want to be pious about your art, whether you do not have to amplify: This is the deadly corpse, which is declared or will be declared? Must say yes. But now he was not declared, you also say yes, and was presently deadly? But [times] Yes: so the disciples must have eaten the deadly corpse, and not the declared one.

(51) Secondly, you know well that the one part of the amplification, that is, the hanging in time, does not have to be true at one time, but only understood. As: "Adam is a man," let [me] not be mistaken that the Sophists say: *Adam fuit horno* (for they do not know themselves,

Where the amplification belongs in the Rhetorica) one must therefore put to right: Adam is now a man, or: has been a man. Here it must not be asked; for that, according to the present, "Adam is a man," is false; but in the mind, "that he has been a man at some time, and is not now," is the other part, and is true. So here I ask on the bare words, and will also venture with Luther, "this is my corpse." Is this, as it is shown here, the declared corpse? If he says, "Yes," I ask, "Was it presently declared or was it declared afterwards? If it was declared at the present time, then it was undead, for it was not declared until after death; it may not die even if it is declared, and all the preceding declarations from God's word must be over. If it was only declared afterwards, then the disciples ate it only dings [conditionally] or on Borg declared, and we eat it baar declared; so we eat it ever not immediately with the disciples; But if they should have eaten him declared, present or future, and he was not declared present, it follows that the declaration was only in the understanding, not present; so the deadly presentness was the other part of the amplification; and if they ate the deadly body of Christ, one follows the other: If it is eaten deadly, it is also eaten sensitive 2c.

(52) That Luther says: 1) "The Jews also ought to be round about, as they were in Christ's death": he is almost justified in this; for from this one sees how piously and honestly he acts, when he speaks of things that are outside the substantial body of Christ, which no sophist, so evil 2) has ever been, has ever attached to the substance, as their own attributes. For to be deadly is such a quality that there is no man in this time who is not deadly; and though it is an importance, yet it is not an importance as to be wise, to be foolish, to be white, to be black 2c., and yet these are in and of the substance itself; but an importance, as being reasonable; as we have been taught in the *Isagoge Porphyrii: de differentiis essentialibus, speciem constituentibus*; imo in antiquis exemplaribus arbores vidimus, in quibus animal *priore* divisione secabatur in animal mortale et immortale; *secunda* dein, animal mortale dividebatur in rationale et irrationale. Sub immortalibus ergo continebantur homines ex mortuis aliquando resurrecturi; sub mortali, hi, qui adhuc in humanis agunt. [Of the essential differences, which distinguish the

1) No. 31, § 46 inaccurately stated.

2) eßtächt - ass-like (?).

Indeed, in ancient specimens we have seen trees (in the manner of a family tree) in which, by the first division, a living being was divided into a mortal being and an immortal one; then, by the second division, the mortal being was divided into a rational and an unreasonable one. To the immortal (being) were now counted those who will one day rise from the dead; to the mortal those who still live in this world].

53) And to be dead is not a coincidence, but such a peculiar thing, that the man before the departure from this time may be as little dead, as little he may not be a man. And again, if he is declared after the last day, it is impossible for him to be dead, as it is impossible for him not to be; but the appearance 1) of the Jews who were around the cross does not serve this purpose, because they are not of the body of Christ, so that they are also not an importance belonging to the substance. 2) Now if the body of Christ was mortal at the time of the supper, the disciples would have had to eat it mortally, as Luther also suggests; or if the disciples had eaten it declared, which may not be, for it was not yet declared in the supper, as has been heard: then it must have been mortal and declared at one time, and must have died before it died; for declaration certainly comes only after death. If he was now declared in the night meal, then he had been dead before his death. These and other nonsensical Marcionian ravings all come from the fact that one wants to fight against God's simple word with man's reason.

(54) If Luther no longer speaks, because we are mad enthusiasts, devil spirits 2c., and can do nothing at all; but he is everything, and also wants to teach us Peter in Spain 3), they think it must be so, and therefore do not allow themselves to be paid, 4) but forbid them to read the books of his opponents. On the other hand, 5) he half-bribes them of their scholars; for if he hangs the horse, they are put on their butts, that they may not say "kauw" 6) against open error. For I have no doubt that there are still some in Saxony who see that we do not argue a substantia ad accidens, but they are not allowed to say so.

1) Perhaps: the joining.

2) Marginal gloss: Oireumstantia non est ejus, tMoä eireurnstat.

3) In the old edition: chips. - For Petrus Hispanus, see Col. 1010 and 1016, § 306.

4) i.e. report, teach.

5) "to coat" probably: to give strokes.

6) "kauw" probably as much as "gack".

Thanks are still due to the honorable authorities of my lords in Zurich (although we do not stand well together, there is human weakness), who do not hold us all in town and region otherwise than that we must give each one an account of our faith and doctrine; yes, I alone am represented twenty times, but in those more to the Anabaptists than to others; and if God's honor has triumphed always, praise be to Him!

55 Now let us speak of restriction, that is, purification. Purification is a word that distinguishes one thing from all other things. As when I say, "Bring me the skirt that is first bleached 7). Here "which is first bled" is a purification before all other skirts. Luther speaks of this on the other tablet, 8) and makes the words "my body" a purification, which may not be suffered according to the Logica, and calls it explanation, and "which is given for you" is a purification in all Logics.

So also here is the explanation, "who is given for you", that is, is killed, which takes the name of the declared corpse. And call the deadly and explanation *accidentia*, important things, although they are essential and indispensable qualities, each in its own time; nor is the deadly introduced by us, but Christ himself had expressed it, and thus explained his words. And still remains the substance, *eadem numero*, One, but of a new form. Now if "he that is slain for you" be a *restrictio* or purification, that where he gave his body to be eaten, he would have given it, being slain; and yet he is not slain eaten, according to their saying; for if he were slain eaten, he would also be visibly eaten, and sensibly 2c.: so it follows that he is neither slain eaten, nor declared bodily eaten. For the word "who is slain for you" purifies, that the words "this is my body" alone must be understood of the body of Christ, when he was dead (for he speaks them when he was dead), where the words are to be understood according to the first appearance. For if I say, This is the hand that was burned 9) to me, will I ever say that [it] was burned, but is recovered. And if I say, This is the hand that was burned to me, I will ever say, It was burned to me, and is burned again. So, "This is my body, which is given for you," indicates that the body is deadly, and is given for us with death, not with death or death.

7) embroidered.

8) No. 21, § 72.

9) In the old edition: verbrunnen.

Explanation; because first he did not accomplish the work of salvation, but with dying.

57 Here the holy or pious man who wrote against me in Latin also has his foolish argument dissolved, since he says: I argue from the substance, essence, to the accidens, to the importance, and make a syllogism; as the students are taught to forgive false eloquence, 1) thus:

- 1) Everything you bought yesterday, you ate today;
- 2) Yesterday you bought raw [rouw] meat: 3) So today you ate meat raw.

So I am told he is acting against me: for truly I have never had time to read his book of one. Leo 2) has shown me on the walk this account; that only besiege, devout Christian. This account adds in the other speech that is not understood in the first; that is the word raw [rouw]; for in the first one understands that one speaks only of the substance of what is bought, God gives how it is boiled or roasted, but that it is eaten. In the other, however, one introduces an importance, the crudeness [Röuwe], which one does not provide for in the first; for where one provides for it, one would not have let it linger, but would have had to form the [former] thus for us: Everything that you bought yesterday, you ate today, just as it was when you bought it; for in this way no one would let up on it.

58 Now let us also set our syllogism or account, and see whether we also secretly conceal something in the first, about which we introduce an importance in the other:

- 1) Christ's body is given for us;
- 2) The bread is the body of Christ:
- 3) So also the bread is given for us.

But as "to be given for us" and "to be killed for us" are one thing in the matter, I will now make the other, which has one [that is just the same] form with the foregoing, but is clearer for us, and urges the adversaries to more ridicule:

- 1) Christ's body died for us;
- 2) The bread is the body of Christ:
- 3) So also the bread died for us.

59) Here I ask the Holy Father, 3) whether the first one is true? [He cannot deny it, for it is the first and foremost in the Christian faith,

1) i.e. to beware of 2c.

2) Leo Jude.

3) Here Zwingli addresses Luther with these words, as can be seen by comparing this paragraph with No. 21, § 44, and calls him a pope.

that Christ died for us. Therefore I ask him: where in the other is an importance introduced that did not appear in the first? For I do not want to introduce anything in the first one but Christ's body and death; so in the second one there is no *accidens* or importance at all, but bread and Christ's body. Where then do I argue a *substantia ad accidens*? I mean, we are half possessed with fools. And shall such fools 4) seduce a pious simple-minded people with vain lies. Who will tell the simple what syllogism *demonstrativus* is? What is major *extremitas*, minor and medium? and how in the holy man's other proposition an importance is introduced that is not introduced in our other? Then they stand and argue, 5) as we are buffaloes, they cannot understand it; so every trickster wants to be subtle, and understand well.

Summa, we do not argue a *substantia ad accidens*, but we freely say first of all: not simply "is this the corpse of Christ", but "is this the corpse of Christ who dies for us", and point in the first supper to the corpse of Christ who sat with the disciples. Must Luther himself say yes. So we ask Luther: whether the bread in the first supper is also the body of Christ? Without a doubt he cries out loud: Yes. So it follows that the bread must also be given for us in death. We ask further: Is the body of Christ, which sits with the disciples in the supper, bodily and sensibly given in death? But if you answer [times]: Yes. Further, is the bread (which was eaten in the supper after the words "this is my body" 2c.) the body of Christ sitting with the disciples? But [times] Luther says: Yes. Now it follows that the bread is the deadly sensitive body of Christ.

61. These syllogismos, or accounts, all our adversaries set up with rogues, heretics, knaves, fools, asses' heads, and such like thunder-axes; 6) but with a thorough saying, or even with substantial philosophy, they do not indicate where he is not right; for they say we argue a *substantia ad accidens*, which is not at all; but we recognize the unbetrayed words of JESUS CHRIST our SAVIOUR to be framed with such prudence: "this is my body, which is given for you", that we see that the words "given for you" are a purification, that he

4) i.e. fools.

5) d. i. bleating.

6) "aufthun" here -resolve, cancel; otherwise in the meaning: to explain, to make gelmd.

Then speaketh he of his body as it was dead; and if the disciples did not eat it so, neither did they eat it declared; for he was not declared then, neither hath he two bodies; it follows that the thanksgiving with the bread signifieth or signifieth the body of Christ which is dead to us.

But Luther argues a *substantia ad accidens*, because he says: 1) "I point with my hand to heaven and say these words: There sits for the righteousness of God the body that was given for us. He must indeed sit there visibly, or there is nothing there at all" 2c. Behold, pious princes, whether here Luther does not deal in humbug? As he shows me into heaven, so he should tell me: This is the body of Christ; so he says to me: There is the body of Christ. Is not the *ubi*, the place, or where, an *accidens*? Why then does he put it in my place instead of the substance? But it is Brendli Murer's work; what they use in one place, they break open in another.

Here I ask you, pious princes and all Christians, that you forgive me for the sake of God, that I have brought so much gossip from the poor meager philosophy. It had to be, so that Luther and his servants would see that they are keeping their blind casts in vain. For the time being, I will train myself briefly in such things.

64. but this is sweet, because he speaks: 2) "When Jesus hid himself, John on the 8th Cap., and went out of the temple, I would say: There goes the body, which is given for us" 2c. And comes but with the *ubi*, and may not say, this is the body of Christ, for he may not show it with his finger, it is invisible. Nor does he want to show it, and he will be missing it as soon as he shows it in the bread. For this reason we do not speak here of the effects of Christ, but of our eating his body. But we have talked enough about the *accidens*.

That we know that the disciples of Christ ate his body in the night meal; 3) is not at all, is not invented even with a letter, God grant! how many words Luther sheds on it. For that we have spoken: If Christ had given his body in the night meal and made it with the words, "This is my body," he would not have given us authority to make his body. This does not let up that he gave it. As I do not slacken,

that Luther is a child, if I therefore say: If Luther had wiped his noses on the Ermel, then he would be a child. But he says, I have let them be words of fact; therefore I have let them eat the body of Christ. Yes, of course I have let it be words of fact; but not of fact that Christ's body was eaten in the flesh, but that new thanksgiving was done, accomplished, and instituted; and it is all an open *calumnia*, intercourse.

(66) Luther calls it a "Büberei" (4) that we divide words into "Thätelworte" [verba] and "Heißelworte" [verba mandati]. I drop here that he understands my words badly, also gives them a strange form. Even if he does not reverse them for me, I should still be lucky that they are understood. I have called words of action, which comprehend a simple action; hot words or words of command, which command something. If I now say that the words, "Take, eat, this is my body," are words of action, and the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," are words of heat, is this wrong? If he says, "These words are near one another," I ask him, "How far are they from one another?" Luke, in the 10th chapter, says, "I mean that he who was kind to him was his neighbor. Then Jesus said, "You have decided rightly, go and do likewise. Are there not also words of action before, and hot words after?"

Luther does not like to be taught, but he is so often wrong in this matter that he is also wrong in other places; 5) for the words of Matthew, chapter 21: "Truly I say to you, if you have faith and do not doubt, you will not only do what happened to the fig tree, but if you say to the mountain, 'Lift yourself up and throw yourself into the sea,' it will happen: Lift yourself up and throw yourself into the sea, it will be done." Yes, Luther calls the words *Heißelworte*, 6) and does not see that they are words of promise. It is enough for us to see how a man's face is lost when he is in great terror, as Luther is standing here. He sees that their opinion is gone, and argues *sicut desperati*, like the esteemed. For when he says, "We should prove the words of the Bible with Scripture," he does not see that there is not one word without Scripture.

68 He may also not attack any, neither the certain: "Do this in remembrance of me!" because he cannot skip the same glimpfs half; and

4) No. 21, § 57.

5) inverted(?).

6) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther, in the arc] d fan the) third panel. [No. 21, § 55.]

1) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's book, in the arc] c at the 6th plate. [No. 21, § 45.]

2) No. 21, § 45.

3) Marginal gloss: [Luther's book, in the arc] d on the first panel, [No. 21, §§ 49 and 50.]

Lift it up, will make it into commanding and promising words with each other: Do it in memory of me! Make my body, and give thanks both together! If he proves that Christ's body was made with words, he proves that Christ also made it with words. And in the midst of this he contends against him, that Christ himself did not give his body bodily to be eaten; and may he not touch a hair of our head. Is not this *petitio principii*? *idem probare per idem, ignotum per ignotum*? that is said of the red pants! 1) We argue about the understanding of the words "this is my corpse," and thus indicate what the understanding of the words "do this in memory of me" is; which, from Paul's explanation [restrictione], teaches us that the words "this is my corpse" do not have the lack of understanding that our opponent shields. Thus Luther goes on, and wants to take from them the understanding that Paul gives them, with the understanding that he has never yet proved. As if someone said, "Why do you eat? He answered, "That I may live. Why do you live? That I eat. Why do you eat? That I live. Why do [you] live? That I eat 2c. So let one do this until [the] last day, and yet not want to be broken 2).

69) Luther 3) does not yet see that the words: "Lift yourself up and we will throw you into the sea" are an exuberant speech for such words: If you have faith, there is nothing so great that you will not do it. Luther thinks that this is speaking of throwing mountains back and forth; for when he looks at the *tropos*, he cannot let up on the *tropos* in this, but fears, as that child said: I will not a hurry [say], otherwise I would have to hurry b also; if he let *tropos* slacken in one place, in another also be forced. But it seems to me that Luther understood the word "command" in our previous scripture to mean "to promise," and we need it to mean "to promise," but there is not much to it.

70) Now when he speaks of words of action, which he calls "words of the word" (he likes to use "words of the word"), 5) he says: "And if Peter or Paul were to say, 'Your sins are forgiven you,'" he says.

As Christ said to Mary Magdalene, "Well then, this is a mere word; nevertheless, sins are forgiven" 2c. Behold, pious princes, how Luther is still in two great darknesses! One, that he does not see that the words: "Your sins are forgiven!" are promising words; for we call these promising words, which give *lybrung* (*sic*), security and instruction to the conscience with certain promise. But since here Christ makes safe, man cannot make safe; for he does not promise us that where we speak the words, sins will be forgiven. Therefore the words are words of action to us, but to Christ they are words of promise, that is, words of assurance and comfort.

The other darkness, so far from being serious that he does not see the word of John 20: "Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them", that the words are not a power to forgive sin; for no creature can forgive sin, if sin alone is against God, Ps. 50 [51, 6]; but they are a recommendation to preach the gospel; and Marcus expresses the same opinion in other and clearer words: "Go, preach the gospel to every creature! He that believeth (that is, believes the gospel he hath heard) shall be healed.

[salvus] 2c. From which words (for they both write one opinion, which is also done and recommended for one time) we learn that the meaning of the words is: To whom you preach the gospel, which is the forgiven [gratuita] 7) remission of sin, *ut remissio peccatorum sit periphrasis evangelii*, their sins are remitted; understand, if the gospel is preached to their hearts; which, however, neither the apostle nor man may do, but the one Father, John. 6: "No man cometh unto me, but my Father hath drawn him." The apostle preaches into the ears, but God alone into the heart. "He is nothing at all who plants; and he nothing at all who waters; he alone who makes to grow is all." And if all the apostles were to say: Your sins are forgiven you! and the man himself is not assured in his heart without doubt by firm faith, he does not know that his sins are forgiven him until he has the spirit of God's Son, in which he cries out: O my Father! that is, recognizes that God is his Father, so faithfully and actually that he provides for him in all his life and concerns. Therefore, if Peter said, "Your sins are forgiven you," he would not say anything else, neither would he say, "Do you believe in the heavenly kingdom?

6) d. i. Command.

7) i.e. free of charge, by grace.

1) Compare No. 21, § 88 and § 275.

2) manufactures).

3) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's book, in the arc] d on the 4th plate. [No. 21, § 59.]

4) By this Zwingli means all kinds of self-educated words.

5) Marginal gloss: [In Luther's book, in Bogens ä at the third panel. [No. 21, § 55.]

The Father, through the act of giving his Son for you, that he might be your Father; so your sins are forgiven you 2c. I have written about this in the first articles 1); I would also like Luther to have read them, as he does not want to be taught by us.

When he says: 2) "Christ calls us to speak these words," he does, as in all things, just as the person in Plauto: *pactum non pactum; non pactum pactum est*, speaks of the rich: that which is promised must not be promised; that which is not promised must be promised. Here he rages: "Christ has spoken the words. Where? Dear, show that! "Do this in remembrance of me!" Let Paul therefore hear what is to be done in memory of his body, that is, death, suffered for us in the body: praise and thanksgiving in the friendly and brotherly meal, as we drink with one another the bread of the church 3) and the drink of love. Although we have no way of knowing that the whole words of the Lord's commitment are not to be read, we ourselves should proclaim them in our churches.

(73) But this is why Luther wanted to say that the words of Christ were commanded to be spoken, so that he might color the foolish enthusiasm in some way, since they say, "The word brings it with it," but there is not a single letter in the whole Bible that God has promised us anything about certain words that are spoken. And as He wants us to speak the words, He does not give us a word, nor a proof, because "He would like to see who would say that they should not be spoken. 4)

(74) So he spake unto us in another place, 5) Saying, We hope that no man will gainsay it. But since we do not speak the same thing to beg to be believed, but when we have proved our mind with the evidence of the Scriptures, we speak accordingly as one speaks before a judge: We hope 2c. For the judge of our doctrine is the whole church.

75 Summa: The difference between Luther and us is in the place that we do not slacken that the words must be spoken at the evening meal so that they do something; for to do something is not to take the evening meal, but to come here with a believing heart 6) and give thanks. But that they are spoken, announced, or read aloud, as a statute, according to which one [will] do something, is read aloud; or as one read in the Old Testament to the paschal lamb, which, as it is written of in Genesis 12, as the Hebrews confess, and is also easily noted in the same place, so we forbear [that] the words should be read aloud. For even if Luther had an open word about reading, it does not follow that "speaking" or "reading" would make the body of Christ; it would be used of Christ in this way, and promised to us, that if we spoke the words as he did, we would also make his body as he did. The tweders 7) may never be invented.

(76) If he had said that we should make the sun and the moon, we would have done it"; he tells us that we are teaching rightly. But where did he tell us to make his flesh and blood? If Luther indicates this, then take the wreath. For what the words "Do this in remembrance of me" are able to do, Paul declares, and nowhere remembers the making. As it is said before and after.

77. "Moses," he says, 9) "did not bring the water from the rock by beating," we leave that; "but the power of God." "Thus," he continues, "his body is not because of our speaking or our words, but because of his hotness." Here Luther very finely (I don't know whether with malice or with deceit) skips over the whole promise, and areas he shows in. So it is written in Exodus 17: "Go before the people, and take with thee the ancients or counsellors of Israel; and the rod, that thou hast smitten the river with, take in thine hand, and go. (These are all commanding words.) And I will stand before thee there upon the rock; and if thou shalt smite the rock, water shall come out of it." (Behold, these are words of promise.) Now when Luther brings forth to the words, "Take, eat," 2c. also those: Here I will presently

1) In the 67 articles of the disputation held on January 29, 1523. In the 51st thesis, he declares it idolatry if a man forgives sin, and also denies the office of the keys, that is, that sins can be forgiven in the place of and by the command of Jesus Christ.

2) No. 21, § 58.

3) d. i. Community.

4) Regarding this statement by Zwingli, compare No. 21, §§ 60 and 66.

5) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's [book, in the bow] d at the 2nd tablet. [No. 21, § 52 towards the end.]

6) Marginal gloss: So we have the body of Christ in the night meal.

7) i.e. neither of the two.

8) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's [book, in the arc] d [at the] 4th plate. [No. 21, § 56.]

9) Randglosse: Is sim Luther, in the arc d an [ders 5ten Tafel. [No. 21, § 59 inaccurately quoted.]

And if ye shall say, This is my body; it shall be there, we shall see it without doubt 2c. But if this be not possible, it shall be with chicken's milk.

78 For the words "Do it in remembrance of me" (which we have eternally said) do not mean that we are to make the body of Christ; that [i.e., because], on the one hand, he himself did not give his body to be eaten, as is heard before and after; on the other hand, we are to make this thanksgiving with expressed words in remembrance of him, and not to make his body. Still so Luther in Mosi's words so freely omitted the promising words, I must ask him whether this was done with or without danger 1). If it is without danger, then look up, and do not teach another time, because he has well seen through the whole sum. If it is with danger, then he sins the highest sin, for which there is no need to ask, of which it says in Matt. 12 and John 5. For this is the sin in Holy Spirit certain daughter, falsify the recognized truth.

When he says: 2) "We must take the bread and bless it," he looks behind him and wants to be seen as having his hand on the fork; 3) that is why he makes crooked furrows in the field of God. "Blessing" is what the Pontiffs say; Luther borrows it from them, but Matthew, Lucas and Paul have *ευχαρίστησαν*, which is "to give thanks", or to praise God. Alone Marcus has which word however we have indicated before enough "danksagen" heißen, not "segnen", as the old women the Ungenamten 4) segnen, and the Pfaffen the patties. But "blessing" serves the purpose; it is supposed to be able to give power to a matter with the words, and to give Luther the ability to bring the body of Christ into the bread.

Soon after this he says: 5) We say that his body is there when we say: "This is my body. Here is, of the first, our one grace to Luther (let stand as he will, the difference of the words 2c., though he does not like it), 6) that he gives us the words report from God's word, when we say, "This is my body!" that [it] is the body of Christ; for we have never yet been told that Christ Himself gave His body bodily to be eaten: then it is not possible that the words "Thut's zu Gedommniß" ("Do it in remembrance") should be used.

1) Dangerous Intent. In § 83 it says "ohn Gefährd" - approx.

2) Marginal gloss: Is (in Luther's Confession, in the arc) <1 at [the] 8th panel. sNo. 21, § 67.)

3) Plow(y).

4) i.e. the devil.

5) No. 21, § 68.

6) These brackets are set by us.

my!" recommend us to bring the body of Christ with the words. 7) Luther should prove as the first that Christ had given his body bodily to eat, and therefore prove the conception 8). That is said enough here!

81) On the other hand, for God's sake, see with what ghost of words Luther walks! Here he says: If we say the words: "This is my corpse!" then his corpse is there, 9) and Christ does not say: There is my corpse; but: "This is my corpse" 2c. If this has not fallen from the substance to the accidens, I never see the Gugger 10). Yes, he says, because Christ does not say to us: This is my body! or: There make my body! but: This is my body. Then I ask him for God's sake to tell us, "Is the body of Christ in all the bread? Says he, Yea, but the words shall not be in the supper, nor in any thing, if it be before." Says he: No; but when the words are said, "This is," 2c. he is there, as he first spoke: so it ever follows that he who was not there before is there now; so he is only anew "come thither," which we take for become; though Luther supposes we look for him by the word "become," for he says, "We say, his body, which was made and became long ago," 2c. And will press him, [in] no way, with the word "become." But this we say that Luther himself does not stay with the word "is," since he immediately means to keep to it. For he denies that Christ is in the bread, as has been said.

82) Secondly, he says: 11) The bread is the body of Christ, and both are bread together. But here he says, there is the body of Christ. So I ask him, what 12) he shows us, if he says: there; does he point to the bread or to the supper? If he points to the bread, then he wants to say that the bread is not the corpse of Christ, if he makes "that" into "there"; then every "is" is therefore taken from the essence, that the bread is not the corpse. If he points to the supper with "there"? then it is as before; then the bread is not that to which the word "that" points, much less may the whole supper be that; for Luther himself strongly disputes the Valette drink, which was not the blood of Christ. But the laborious word-fighting, indeed real sorcery,

7) For this, see No. 21, § 68.

8) d. i. Command.

9) The words of Luther No. 21, § 68 completely twisted.

10) d. i. Cuckoo.

11) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's book, in the arc] t [at the] 8th plate, [No. 21, § 339.]

12) d. i. whereupon.

must help the matter, otherwise it is completely over. 1) Keep in mind that Luther negated "in bread" before; here he negates "that" and makes "there" out of it; and afterwards he again makes "that" out of [the same], so that it is sufficient for bread.

Luther, however, tastes like the garlic and onions in Egypt, so he says: 2) "Therefore, those who eat this supper do not need to have faith" 2c. Thus the pope must speak, if he were to pretend that the body of Christ was eaten here in the flesh; and if Luther also wants it, he must also speak in this way against his previous writings, since he wrote against the pope: where there is no faith, the body of Christ is not eaten; only the body of Christ is eaten by the faithful, but the unbelievers eat only a condemnation for themselves, not the body of Christ. These are without danger the words that he needs, I am quite aware.

But be it as it may. Watch, pious princes! When Luther speaks against the difference between the words of truth and the words that are called, he says: there are some with which faith is bound, as in the miraculous signs 2c., and some with which faith is not bound, as the words in the supper. 3) Here I [first] ask Luther whether the believer should not believe all the words of God, rightly understood? if he says yes without doubt. How then can the servant be sent to the ministry of preaching if he does not have faith, or to bring the body of Christ? Yea, if he prove with the false prophets, and with them that did eat his body unworthily at Corintho, I say, Why speak of the error, that it may be with the minister, and faithfulness may not be with him? Is not this an open way of seduction? Shall I say: A prince must not be faithful, a councilor must not be wise, because there are many unfaithful princes and many unwise councilors? Shall one not speak thus: He who is not faithful to his people is not a prince; and: Whoever is not wise cannot be a councilor, and the like? Which prince is not faithful, he is a tyrant and not a prince; which is not wise, he is not a councilor, but a ruler? 4) Where I have found Luther not to have really understood the Scriptures, I have admitted to him that he has not understood the Scriptures.

still prefer it to the good of the consciences, but now I truly can't say it anymore.

(85) Secondly, I ask whether it is a miracle that Christ is eaten in the supper? There is no doubt that it is, for they perform not only one, but many miracles; and Luther must perform one, which neither can be nor will be in heaven or on earth, that is, that God is and does contrary to his own word; that is never possible. Now if the servant or magistrate did such a wonderful work here, how would it be for him to do it without faith? Now Luther himself says that faith is required in moving mountains; and Marci 16: "But to those who believe, these signs will follow" 2c. And it does not help here to drag in the one who did not follow Christ, and yet cast out devils; for *privilegia paucorum non faciunt legem publicam*, special exempted deeds do not make a law; but we are to remain with the common law of Christ: that where miraculous works of God are done by men, man must believe.

Thirdly, see, pious princes, how Luther's scripture stands here, where he says: faith is not bound up in preaching and supper. How does he prove it? He has not one scripture for this. But we have open Scripture against Luther's error. 1 Cor. 4: "This is especially 5) required of the servants of the household, that one be faithful." But why is one faithful to God his Lord? Without doubt, because he loves him and trusts in him. Thus the ministry of preaching requires faith. And whoever does not have it is not a servant of God, does not carry the word of God, but of the devil. So also in the supper: He who does not have faith would much sooner bring the devil there, neither the body of Christ. Yes, says Luther, that is described by God's power and word. Just as if casting out the devil, making the blind see, does not also insult with God's power and word. Rather, listen to the words of Peter, Apost. 3: "In the name of the Lord Jesus, arise and walk!" Did not the lame man stand up by the power of God? Did not Peter call the name of Jesus upon him?

Now, good princes, I will show you that Luther writes more dishonestly about things than the popes themselves. The popes have led a question: Whether the priest, when he speaks the words, this is my body 2c., must have will to "consecriren," "walk," or "bless," as Luther speaks, and have about this

5) Marginal gloss: x 62 liokraioo pro oxiruio er praooiupo.

1) d. i. there.

2) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession, in the arc] e [at the] first panel. [No. 21, § 70.]

3) No. 21, §§ 69 and 70.

4) Gauch - a stupid person.

given this notice that: Yes. Et si quando non esset actualis intentio; that is: and if it were the case that one would not have a present will or intention for something, then there must still be a common habitual will; that is: that the priest has always been accustomed to put the will and mind there, he wants to walk in the body of Christ the bread 2c. Now whoever has ever had a will must ever believe that the words make this so. Behold in one proceeding, 1) what a butcher of conscience the mass is! See also how badly Luther falls when he writes that is not based on God's Word; namely, that faith is not required here! But this has pushed him to the point that we have indicated that no one can be sure whether the body of Christ is there or not. For if it should "come to pass" according to the words spoken, and the miraculous works require faith, and we ever know not whether the minister believes or not, neither would we know whether the body of Christ were there or not. Yes, this forced him to speak "with" the popes without Scripture, yes, against Scripture this final speech:

88.²⁾ Preaching the gospel and performing the supper does not require the faith of the servant. ³⁾ This concluding speech I carry to all creatures, that they prove the first part, that faith is not required in the minister of the word, from God's word. Let us see, who wants to take our reason away from them! But as I see it now and then, the final speech comes from the quiver of the pabst, so one must make use of it who does not have right arrows; for "no one speaks, the Lord Jesus, without in the Holy Spirit." 1 Cor. 12.

I had shown Luther with my finger where he found in Paul that bread is and remains bread, and that the body of Christ is called, not is. He takes this from me so impatiently, and makes so many words, 4) that whoever wanted to answer them would have to write a book as great as [the] New and Old Testament. And therefore let us prove lately that the words of Paul, "For as often as ye shall eat the bread, and drink the drink," 2c., have the sense of

1) "Procedure" Well as much as: Example. - "welch" put by us instead of "wol". - "Metzg" actually "slaughter"; here as much as "plague". In g 443 of this writing it says: "er metzget sich" - he plagues himself.

L) marginal gloss: Ann Riffen fGalgen; Riffen -- Stricks with the closing speech!

3) No. 21, § 70.

4) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession, in the arch s at the first panel. sNo. 21, § 716

and explain what it is that was called corpse and blood before.

xxxxx, i. [e.] resumtio, that is, the taking up again, is such a form of speech, since one takes up again what was previously spoken darkly or inadequately, and makes oneself understood more clearly or sufficiently. As I say: Luther's pen is a bear's paw, no matter how far away; for as he wrote angrily and furiously against all men before, so he still writes, and cleans his writing nothing at all of invective. Here, the first words are quite tropical and dark: feather, hay as far, and bear's paw. Therefore, I take what I mean by this to hand again, and say that I understand his writing and his speech by the pen; by the bear's paw, the insolent peeling and the careless hammering, since he often sneers at himself, just as the bear himself hits the paw on the spit; hay and far here means, for and for, that he also does not measure up against kings (but who are far from him) and brothers. And here the little word ([vox] *causalis*) is a sure sign of the taking again; this indicates that one wants to purify afterwards what one meant with the dark words, and why one called another with different words; as is now heard. I have given another example from Rom. 4 in the sermon 6) at Bern.

90 When Paul therefore wrote the epistle to the Corinthians, and saw that the words, "This is my body," 2c. were well and truly written by the other evangelists, but might easily be taken into another sense, he and Lucas therefore made these words so clear and plain, saying, Jesus took bread, praising God, and broke it, and said: Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, The cup, the new testament, is in my blood: This do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat the bread, and drink the cup, proclaim, praise, or magnify the death of the Lord, until he come.

In the words we see the epanalepsy, that is, the resumption, which follows after the word "for. And just as in the previous example of Luther's pen and bear's paws, after the little word "for" follows the explanation, what

5) According to § 91 "Tradel" is - uncleanness. Compare § 361 of this writing: Tradstückerlein. - Schälken - to do mischievousness.

6) In the old edition: Predge.

with pen and bear's paw: for as he was of unclean speech and writing before, so is he now. So here, too, after the word "for" follows the explanation of the three words, "corpse, blood, memorial"; in which one sees what Paul understood by them, namely, that he understands that which is served, not "flesh" but bread; not "blood" but wine; not "lightly remembering" (as one also remembers what he ate at night), but "with thankfulness praising, extolling, proclaiming, pronouncing". And speaks as if he spoke thus: "For as often as you eat the bread, which I first called the body of Christ, and drink the drink, which I first called the blood of Christ or the new testament, you shall praise God for the death of the Lord. 2c.

Here Luther will cry out for proof, so he has it: proof: Where the little word *enim*, denn, stands, there surely follows a cause or purification of the prior opinion, as the children learn in the Donat: *da causales*. But let us prove this with a few examples, of which the whole of Scripture is so full that there is not a leaf in the Bible where many such examples are not found. Rom. 7: "But I am carnal, and sold under sin: for that which I do I like not: for I do not that which I would gladly do, but that which I hate, that do I."

Here, pious princes, look at the two, and you will find that they are signs that give cause and purification to the previous dark speeches. "Carnal" and "being sold under sin" are both dark, half of the word "sold". Thus he shows from the beginning what he means by the *tropum* "to be sold"; namely, "to be owned by sin," just as a bought servant must do not what he but his master wills. So we also find prest-¹⁾ and sinful; and if we have God's knowledge, faith and love, everything that is against God displeases us; nor is the weak flesh so weak that something that is against God displeases us every day. And therefore he says, "For that which I do, it is not pleasing to me." And so from that time on, it would be spoken against: Why then doest thou it? but he answereth, xxx xxxxxxxxxx, 2) and saith, "Because I do not do what I would like to do, but" 2c.

94. 1 Cor. 1: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, not with wise speech, lest the cross of Christ should be emptied. For the trade or preaching of the cross is to them that perish a

foolishness; but to those who keep it is the power of God" 2c. Here we see the little word "for," and understand by it that a causal explanation of the preceding words follows, which is to empty the cross of Christ, and for what purpose God intended the simplicity of preaching.

Accordingly, it is evident that if anyone wants to explain himself, he must speak clearly in the explanation, without doubt, and everything that was previously spoken darkly and with used words, must be presented simply with unused and unaltered words. But then Luther will cry out: Prove it, you wretched devil! So I will answer him: Not, "the devil!" Take the whole Bible, together with all the writings that are in the world; then do not invent a speech that is an *epanalepsis*, that is, a rehearsal, since it is not so. Gal. 3. says thus, "But since faith is come, we are no more under the schoolmaster." But here it is obscure what the schoolmaster is. And when we hear that he calls the law so, he *expounds* why we are no longer under the law, saying, "For ye are all the sons of God by faith in the Lord Jesus." Behold! how bright; behold! how all tropes are omitted, and nothing dark is spoken here.

96] To the Philippians Paul speaks thus: "Much more in my absence, accomplish your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God who accomplishes in you the will and the work" 2c. Here we have, however, after the little word "for" an explanation that is without any *tropos*, and again takes up the little word "working"; for the same brings something dark with it, namely, how man may work his own salvation, and speaks as if he thus spoke: "Understand me rightly with the working! Whether I call thee work, yet all the work of God is 2c., *ut etiam sit* *μετάνοια*, *correctio*, that is, an infraction.

The first is the improvement and a right naming and explaining of the work. So it is also here; 4) yes much brighter and stronger, because even close all *epanalepses*, i. [e.] Resumption, are in all Scripture. For as "corpse", "blood" and "memory" are written before dark, he collects them all three in the explanation, which is written after the little word "for", and thus explains himself: "For as often (see here, pious princes, as he also takes up the words "as often" again, so that one can see that he wants to explain himself about the previous darkness!

1) prestigious -- frail.

2) i.e., in response to an objection.

3) d. i. tropical.

4) Marginal gloss: Ita epanakeps's est, ut, si examoMnL V0668, HON P66668.

I called it a corpse, but it is only bread in substance, which you will eat 2c. as indicated above.

(97) This is now sufficiently evident to you, pious princes, that the manner of speaking of the words of the Greek language is wholly capable of this and no other; but that which follows after the words is also wholly conducive to this understanding, and thereby teaches us how Paul calls the bread and drink alone the body and blood of Christ, not that they are. And Paul continues on these words thus: L-rs, that is, "and therefore whoever shall be he that eateth the bread, or drinketh the cup of the Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Here [you] shall see for God's sake, pious princes, that Paul, according to the explanation with which he set out, 1) has never put the body and blood to eating and drinking; but whenever he speaks of eating or drinking, he puts bread and cup alone to it, and that with such loud articles and pointers: 2) τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, that is, The bread .Of the supper of the night; or the bread of which we speak; or that, the bread which is only bread. That a wonder is that the world ever got behind the error we so actually see in the Greek language may not be suffered. And let this be said to all students who have not eaten more than half a quart of salt in the same language.

98 But here we must say, how is one guilty of the body and blood of Christ, if, according to the substance, he eats nothing but bread and drinks wine? This is what our adversaries say against us. As if the daily custom of all languages were not full of such speeches. The watchman falls asleep on guard; the reuter at the halt misses something, so that the prince suffers a great loss, or [the enemy takes him] the cord 3) even. Do not say now manly: The dissolute man is guilty at the pious prince. How? He did not kill him after all. True; but he did not watch when he should have. So one is guilty of *criminis laesae majestatis* against the prince, if one lewdly touches his legate or embassy; and yet does not touch the prince. So every superior is blasphemed if his coat of arms is reviled, and he does not feel this. Here Luther will cry out: Scripture here! Take care of it; everything is coming.

99. Matth. 25. Christ speaks in the person of the

King, saying, "Amen I say unto you, that as often as ye have not done it unto one little of mine, ye have not done it unto me." Can we not here also speak thus: How can a man be guilty of not having fed, clothed, comforted, and taken into his house the Lord Jesus, when he is not 4) there? When our adversaries so splendidly throb in: How can one be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, if you say you do not eat them? So you see, pious princes, that those leave the Lord hungry and thirsty, who do not help his poor here with such deficiencies, 5) and he suffers neither hunger, frost, nor thirst anymore. And again, three will be equally guilty of the body and blood of Christ, who do not celebrate the supper of Christ with such faith, love, and discipline as befits the whole church, and each one should be especially consulted and reminded by Himself, which will soon come. And as little as the body of Christ may be clothed, and yet be guilty of it, whoever does not clothe it, as surely as he who does not go to the supper in a proper manner, is guilty of the body and blood of Christ, not which he has eaten, but whose sign, sacrament, and meaning he has misused. Such are: "He that receiveth you receiveth me"; "what ye do unto the least of mine is done unto me"; "he that despiseth you despiseth me." In all of these proclamations one becomes guilty of the Lord JEsu himself, or serves him himself, even though he is not physically present, nor is he bodily served. And so he becomes guilty of the hungry Lord, who may not suffer hunger, who does not feed him the bodily hungry, and becomes guilty of the corpse and blood of the Lord, which may not be eaten or drunk, who does not rightly commit the supper to him, in it highly praising and giving thanks for the death he has suffered.

100 "Worthy" or "unworthy" is not to be understood in the papal way for "without sin" or "sinful": for thus no creature would want to give thanks if we sin daily and say daily, "Forgive us our trespasses," even though there is nothing damnable attached to those who are in Christ Jesus, Romans chapter 8. We are indeed burdened with the daily burden, but it is not condemnably to us, if we are trusting in God. Now if "being worthy" is not "being unworthy," we must look at other places where "worthy" and "unworthy" are taken in Scripture. Matth. 10. Christ teaches the disciples, "if they came into a city, he would not be worthy.

1) d. i. has declared.

2) Marginal gloss: Vis Artieuli et demonstrative!.

3) "String" perhaps as much as: Rein, regiment. In the old edition: "damit der Fürst ein große Verlorst, oder die Schnur gar nimmt".

4) i. e. nowhere.

5) "bützen" actually: to clean; here: to remedy the defect.

to search who is worthy in it". But it is certain that Christ did not draw or direct his disciples, to whom he recommended nothing higher than love and lowliness [i.e. humility], to high-mindedness, nor did he say after the manner of the Pharisees: "Do not touch me" 2c. Therefore here "worthy" means skillful, decent, honorable, chaste. So also here "worthy" means rightly skillful, as it belongs to the supper, faithful, thankful, chaste and faithful, so that no one appears in it with unbelief, that no one does intemperance in eating or drinking, that no one despises his neighbor and does not wait from his poverty because of him 2c., as Paul shows them the presbyters. Luke 3 John says, "Do worthy fruits of correction." But there "worthy" is taken for rightly made, due, and proper. Bring forth fruits that belong and befit correction.

101 Now Paul continues: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh vengeance for himself, if he choose not the body of the Lord." But here we see how he puts eating and bread, drinking and cup together, not corpse and blood. Secondly, that after the word "prove" he calls it bread and drink. Therefore we may take it without doubt that Paul here supposes nothing of substance to be eaten, neither bread; for otherwise he would have said thus: "But let a man prove himself beforehand, that there be no doubt in his mind that here the flesh and blood of Christ are substantially partaken of, and therefore let him eat the bread again. But this is not so, but after he has said "prove" enough, he indicates that one should prove himself to oem bread and drink; not of substance, but for the sake of faith and discipline. Therefore, for the third time, we want to indicate to the ancients about this place that Luther cannot say everywhere: we speak, which has never been heard, even against the old teachers; but see that "prove" is not spoken of for the sake of the corpse's food, but certainly for the sake of faith, and for the sake of the church, which is the corpse of Christ; that in it no fornication be committed, nor the neighbor despised.

102 Ambrose speaks "about the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians", Cap. 59, thus about the present words: "Paul says that he is unworthy of the Lord who performs this *mysterium* or sacrament 1) differently, neither is it instituted by him. For he may not be devout who performs it otherwise, for

It is given by the author. And therefore Paul warns beforehand, so that the mind of the one who goes, according to the order given, may be godly for the thanksgiving of the Lord. For it is the judgment henceforth, that every man on the day of the Lord Jesus Christ take account how he goeth, so that they who go without the order of the use and discipline of the walk are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. For what else is it to be guilty, neither to be punished for the death of the Lord, if he died for them that count his goodness void?"

These are all the words of Ambrosius, in which you, pious princes, see: I. That the devotion should be to give thanks to God for the good deed that he has shown us in the death of his Son. Now no one gives thanks for this, neither he who feels in his mind and soul the fruit and joy of his death, therefore faith is required above all things.

104 (II) You see that he requires the order and discipline of the offering, and whoever does not keep them is guilty of the body and blood; not whoever has eaten them unworthily in the flesh. But if Ambrose is with us, we recognize that one becomes guilty of Christ himself if he does not eat him, but does not eat properly that which is eaten in thanksgiving for his good deeds. But what order is, one learns from the disorder, which Paul punishes here.

The messes in the night meal.

The first disorder: When they came together, they became worse. So the first order is: That we should come together in thanksgiving for improvement.

The other disorder is that there was discord, division, and separation of doctrine and minds among them. Thus, the other order is that we be in one accord, which must be, provided we have One Faith and One Spirit.

The third disorder: That such divisions and discord were so hantlich 2) kept that it came to sects and gangs; but the orthodox remained with the discipline and use of God, and served the naughty outrages to the probation. This is the third order: that no one should become a sect, but that he should leave. There shall also be no one who will not give and take account of his doctrine or opinion in the church,' but, alas! do those who let themselves be deceived in this matter by a few, so that they do not know the truth,

2) Perhaps: sothanlich? -sothanish.

1) Marginal gloss: xxxxxxxx Latini sacramentum in terpretAti sunt.

which one still presents for and for under the Christian Church, decide, 3) and do not respect it, as if one fell people, as under the church, do not let interrogate. God down and ate at a tavern. From this we see that to decide does not allow to err where his spirit is. If the spirit of God the body of the Lord is nothing different, neither to decide is in a church, it may not be deceived into reading Luther's the church with its head from other assemblies, higher writings, which are nevertheless erroneous in this matter. and more special.

And again, if our teaching were erroneous, it would not be 111) The seventh order: That the poor were despised, accepted in the churches now and then. But not and therefore stood there ashamed, if they did not have interrogating and not considering with godliness and faith delicious food; indeed, some of them had nothing at all, is a cause of discord. For it shall befit the least 1) in the and the insolent, wanton rich dined and drank with church to prophesy in his order. splendor. 4) So the seventh order will be: Recognize that

The fourth disorder is that they came together, not as all who appear with us here are indicated to us by God as to the banquet of the Lord's thanksgiving, but carelessly, our members, whom we are to provide with food and recklessly, and wantonly, as one comes together to another banquet. Thus the fourth order is: That we come clothing as ourselves. This is not to despise the body of the Lord, but to esteem it highly and rightly, for we, the hither devoutly, with thankfulness and fear of God, giving multitude, are His body. Therefore, we want the order and thanks to God for the great counsel, that he took upon discipline of which Ambrose speaks to be proven from himself to make his Son ours, that we might be his [i.e. Paul, that it is nothing else at all, but 5) right faith and love of neighbor, in which man should prove himself.

God's] through him; that he made him, according to 112. III. Now we come again to Ambrosium. Thirdly, human birth, our brother in the flesh, that we might be Ambrose specifies the discipline of the vows: "and heirs of the eternal kingdoms. O delight and depth of whoever does not keep them will be guilty of the corpse and divine wisdom and goodness, when thanks are given to him! not only [because of] the incarnation and fruitful life and blood of Christ. And he does not say at all: of the and teaching, with which he instructed and educated us the corpse which he has eaten, but that he despises the dead as a schoolmaster, but first of all gave himself in death as corpse, if he joins those who give thanks, and is taken from fornication, not believing; therefore he despises the a sacrifice for our sin; in it he mocked, spat upon, death of Christ. For Ambrose says: "The immoral person is punished for the death of the Lord, not for the eaten crowned, scourged, struck in the cheek, insulted, reviled from body; so the immoral eater counts the suffering of Christ as wrong 6). And everyone who does not go with a right and cursed us 2c. Whoever, then, comes to these and their like actions with a mature mind, will go with mind and seriousness counts him wrong. Go now, Luther, earnestness, and not with foolish pleasure, as the and war with Ambrosio, not with us.

109) The fifth disorder: That they did not eat with each other, but each one ate and filled himself as soon as his judgments [dishes, feroula] were presented to him. Thus the fifth order is: That one should eat with another, that is, for thanksgiving 2) of unfaithfulness and contempt; wherefore now we do him no injustice, that we take the meal, which is to put up with hunger and thirst, according to the apostle's teaching, at home.

(110) The sixth disorder, that the whole church should be despised, every man eating as he pleased, and not looking to the church to eat chastely with one another. Thus the sixth order is: That we should eat the body of Christ, that is, the

113 Augustine speaks ad Januarium, epistola 118, thus: "This food alone does not want to be despised, just as the manna did not want to be despised. Then also the apostle says that this sacrament is unworthily received by those who do not separate it from other foods, with their own or more solid worship, which belongs to him. For from the time that he said: He eateth and drinketh judgment or punishment unto himself; he addeth, and saith: 'Not decisively the body'^" 2c. These are all words of Augustine. This is the epistle from which Luther in the

1) i.e. the least.

2) d. i. against the suspicion...

3) d. i. distinguish.

4) jossen und tosten-schlemmen und demmen.

5) Side note: Faith and love become the highest requirement in this sacrament.

6) i.e. for nothing.

front book so much; 1) but now he acts as if he had never seen it.

But you, dear princes, see that Augustine understands "prove", "unworthy to see" and "to decide the body of the Lord" with us!

(115) First, "prove," when he says, "Let the food be unworthy of consideration," and does not say, "Prove," whether we believe that there is flesh and blood here.

(116) Therefore, "That they are unworthy who count it no other meat" than the Corinthians did? It is not that they did not judge the food rightly, if they did not recognize that flesh and blood were eaten; for if this were so, Paul would have had to say of it above all things, and would have considered it the highest cause that they did not esteem the presence of the body of Christ highly enough. Moreover, if the Corinthians had ever been told that the body of Christ was bodily present, 2) they would never have fallen into such recklessness. Here we also see that we do not want to repress this sacrament because the body of Christ is not eaten in the flesh, but we indicate the actual worship and discipline, as heard above from Paul, so that the foolish horror, which we have received here from our writing, is accepted, and more proper devotion is adopted.

117) Lastly, Augustine says that those who eat vengeance for themselves do so because they do not decide the body of the Lord, and not because they do not believe it to be eaten. Now it is sufficiently proven from Paul that the body of the Lord is not to be decided upon, on the one hand, so that one does not come to this meal in any other way, neither to a filling meal. On the other hand, to despise the church, and the poor of the church. These two things are comprehended in the one word "body". For the church is the body of Christ, and Christ is the head. Now the head and the members are one body, therefore "to decide the body of the Lord" is to recognize Christ as the head, and the church as the members.

118 But Augustine says, tract. 62. in Joannem, thus: Be mindful why it is written: "Anyone who eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily will be condemned to death.

The body and blood of the Lord. For when the apostle speaks this, he speaks of those who took the body of the Lord as other food, without distinction and lightly." All this serves to show that "deciding on the body" is not to be understood as believing that the body is there; but that one held himself lightly in the meal, as in some other meat or company. But that Augustine here calls the sacrament the body of Christ should not grieve you, pious princes; for the ancients called it by the name by which Christ himself called it. But they also understood by the name what Christ understood. And as the Italians still today call this Sacrament *corpus Domini*, so it is called for and for, and yet only understood the Sacrament, that is, sign and special measure, which is carried around in thanksgiving.

(119) Now if Luther perverted all the order of our previous scholars, so that he cooked something that no one knew, and we are here at the place where we indicated to him that open places were also found in Scripture, in which it was learned that according to the substance there is nothing different here, neither bread nor wine, but according to the meaning and custom to be highly revered and feared, (2c) let us also compare the words of Luke about the cup before the supper with the words of Matthew and Marci.

120, Therefore hear, pious princes: The Hebrew way is to understand in the title of the matter the end and summa; as when we speak: When we slew the Duke Charles of Burgundy, we went against Nanze [Nancy], half of the forest 2c. Here the summa stands first, that the duke was slain, and the procession afterwards, which was before. As then in the biblical books daily is indicated, and the *annotationes*, with us excellently, testify, so is him also here. Matthew and Marcus 4) speak the opinion after the supper: "But I say unto you, that I will not drink of the vine 5) henceforth" 2c. With what words Christ Jesus has preserved for us the divine wisdom, that we may well see what it is according to substance, which he only before called his blood.

121 First of all, the Lord Jesus did not speak simply: I will not drink wine again; but by a periphrasis: "no more of the generation of the vine", *periphrasis* is as a

1) i.e. used superfluously much.

2) Marginal gloss: sarAUIEntums a oonjsetura irrefragabili.

3) Instead of "the" should have been put "of which".

4) Marginal gloss: comparison of the evangelists of the vine.

5) Marginal gloss: grape juice, idiocy MrrmLuiieu.

much as a circumlocution, as when we say: The bold sword, but want to understand a bold man; the man's child, for: the man. But these circumlocutions should have the power that with them they actually bring forth the essence or quality of the thing of which they are. For it is much more glorious to say: There the bold sword appeared, neither: There the prince appeared; for the previous speech indicates that the prince was in [iron] and bold of mind and hand. So also the "human child" indicates to me either the human unfaithfulness and deception, or the human stupidity, which I do not understand in the word human, unless xxxxxxxxxxxx. Similarly, here "vine sex" is *periphrasis*, a circumlocution of wine. But the description or circumlocution brings with it that herewith Christ speaks of the essence and substance of the cup; and is not of the wine, as much as it is a sacrament, as if he thus said: That I have called my blood is according to the substance right natural wine, but is well a sacrament of my blood. Luther did not see this, and treats the vine like a sow treats an organ; and if he sows long enough, he strikes it so that the *claves* leap to heaven.

Yes, he says, before and before he acts this place: 1) If Christ had wanted something tropical to be understood in these words, he would have indicated it. As if it were the custom, when one speaks tropically, that he also always puts on the *tropum*; or if the tropus is a putting on, as *periphrasis* is, that he then first puts on what he wants to do with it. As when I said: Luther is a lynx; that I would add: That is as much as saying that Luther is as cunning as a lynx. And should Christ speak to him here thus: "that is", that is, "that means" my corpse. No one says, "Luther is a rude man," that is, he is crude and inhuman; but if someone wanted to rebuke him in this way, he would let it remain with the ruffian. But so that he lacks nothing at all, there are so many signs in the words, so many words; from this you can see that [it] is a tropical, used speech.

The word "that" forces Luther himself not to say that the substance of the bread is the substance of the body of Christ. For he immediately proves his praedication sur icksutioaru, that is, that the bread is bread and the body of Christ with each other, 2) and says: Yes,

sacramental. For the bread is the body of Christ, as the scepter is the king.

The little word "is" must also force him not to understand it essentially; for if the bread is essentially the body of Christ, then the bread must have been crucified and risen, yes, born of Mary, suffered hunger with him in the desert, 2c., and no counter-argument does not help, for if it is essentially the body of Christ, then it must ever be encountered by that which is also encountered by Christ. Therefore, even if Luther complains, he still lets the word "is" be understood sacramentally 3), which is nothing else at all, neither "significant".

The word "my corpse" must also force him, because he who spoke it may not lie. If he has not spoken tropically or used, then it must certainly be his corpse; but if his corpse is taken from the lineage of Abraham, then also the bodily bread must come from the lineage of Abraham. His body also is taken in unity of the person of the Son of God, and the bread is his body: so also the bread must be taken in unity of the person of the Son of God. Dear! Release us, Luther, from the *sylogismum*, we do not know the Logica!

(126) "Who is given for you" is sufficiently indicated before also in other books, that they compel to understand the words otherwise. Not to mention the dissimilarity of the words in other and other evangelists, other and other articles, which will come hereafter; all of which compel to recognize the words of Christ as being tropical or used.

Now when Luther sees that Matthew and Marcus 4) are so unanimous in putting the words of Christ after the given drink of the supper: it is grapevine; he starts, like the false intercessors, 5) who can talk a hole through one's letter with a bit of eau de vie, and says: it cannot be, the evangelists must all three be unanimous, and speaks right; for they are unanimous, but not the way [that] he supposes. Accordingly, the number presses him, that those who put the words of the vine after the Lord's Supper are two, and Lucas, who puts them before, is one. Why does Luther not give an answer about our explanation, which we have therefore let go out before? Yes, after much distress that he suffers,

1) Marginal gloss: Is in Luther's [Bek. im Bog.] y at the 5th tablet. [No. 21, § 384.]

2) Perhaps: softened, d. r. mitigated.

3) Marginal gloss: Sacramental is as much, as significant.

4) Marginal gloss: union of the evangelists of the vine.

5) d. i. Advocaten.

He says: 1) that the words of the two should also be understood before the use of the supper, because it is a valetetrunk of the Old Testament. Is right: I thought of an old Bohemian astant. 2) And therefore does not present any proof, thinks it is enough avT-oc e->", i. [e.] Burckart has called it; therefore we must give him a tvenig hinters Fäl. 3)

Behold, pious princes, in Luther's book, in the arc of the eighth tablet, 4) how honestly he holds himself in the words of Luke, which read thus: "I have desired with great desire to eat this paschal lamb with you before I suffer; for I tell you that I will eat no more of it until the kingdom of God is fulfilled. And when he took the cup, praising God, he said" 2c. Here Luther leaves with great diligence 5) eü/aj0t<?-7'<r "c, GOtt gelobet, dahinten: GOD thanks him! But why does he leave it back there? He has it before verdeutschet "blessed", so that he nevertheless strokes the simple ones something over the mouth. Should he now also interpret here that he has blessed the cup, it would become too loud among the simple, because they would think: Luther says what he wants, he needs "bless" in the opinion that one should understand that the words make the body of Christ bodily. Now if the cup is blessed here, and it follows that it is made of grapes, then Luther's blessed cup must also be wine according to the substance, and not blood, as Christ himself calls it after blessing. But should he interpret: He praised God or gave thanks, he would miss the blessing, which he made out of the xxxxxxxx.

7) [so] that they may prove all the glorious words: The word brings it with itself, so that they may anoint the simple, niener with [nowhere with]; for where do they want to bring about in the whole Bible, that some 8) words are determined, where they are spoken, that then it will certainly follow, which they read ?

129 The words: "In my name they will cast out devils" 2c., do not mean that, where the syllables "Jesus" are mentioned, that the devil is there.

But "name" here means power, authority and majesty, and so Peter drives the lame from the meager before the temple in the power of Jesus. (Apost. 3, 6.) Yes, they speak gloriously: The words bring with them that they read. This is true; they bring into the mind of man the opinion which they declare; as when Christ says, "Unto clean!" we are made to understand by the words, that the leper was cleansed by his divine power, that he had done nothing else to him, but only said, "Unto clean!" But that the closed] words bring with them, that they read, that is a foolish seal; or else 9) that poor farmer, who had no more than one cow, and heard that God would give him back a hundredfold here in time, would have done him right, since he gave her up; wanted to buy a hundred from God with one. Yes, since Luther saw that he would like to come right with the word "GOD is praised", he leaves it out nicely, and is, however, beautifully conceited, so that he frightens us that we may not punish it.

130] So hear, godly princes, the right reason and opinion of the evangelist Luke: All Greek books, which I have seen, have a great beginning at the words: "And when he took the cup" 2c. From this we see that the previous words are well and rightly understood, that he would never eat the old paschal lamb, but that he would then begin to count how Christ instituted the new thanksgiving; and therefore says of the cup alone, first of all, that where one has in Scripture of this sacrament, and at once is said only of the one part, the other is also understood. In the Acts of the Apostles, the breaking of bread is mentioned, but the cup is also understood. Here only the cup is mentioned, and what is understood of the cup is also understood of the bread. Now if the cup is the birth of the vine, the bread is also the birth of the ear or the mill. Secondly, Lucas sets the words for a title, so that the insert that follows may stand all the more gloriously after the Hebrew manner, as has been heard, and to prevent the words that follow from being understood by anyone that bread and wine are different in substance, neither really bread nor wine. And therefore begin to tell the use.

(131) That the first words of Luke are the title of the supper, and a forewarning, is proved by the words of Christ, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for these are the very words which Matthew has, Drink ye all of it.

9) Marginal gloss: Stands in "the souls spice garden".

10) twedern - neither of them.

1) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's writing, in the arc] y on the 2nd panel. [No. 21, §§ 376 and 377.]

2) Perhaps: Säuer? because this word is directed against Luther's expression "Valetetrunk", which Zwingli calls an "old Bachantenwort" in § 131.

3) This word "Fäl" is used by Zwingli to be our modern "Fehl", but here it seems to mean "fur".

4) No. 21, § 392.

5) Marginal gloss: Ln eauäorsna!

6) maybe: out loud, sure!

7) "therefore" - in relation to it.

8) i. e. any.

out"; and Marcus thus, "And they all drank dgraus." Both of which speak of the cup of thanksgiving. Therefore also Lucas speaks of the cup of thanksgiving. Cause: that neither in the New nor in the Old Testament nothing at all is invented, that s>s] had been a use in the old thanksgiving, to offer the drink around. But probably in Luther's "the new blasphemy", 1) that is, in the book against which we write here, the old bacchanal word is written: "Valetetrunk". Heben an ^zr/ smell garlic and Bollen 2) in Egypt. It is not enough that Luther, to prove his error, again runs to the old sophistic pieces behind him, he must also bring forth poor words that would be agreeable to the old priests 3). Oh God, oh God! How true it is: Who wants well, may easily be able; who wants badly, no art helps. When Luther wanted good, everything went well with his hand; but when he now goes the wrong way, what he takes in hand is lame. For when he is pained that Matthew says, "Drink, all of you, from it"; and Marcus, "They have all drunk from it," it all comes [from this] that he does not know the trvxvs and figures. There are two figures, one is called *Prothysteron*, the

other *hysterone proterone*, that is, the anterior after that, and the one behind before that; since one says that which only happened after that, before that. As here, when Marcus says, "they all drank from it," but which happened only after the offering, thanksgiving, and after the words "that is," 2c. As soon as one says, "When we came to the Lord, he was kind to us; and when we rode into the castle, he met us. Here the kindness happened afterwards, but it is said beforehand. But when one says a summa beforehand, which one actually expounds afterward, that is *prothysteron*. So the speech is Lucian; [he] puts the summa beforehand 2c. as is heard.

Luther is also at ease in the aforementioned place that he refers to Augustine and says that he has almost worked his way through it. But why does he not say that Augustine is not of his opinion? Because the simple-minded should think that it is his turn, if he has only named him; they do not come over Augustinum. But Augustine speaks of the unification of the place thus, de CONS. evang. III. at the beginning: "That Lucas says twice 4) of the cup; once, 4) before Christ gave the bread, afterwards, when he gave the bread, [with this it is so/ that he said in the upper place, has

he took before (vocat autem *praeoccupationem* Augustinus indubie ανθυποφοράν, quam Fabius anteoccupationem, cum tamen *anthypophora* sit sententiae figura, non orationis; praestat ergo *prothysteron* vocare), as is his (the evangelist's) custom. But that which he has set in his own place he has not wished to count in the upper place."

See, pious princes, that Augustine does not remember the last drink of the Old Testament, but that he speaks first: Lucas speaks twice of the cup. Which cup? Of Luther's. Valetetrunk? No: for he had spoken of the same only once, when Luther also confesses. Thus he speaks of the cup of the Lord's supper; thus Augustine holds it with us when he says: he speaks twice of the cup of the supper.

134. secondly, Augustine speaks: that [it] is the custom of the evangelist; this is spoken of Hebrew kind and custom, which language Augustine did not know; nevertheless, he has grasped its kind more than some who know it, as in *doctrina christiana* probably happened with him 5).

135 Thirdly, he also calls it a forewarning or foreshadowing, but not in the sense that the evangelist wants to count the matter, but only to name and preface it. As if one forewarned and said, I will bring forth much fire; but you shall not understand it otherwise, neither that I take "fire" for punishment and repugnance.

136) To the third [fourth] he says: that, since Lucas said the other time about the cup, the feie commemorirt, 6) that is, counted, and the upper not; and takes "count" here for "actually tell the essential trade". Vorsetzen, however, he takes for naming, titling and forewarning.

It is also clear that in previous books, also in this one, when Luther wants the words: "This is my body" to be dry, he can say, "Matthew and Marcus have the words dry"; and if there must be loud unanimity among the evangelists, then it follows that Lucas and Paul want nothing else at all, but that Matthew and Marcus. And from this argument he cannot find that he, half of all words, in turn also says: So also Matthew and Marcus must have the same opinion with Lucas and Paul. And here he also cannot say: Lucas must be of the opinion of which Matthew and Marcus are. Thus, Matthew and Marcus are on our side,

1) Mocking for: Testament.

2) d. i. Onions.

3) Hiemit is aimed at § 422 of Luther's writing.

4) In the old edition: "zwürend" and "einst".

5) Instead of "happen", perhaps it should read "to see".

6) Marginal gloss: l'stlus usus est ^u^uktnus 00m-nenro-a-rÄ vsrbo.

and have two witnesses; so without doubt Lucas must be one with them, and Luther must have his teaching in the place of the spirit of disunity.

138. That he says: 1) "Before he would hold it with us, that there should be nothing but wine and bread (but we understand this only in substance, for we have already explained faith, love, discipline, and meaning), before he would hold it with the papists, that it should be vain blood," is well for him to say, yes, if he does not want to do anything right: For, as indicated immediately before, it is contrary to all Scripture that the bread should be changed into the body of Christ, as the papists say. Neither did he accept the angels, but only the seed of Abraham, not the bread seed. It is said (although I have never believed it) that Luther boasted that "he wants to direct the Pabstthum Wohl again, if he wants to". Where he is therefore, it would be in his hands to raise up and to break. If he has set something up, it is good to break it; the pope is stronger than he is; but if God has set it up, how would Luther break it? I want to look at, the calf with the gugel, 2) born in Saxony some years ago, is not yet laid out right. But what unfaithfulness each one has in him, God will well open. If Luther now speaks from the heart that he would rather have it with the popes; why then does he say of sacramental unity or presence of the body? 3) Which is more with us hellet [sonat, consonat], neither with the popes, because they have not let Berengarium remain with them; and yet Luther praises his recantation. And therefore God will bring it all to light. Chrysostom and Origen also understand these words "grapevine" from the wine, which is called the blood of Christ in the night banquet of the Lord. *Chrysostom* in *Matthaeum*, homel. 83rd; *Origen*, homel. Now these are the irrefutable places of Scripture, from which we learn that God with His own Word tells us that the substance of the sacramental signs is wine and bread, and not the body and blood of Christ.

139) Now when Luther says, 4) we conclude thus:

"With eating the sins are not forgiven; so also the body of Christ is not eaten," [he] publicly misleads us, so that we rightly conclude: If with eating the sins were forgiven, then there would be two ways of forgiving sins; one of bodily eating, the other of bodily dying. If this is not the case, then Luther is wrong in saying that sins are forgiven with eating; he wants to make him wrong; but if he cannot solve it, he writes such stamps, 5) and this throughout the whole book.

(140) He also teaches an unchristian doctrine without Scripture, without any foundation in Scripture, since he teaches us 6) about the merit of Christ and about the distribution of the merit, and says: "The death of Christ merited the remission of sin; but in the supper the merit is distributed. Answer: If it were so (which it is not, for the teaching comes from Luther's port, not from God's word), then the merit of Christ's suffering would have been given to the disciples through the supper before it was, for he never suffered in the supper; but if the merit of the suffering was given out in it, it was given out before it was.

141) Luther says: "God may well have made that which came after already present. 7) Answer: From the ability of God will come afterwards. But if the reason were to be believed, then we would even empty Christ out with him, and thus say: God might have redeemed and graced the world without the death of His Son; thus His Son did not become man. And to this blasphemous error there is one [the first] undoubted stage, saying: in the supper the merit of the suffering is distributed; for the next stage follows: so must the merit be distributed to the disciples in the supper; and after that the third: If he has not yet suffered, then the merit and forgiveness of sins was before and without the suffering of Christ; the fifth: so man would be blessed with the eating of the sacrament; the sixth: so it would not ever need death, if it could be accomplished with eating. Such a pretty thing follows from Luther's fictitious teaching, if he has turned to teach besides God's word.

In addition to this, "distribution" 8) is properly defined in Scripture. The outward distribution is the outward preaching, which Paul,

1) Marginal gloss: Is (in Luther's book, in the arc) z [at the] 1st tablet. [No. 21, § 364 at the end.]

2) i.e. monk's cap. - With this Zwingli means the "interpretation of the monk calf in Freiberg" by Luther, Walch, St. Louiser Ausgabe, Vol. XIX, 1940 ff. - About the "Freiberg monk calf", which was born at the end of 1522 at Waltersdorf near Freiberg, compare Seidemann, Reformationszeit in Sachsen, p. 200 ff.

3) Marginal gloss: Luther but against himself.

4) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession, in the arc] e an [der] 4. Tafel. [No. 21, § 77.]

5) i.e. useless talk.

6) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's book] in the arc § at the 5th plate. [No. 21, § 78.]

7) Cf. No. 21, § 119 f., § 141.

8) Marginal note: How the suffering of Christ is distributed.

Peter and all the apostles do, 1 Cor. 4: "So let men esteem us ministers of Christ, and dispensers of the things of God, which before were secret. The inward dividing is the drawing of the Father: "For no man cometh to the Son, but the Father hath drawn him," John 6; does not say, "He hath eaten my body bodily in the supper. Other disbursement is a false poem; for "as the rain and snow, when they fall from heaven upon the earth," Isaiah 55, "make the earth fruitful" without a disburser; thus, where God drops this dew of his grace and Spirit [cadärs kaot], there is already light, truth, redemption, joy, and security of conscience. For [-der] that 1) the grain comes into the earth, it grows without our work. So, where faith is, there [gernünant incls] heavenly fruits get; and the sacraments may not give faith, nor the flesh and blood of Christ, or else the pope would be believing; for he ever, according to Luther's opinion, eats the body of Christ. Therefore, let the poem please whomever it pleases, for it is an open blasphemy and may not stand by God's word.

(143) It is indeed unchristian that he speaks, 2) as if preaching forgives and accepts sins, [likewise] baptism, reading, eating the evening meal; for he does everything without Scripture, not considering that "neither the planter nor the waterer is anything, but he alone who gives the increase is everything. But Luther does as he always does, bringing the knife with him and speaking:

144 Luther [in his Confession, in the bow] e at the 7th tablet: 3) "We know well that Christ has not redeemed us through our eating, nor has anyone ever heard it otherwise from us."

Praise be to God! Be Luther of the words only well remembered! How then is the corpse and blood, eaten in the flesh, the testament, if the testament is the remission of sin? For if Christ did not redeem us by our eating, neither is sin forgiven, much less pardon dispensed, by our eating. How then are the sins of the disciples forgiven in the supper, or pardon given, if pardon is not in the meal? But the more he goes astray, the more he errs. So it goes with Luther; the more he writes new doctrines, the more he becomes a disgrace; for in the end, he always remembers what he has learned.

He taught that in the one death of Christ there is forgiveness of sin, and that only through the Spirit does a person become aware of this in his heart, if God's Spirit gives our mind a message and testifies that we are children of God, Romans 8. And therefore, the truth compels him to speak, which he vowed against 4) before. And this describes him throughout the whole book, and in all the books he writes in this error.

Luther says: 5) "Now one and the same being can be visible here and invisible there. Behold, pious princes, how insolently Luther speaks, and yet does not present a scripture, but right on top of it he rumbles, and says: "Oh, it is fool's work! they do not want to answer us, but they only want to plaudit and boast uselessly. Behold, this is his proving of so difficult a speech, that a thing may be visible in one place, and invisible in another at one time. Why? If he indicates the same thing, then he must indicate either the one Godhead, or else an eng rationis, i.[e.] a thing of reason. God is visible with the elect in heaven, and invisible with us here. But this alone befits the Godhead, Ps. 112, Isaiah 66. But we are speaking here of the body of Christ, which, while it lay in the pure body of Mary, was not visible in heaven and invisible here, but invisible in heaven and earth. Then he should indicate to us with Scripture that he was at one time in two places, invisible in one and visible in the other. It is not possible for him to do this; so he gives us a hard time about it, so that he does not do nothing at all.

But if he indicates a thing of reason, as: that I, bodily and visibly to Zurich, am nevertheless in Luther's sense; but as value, as the dog in the kitchen. But that I am with Luther is only an image, thought and mirror form. If he now wants to say that Christ's body is invisible in the sacrament here, we want to say more than he: that he is essentially present in our hearts according to God and humanity, and not in the bread. For the bread has no mind; it does not think, does not form, does not strive; but our mind strives, recognizes and sees his true humanity, his death, his glory; there he is right at home, there he is known. What shall he do in bread? shall bread strengthen the soul? The soul does not eat bread. Should it bring the knowledge of Christ into the soul? What may

1) Instead of "that" should probably read "there".

2) Marginal gloss: [In the bow] e on the 6th panel. [No. 21, § 79, completely distorted by Zwingli].

3) No. 21, § 82.

4) "vowed" - made a vow that he would not depart from it.

5) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's writing, in the arc] f on the 1st panel. [No. 21, § 85.]

6) Marginal gloss: So Christ is in the supper.

Is it then the preaching and fructifying of the spirit? May one overcome faith with food; how then that one may not overcome all the graces of God with food? since faith is the summa. Why then do Luther and I not become wise, learned, chaste 2c. ? There are his sheriff's red pants 1) in the cooling bath with the blue ducks.

We have indicated to Luther and to all believers in Christ: that God's word itself may not suffer the body of Christ to be in the supper. And by other words, especially those indicated, which must be understood publicly of the absence of his body; for according to the Godhead it is not possible that he should not be everywhere. Luther now argues against this in two ways: One, that it is possible for God to find a way that is unknowable to us, which way he may be bodily with us; for all things are possible to God. Luther disputes the other way against the counterchange of the two natures in Christ.

149 Let us therefore now both hedge them up, and keep them, that he break no more through. Since we have these words: "You will not have me forever," Matth. 26, "I am leaving the world," Joh. 16, "For now I am not in the world," Joh. 17, 2c., he strikes them all with one stroke and says:

Luther: 2) "And what is more of the sayings, since Christ is preached to be in heaven. We also believe and say this, and there would have been no need to teach us. But it would be necessary to teach that because Christ is in heaven, His body cannot be in the Lord's Supper."

150 Answer: Although we would like to say that he is no longer in the world in the flesh, but only through faith, which recognizes him as true man and God, he has been here and died, and is now sitting at the right hand of God. Therefore, our adversary needs to prove that he is here. Nor do they do so on other grounds, either [the words], "This is my body"; or, "Do this in remembrance of me." And is heard six hundred times from Paul, that the words, "Put this in remembrance of me," 2c. do not mean, Neither to make nor to eat his body; but: Give thanks that he is given in death for us; this we ought to do. So then, if the words do not mean that we have called the corpse

1) This refers to No. 21, §§ 88 and 275.

2) Marginal gloss: [Luther in the bow] f on the first panel. [No. 21, § 86.)

3) i.e. hurriedly, immediately.

But with the word of God, it follows that, although Christ made his body with words, we have no power to make it, since it is nowhere recommended to us to make it.

151) Here serves, pious princes, that we admit to the adversary, if Christ had made his body like with the words "this is my body", that therefore it does not follow, we may make it, because we have no word about it. Not that we truly admit that Christ gave his body to be eaten with the words, but we admit to the adversary alone: if it were equal to him, but is not, yet they would not prove that it was recommended to us, as little as it is recommended to us, to transfigure him, although he is transfigured before Peter, James, John. Although we would like to have this entrance, which they truly cannot answer for: nevertheless we want to let it stand amicably, not overestimate it, 4) so that we may come to an end, and so we say:

If Luther can account for all the words: "no longer have"; "no longer be in the world"; "leave the world"; "I will take you to myself"; "one should not believe if one shows him here or there"; "he will visibly come again as he visibly went"; with the words:

Luther: 5) "So also, you always have the poor with you, but you do not always have me with you. What is meant by "with you" is given by the text itself, and is well to be reckoned, namely, as the poor are with us, so he is not with us. And so on, what they bring forward of the sayings more, is soon said: Christ is not with us, like the poor, mortal and worldly. Therefore, they cannot yet bring it up that our understanding is contrary to the Scriptures." So much Luther.

153. If Luther may offset with the answer all the writings that publicly speak of the absence of the body of Christ, then the two preachers, the one with the silver dagger, the other with the iron rings on his fingers, are not yet wrong [with that] which they practice in their cities; for with Scripture they cannot bring it about that one believes that flesh and blood are here: Only watch, pious princes, how Luther resolves all the words: "no longer have"; "no longer be in the world"; "leave the world" 2c. with such strong writings! "It is well known that just as the poor are with us, so Christ is not with us to die.

4) misjudge - to go there.

5) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther in the bow] f on the 2nd panel. [No. 21, § 87f)

6) Compare § 29 of this paper.

and worldly." Is not this a beautiful thing, that the whole world again should eat flesh and blood in the supper? I think Luther should bring out where "have" would be taken for "die"; and "have no more" for "die no more" 2c., so he brings on the Scripture: "And so on." Is not this strong thing? Well, good preachers of silver daggers and iron wrestlers! I must also present an experiment, that is, a request. When I say: Christ must have given us his body, as he was deadly; if you want to argue: he gave us his body, because he says: "This is my body, which was given for you" 2c. Have you not thus spoken to this irrefutable truth: You arguist a *substantia ad accidens*,

a *quod ad qualiter*, from substance to importance? Yes, we have done it; but have you also understood that you do not know what you are saying, if I do not introduce anything in the subsequent speeches, but what is opened and understood in the first with bright words? I think so, too. But what do you think of Luther's opinion here, when he says that his should be understood as "being deadly, being worldly", *ab esse simpliciter ad esse secundum quid*?

"No longer have" should be understood: no longer have mortal, no longer have worldly. Although I cannot say what Luther meant by the word "worldly"; whether Christ was also "worldly", "like us sinners", which I do not hope [that it] will be said by Luther; or whether Luther meant "worldly" as "human", *habitu inventus ut homo*, that he was human in manner and measure, visible, sensitive, suffering. Where, then, does he need the word "worldly" for this, by which the simple-minded is hurt? But he wanted to make the clouds and smoke [fumos] thick, so that no one would see anything.

154. on this I must put the noble evangelists, pious princes, their dung before the noses, that they may be recognized by other people, for they do not know themselves; want to indulge and forgive me so much. We have shown before enough how honestly we in our syllogismo, 1. [e.] account, in the first [of the majors] nothing at all but God's expressed word dargethan; in the other of our enemies verjähene¹⁾ speech; and in the third nothing at all decided, than that is conceived in the previous two, so:

- 1) Christ's body is who died for us.²⁾
- 2) The bread is the body of Christ.³⁾
- 3) So the bread died for us.

1) i.e. pronounced.

2) Marginal gloss: Are words of Christ.

3) Marginal gloss: Are words of our adversaries.

Now let us also set Luther's account with the deadly poor, and give him first of all much merit in it.

- (1) You will have the poor everywhere, but you will not have me everywhere. 4)
- (2) The poor are deadly and worldly, so we will not have Christ deadly and worldly. 5)

Here open your eyes and see if Luther does not argue a *substantia ad accidens*, i. [e.] from substance to importance? as in the sophistical account:

- (1) Everything you bought yesterday, you ate today;
- (2) Raw [rouw] meat you bought yesterday;
- (3) So you ate raw meat today.

For Luther introduces (obmittam [omittam] enim, Huoä non rsots inäuoit minorsw oatbaZorieam 6) ack majorsm b^potbsticram) in the other one (the minor) an importance, which is not indicated in the first one, that is "tödemlich". Just as in the sophist's talk in the other one the importance "raw" [rouw] is introduced, which is not thought of in the first one. And that is to conclude from the substance to the importance.

But if Luther wanted to act formally, he would have to indicate the importance in the first [number] with the little word "like," thus:

- 1) You will not have me like the poor. 7)
- 2) The poor are deadly and worldly. 8)
- 3) So you will not have me deadly and worldly.

Then he lacks the first: for there are no more words of Christ, for Christ said simply: "But you will not have me forever", and does not remember the word "like the poor" anywhere. For the speech, when the disciples murmured about the poor, did not arise from the importance of how the poor were in the world, but badly from the substance of the poor,

quod essent futuri; non, qualiter essent futuri in mundo; thus Christ also speaks of the essence of his substance.

157 Notice also, dear brethren (for I want you to be brethren, but you do not like yourselves so well; you are young roosters, or else your comb will be bitten), that in our first [proposition] Christ is the body that dies for us; the dying (which we call an important

4) Marginal gloss: Are words of Christ.

5) Marginal gloss: Is Luther's castle.

6) Is probably a misprint for eatsKorieaw. (Walch.)

7) Marginal gloss: Is Luther's castle.

8) Marginal gloss: Is mean, but strange in this.

However, it is a property, *proprium aut differentia constitutiva speciei, hoc est, descriptiva*, which is not abivesen (*abesse*, absent [one] may be at his time), yes, dying is publicly emphasized in our first one. But this does not describe in Luther's gloss.

(158) Notice also further that we rightly exclude under the word "killed" when we say: but he is sensitively and painfully killed; for we assume under the importance another importance, without which [the] first may not be; for what is killed must be painful: so Luther excludes under the substance importance, under the substance of the poor "deadly" [mortality], and therefore it behooves us to conclude:

(1) Christ's dead body is in the night banquet. ¹⁾

(2) Now he is sensitively killed. ²⁾

(3) Thus, he is sensitive in the night meal.

See how we exclude under "killed", and yet "killed" is publicly emphasized in the first [proposition].

I, pious princes, have to indicate that we poor people should learn to recognize with what muck we are dealing, if we do not want to look at the light of truth. You, simple reader, do not worry about it; for Luther was right and concluded that Christ would not be deadly with us and worldly, which is otherwise also true, because he would be invisible with us? that is why they are blinds. You must still have patience, so that the "perverse" (I have misunderstood) the "scholars" of this world can have their confusion removed; but you see here, where we want to explain the matter with simple scripture in such a way that you will grasp the truth and Luther's dishonesty with one hand.

God is the highest good, so that nothing is good at all, except that he is, and that is in him; yes, there is 3) nothing at all, without in him. He is wise, just, true, strong 2c., all to the highest. Now if he is also true to the highest, it is not possible that he should speak or promise anything that is not also certain to the highest; 4) so certain, indeed, that when he speaks words that are contrary to one another, according to our liking, from the first (if we look at them with faith, that is, the fear of God and the love of the truth) we feel that he is true and righteous, and that we had not rightly considered the truth. He is also so true,

1) Marginal gloss: Are words of Christ.

2) Marginal gloss: Are words of scripture, per -roör's cket.

3) In the old edition: "he".

4) Randglosfe: That it is a dishonor to God to say he may do against his own word.

that everything which is a lie, or includes a lie, may not be of him, nor with him; but "the devil is the father of lies," John 8.

Now it is evident that "to be" and "not to be" may not exist with each other; so neither does God like that a thing be and not be with each other, for that is the lie and of the devil. Adam was created by God. Now if I wanted to say: God would be able to make Adam never be created, then I will make God the devil. For to be created by GOtt and not to be created is ever not truth; so GOtt does not like it; for it is a powerlessness, not a power. If the princes of this world deny that which they have promised, is it not dishonor? But why do they deny? Either that they may not perform what they have promised, it is ever a powerlessness; or that they repent of what they have promised; this comes from imperfection of wisdom, and both times become lying. Now if God were to pretend that it had not happened, but it did happen, it would be a powerlessness, not a power; for to pretend to oneself 5) is a powerlessness, and God would be found false. And if he spoke, and did another, neither he spoke, he would ever be lying.

162. probation of all things. Christ says, "I will be with you until the end of the world." And saith, "I will be henceforth no more in the world." If the words are meant to be true, that he is in the world, and is not in the world, according to one nature and essence, it is not possible that they are God's word. But they are God's word: so it follows that they must be based on other natures. For if they be not true of one nature, neither may God do them; for he may not do wrong, untrue, and lying altogether. "All that proceedeth out of my mouth shall not be turned back," Ps. 88.

So then we sit with faith and love between the words, 6) and faith says: If he has spoken it, then it must be so, it may not be the contradiction. But love says, "O Lord, I would gladly know the truth, that my flesh might be satisfied, that it might leave faith unchallenged; make known to me how these two contrary meanings are to be decided, and whither they are to be understood and drawn. So then God teaches by His Spirit and by the letter, which is written by His Spirit and order, saying, "Learn the Scriptures." So then we look at the Gospel of John in

5) represent as unjust.

6) Marginal gloss: Thus one comes to the knowledge of the truth.

of the teaching after the supper, and publicly invent that he wants to say that he will no longer be in the world in the flesh; of this afterward. Thus we are delivered of the one word-shale, "I shall be no more in the world."

The knowledge of faith also says: Christ is God as well as man; and if it is not possible that God is not everywhere, then there must be no doubt that Christ is with us in eternity with his divine power and protection. And may both sayings of any nature in particular not be understood at all. It is not possible to speak of the divine, that we will not have it present all the time; so also "not have it all the time" must be understood to refer only to the human. So it is also not possible that the human one is on earth; for God does not like to lie, but says: "I will no longer be in the world"; so heaven and earth must break before we force him into the earth with our calculating, chattering and chattering. Luther does not want to accept this, and wants to force against God's word that Christ is bodily in the sacrament; which is nothing else at all, neither does it make him a liar. For that bread is his body, and that he is no longer in the world, may stand together as little as if I said, God created the world, and did not create it; or, God, who created the world, is well able to say that he did not create it. Which is not only nonsensical to think, but also foolish to speak.

Here Luther would like to say: I do not say that he is bodily here, and not here; but I only say that he is here, and is bodily everywhere, but that the words (which do not let him be here, even with faith and love decides) teach us that he is now dead and sensitive no longer here 2c., as is heard. On which words we might well say that Luther himself does him wrong; for he speaks publicly: how we might know by what means and skill the corpse might be here; and cites many examples (which, however, are all with us), whether he might find a way to teach us how Christ might be here bodily. And to what end does the *praedicatio identica* serve otherwise, neither that God should be made false? since he says: "One thing is possible for God to make, that it be two things with one another; namely: that the bread be once 1) bread and the body of Christ. For so it behooves me also to say, All men are flowers of the field and hay. Isaiah 40: God may make man once 4) grass and man. Soon the prophets make un-

1) i.e. at the same time.

sensible animals, wind, harbors, firs, cedar trees, and others from the people. Are they the same also to that, that they are men? It must be according to Luther's *praedicationem identicam*, that is, speech, that one thing is at once two or many things: so the foolish speech, which even the Sophists reject, *quod omnia entia sint unum ens*, 2) that all things are one thing, must be true. And if so, it followed: If a man had killed a man, he would have killed only a blade of grass, and if he had let the poor die of hunger, he would have let a flower perish. Thus all truth, justice and godliness would be accepted. It would also not be true that God made all creatures with difference, as the creation shows; and would make God false.

This followed from Luther's *praedicatione identica*, since many things are one thing to him; but that is not possible for God Himself, if it is not possible for Him to do contrary to His own word. Now he says brightly that he alone took the seed of Abraham to himself; so the seed of wheat may not be "him"; and if Luther puts it to him, he makes him a liar. But that man is one thing, made up of two, that is, body and soul, you must not therefore understand that one thing is two, as we speak of it here; but the two things make a third, the man; and the body is not body and soul together, and the soul not soul and body together; but each is its own special substance, and when they come together it is one man. Thus in Christ God and mankind are One Christ, One Person. And no creature may be itself essential, and the other also; or else all creatures would be One Creature without distinction, and God would be *irritus*, inverted; for since he has made distinctive works, we would say: they would not be distinctive.

But ever so! Luther means it with the same error as he wants, so let us now make it clear that the words of the deviation may by no means be defended with "deadly" and "worldly". First of all, let us take Matthew 26: "But you will not have me all the way," and say thus: that in the days of the fables and the harrows 4) we would have been well provided with such a gloss: "Not to have" is: not to have deadly, not sensitive, not suffering; but not to Luther. For Luther cries out so often and loudly: We shall force the sense; since we have it

2) Marginal gloss: *tzuoälikst e quoälikst*.

3) Maybe: "it"?

4) d. i. D. Eck.

He is forced from one corner to the other, that he doubts his own writings and therefore recants; that he speaks publicly against himself, and must soon escape from the circle. And does he not add a word from Scripture to such an unheard gloss? Why should he? He has not, otherwise he would not have spared it; for who has ever heard it interpreted with Scripture, "Me ye shall have no more": I shall die no more, nor be sensitive, nor suffer? He says, "Me," and not "I"; "ye shall," not "I will"; "have no more," not "be no more suffering." For if he were unsuffering with the disciples, yet they would have him; for they would have him with them after the primitive state, and was not deadly; but Christ casts off the "have," and saith, "They shall not have him for ever." And so this place remains firm and unchanged by Luther.

168 That is, look at pious princes, as Luther does here. Couples many proclamations together, and says: "and so on, what proverbs they bring more, is soon said: Christ is not mortal with us" 2c. It is true, it is soon said, but it is not yet valid. But one should make such an unheard gloss firm with many scriptures, and force it to be just.

The places, Matth. 24. and Marci 13.: "that we should not believe those who show us Christ here or there, because they are false prophets", still remain stiff. For from Luke 17 we learn publicly that Christ speaks of his bodily presence; not of external things, as Luther says. Now if he says him to be "in the bread, with the bread, with the bread," or as he wills, he ever shows him to us in the supper. So now see how he will reject that the evangelists call him a false prophet!

170 John 16: "Again I leave the world," 2c., Luther may also not be satisfied; for he must not glaze the word "leave" with "not mortal" or "to be worldly. Now it is certain that he may not leave the world according to divine nature; so only the human one must leave.

171 Marci 16: The Lord, having spoken with them, is taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God. If he is taken up, he is not here after mankind; for Luther, not yet a creature, has never proved that the humanity of Jesus Christ is more than in one place. But what Luther subjected himself to in destroying the Word of God will come later.

172 And that Luther could not say, He is well received in heaven, but yet he was with them; so hear Lucam, Apost. 1: "He went, 1) that they might have seen, and the cloud received him out of their sight." So he went away from their eyes. And if Luther would say, "He came out of their sight," 2) Lucas rivets it with a bass, and soon after says, "The Jesus who was received up from you into heaven." Behold, pious princes! as he speaks, "Up in heaven," "from you" that are on earth, "he is taken and received." He does not say that he is here on earth, but invisible; that he is with the disciples, but immortal; but that he is of them, and not near; but that he is in heaven above, and the disciples here.

173 "He is risen, and is not here", Marci 16. Here we have "he is not here". We do not take this place to mean that he is no longer in the world, but that you, pious princes, may see how Luther does not speak at all according to God's word when he says: Christ is everywhere according to mankind, as well as according to the Godhead; also when he says: one should understand the words "no longer be in the world": "no longer be deadly and worldly" (that is, sensitive, visible, suffering). Which comment or poem is thrown to the ground with the some saying. For, to speak according to the Godhead, Christ is ever everywhere; so this saying must be for mankind alone. If then Christ was not there, then mankind is not everywhere where the Godhead is; for the Godhead was there, not only according to the omnipotent presence, but according to the gracious illumination of the Spirit, who set the hearts of the seekers on fire, so that they fervently sought him.

If now Luther would also dispute this place: "He is not here" should be as much as: he is not deadly nor suffering, or prestigious 3) here: so the angel would give the answer from Luther's opinion: Christ dies no more, and is no more worldly. I have no doubt, the pious women would report him: Dear angel, we do not inquire of the same, we inquire essentially of his body, and have prepared ourselves with ointments to anoint him. Therefore he gives them an answer from the substance of his body, that he is not there. Or did Luther mean to say: he would not be worldly,

1) Marginal gloss: m-H/iöy, mors liedraioo "A.

2) The Gesichte is called visio, quas vel oculus vsl Wsnts üt; but the face is called kacüss by Zwingli. (Walch.)

3) i.e. frail.

If the man had been there in a sensitive or passionate way, the women might have said, "We can see for ourselves that he is not there. We ask about the substance, we ask about him, we do not ask about the importance.

175 Behold, pious princes, how Luther seeks all excuses from substance to importance. But all this put aside, even though we would like to answer Luther with a few no's, because he, as is indicated, brings nothing at all but his deeds, not Scripture: so [we] want to give the simple Christian people, who [are] ourselves, into the hand (because the servants threaten us daily, as it will soon be over for us), that God's servants can defend themselves against the poem itself.

In Luke, the angel decides the whole mess that Luther makes, because it says: "And he", the angel, "spoke to them", the women: What seek ye? seek ye him that liveth among 1) the dead? He is not here, but is risen" 2c. There is no doubt that the angel is speaking of the resurrected body of Christ, when he says: "You are looking for him who is alive among other dead", who are alive according to the soul, but the corpse lies dead, as Isaiah 26. says; but this corpse lives for other dead, and is already resurrected. Accordingly, he says that the resurrected, transfigured corpse is not there. Now what mouth on earth has ever been allowed to say among old and new scholars that the declared body of Christ is also everywhere? Only because they see here publicly that it is said of the declared body that it is not there, it is never everywhere. Except the one Luther may speak against everything that has understanding in heaven and earth, that he is everywhere. And the Word of God is clear and open; and to prove this, nothing at all brings his laborious argument: he is not sensitive, or visible, or deadly there. And if we want to rumble with him and say: "is, is, is" there; as he is wont to do: "He is not there", let the words of God stand in God's name! He will not find a word for this, since "is" is understood for "to be deadly": for this, where he would find it, he speaks here of the body, which was already deadly, that it is not there. The women did not need the angel to tell them that he was not in the world and that he was deadly, because they saw it.

177 Therefore, you, simple Christian, may safely place yourself behind the two reasons, "He is not here" and "He who lives among the dead is not here," against Luther's confusing teaching, since he pretends,

1) Marginal gloss:xxxx xxxx xxxxxx.

Let the corpse of Christ be everywhere, and let him therefore shoot at you with all the thunders of words, let him cast the fire of his anger and rage against you, and with the blasts of his evil words let him hurt you, and he will not move a hair of your head. Until these reasons also be remembered; for we shall hereafter speak further of the declared body of Christ, whether it be everywhere.

178. John 17, Christ thus speaks: "I will no longer be in the world, but they will be in the world". The saying is an antithesis, a counter-setting, by which one sees what Christ meant by "being no longer in the world". As, so I speak: Dear friend, I cannot be with you, but my children will be with you. Quia *χῆ ἀντί ὁ 2) ponitur* Hebraeorum more. Here I must ever be understood thus, that my children will remain essentially with the friend for the time [ea vice]; and so we see now well in contrast that I speak of the presence of their body, that I speak also of presence of my body; and want to say that I want to be half of the body completely not there. But do not deny that I want to be there with the thought; but my thought and care will be there more than if I were there bodily.

So this is an *antithesis*, a contrast: "I will no longer be in the world, but they will be in the world. But if Luther were to come with his "worldly" and say: Christ would not be worldly or deadly in the world, but the disciples would be deadly in the world, it is not enough; but he must express the contrast in the disciples as well 3) as in Christ, and thus speak: Christ would not be deadly or worldly in the world, yet essentially; but the disciples would be deadly and alive in the world, and not essentially. Since it is seen that according to the power of speech it is found that Christ speaks of human nature, that therefore he will not be essential in the world at all, but according to the Godhead with his care and grace.

180 But all this notwithstanding, the whole of the seventeenth chapter of this book is so open with us that no one can contradict that Christ goes out on the opinion that he has been with the disciples until now, and that he has cared for them so faithfully that, without Judas, no one has perished: but now he goes away from them, so that he commends them to the Father. For he saith afterward, But now I go unto thee, and speak these things.

2) Edge gloss: per

3) marginal gloss: Virtuts1
tionis; 68t snim expositiVÄ propositio.

in the world, that they may have perfect joy" 2c. Then he will say, "I speak these things to them so that they may be comforted and undaunted, even though I am no longer with them; for you will keep them as if I were with them.

And the whole seventeenth chapter is an *antithesis*, a contrast, to all its previous physical presence. Until now I have been with them; but now I will not only not be with them, but no longer in the world. I would also like to hear how Luther glossed it: "But now I am coming to you. For it is knowable that, according to divine nature, he never came from him; and the words, "I came forth from the Father," and the like, are all xxxirocear, that is, an imputation of human morals 2c. For how will "I shall henceforth be no more in the world, for I go to the Father" rhyme with Luther's opinion: he shall be invisible in the world, if he speaks plainly: "No more to be"? I think: where "to be, is, being, are" 2c. would stand, should the words be understood allways essentially according to Luther's rule? But it is heard enough that also the invisibly declared body is not everywhere, so it is also not in heaven and in the world at once.

182. On the 14th of John, Christ says: "I will ask the Father, and he will send you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever. Here Christ does not say: I will send you another Comforter; but: "another Comforter, the Spirit of truth. By which words we well see [that] all the consolations which Luther sets forth in the bodily meal are set down, for the Spirit of truth will comfort, not the flesh eaten bodily. One may also put down with all theologis Luther with the word "other"; for the Holy Spirit is nothing else at all, neither the Father nor the Son; but he is indeed another, namely another person neither the Father nor the Son. Now if another Person is indicated here, and Christ is One Person, of divine and human nature; then the consolation is ever withdrawn from human presence, if it is placed on the Person of the Spirit; for humanity is [i.e. belongs to] not the Person of the Spirit. Knowing well that all the effects of God are against the creatures of all three persons, because of the one essence. What concerns the personal qualities, however, remains unchanged and unmixed in each one, as becoming man, suffering, dying is the personal property of the Son, and is not added to the person of the Spirit. More about this in the sermon given at Bern.

183 Luther does not understand Paul's saying, 2 Cor. 5, 1) he should not be angry. For short of that, he still does not see the argument or opinion on which Paul there goes out. He says just before that [vv. 11-16]: He is in hope that he is well thought of in the Corinthian consciences, so that he may not boast before them, nor may anyone write and recommend for him, as the false apostles boasted and wrote for one another. For he is well known to God; but all that he boasts of before them is for their sake, that his name be not taken away from them 2). And if he does anything above measure, it is for the glory of God; or if he boasts so highly that it seems childish to someone, it is for their benefit. For the common love that all Christians rightly have for God also compels him to gladly risk his life for God's sake, 3) since Christ gave himself for all of us, it is right that we also give ourselves for him without looking back. Therefore he does not think that his name will not be reviled, because he seeks no comfort or help in all creatures, that he seeks no other comfort in the flesh of Christ than he has already received, that is, that through the means of the flesh he has suffered death and redeemed us with death; he seeks no further comfort in the flesh of Christ.

Now Luther thinks that Paul teaches us in this place how we are to be a new creature. This is not so; but Paul argues from the common sense, *ἐξ ἡς χρείας*, 4) since all Christians know and understand that we should all be prepared to suffer death for the sake of the Lord, if he has borne it for our sake; that he, too, is completely of this mind, and does not pride himself on protecting himself or his name; for there is neither comfort nor compunction in his heart [*cordi sibi*], neither the one God; that he also does not seek in the flesh of Christ any other 5) comfort than that which he has already received and felt. Otherwise he knows that Paul often teaches how we are to be a new creature. Let the scholars see what I say!

185 But in the words of Paul, Luther's consolation falls to one whom he promises in the bodily meal on his sock, not on God's word. It

1) Marginal gloss: In Iluthers Buche, Bogens 1 an der 6ten Tafel. sNo. 21, § 99 ff).

2) "upbeat" - cause to accusations against them.

3) o. i. to that effect.

4) Marginal gloss: 8oe est, qnoā omnidus in ors est Ltqnk in eoinlnuni omnium eonsensn.

5) In the old edition: foreren.

teaches us also, for another time, that Luther's rejection of the AllCEh, since he does not yet know the name, as follows, is a futile sacrilege, when he sees that Paul may also especially call the flesh of Christ, and say: "he no longer recognizes it according to the flesh". Now here "to know" is taken for *susplicere*, to hope, but the He is always exempt from comforting sufferings, but even Paul rejects other consolations in the flesh. And yet holds the inseparable unity of the person of the Son of God, and hopes in him, has all comfort in him, and yet rejects the flesh for other comfort.

Luther says: this saying would be better for us than for him. Yes cr says it, but does not indicate it with any sound, neither with his rich verbiage. But he is able to do two things, of which Luther may reverse tweders [*neutrum*, neither of them]. The first: If Paul recognizes nothing more in the flesh than his death, resurrection, ascension, 2c., so that the flesh of Christ, which sits at the right hand, brings him no more help nor comfort than he already has, then the saying is able to do as much as: The flesh is not profitable to eat. The other thing that Luther cannot reverse is that eating the flesh of Christ does not forgive sin; or else Paul would have taught daily comfort in it, not realizing that he sought no further comfort in it.

Now, pious princes, Luther would easily protect this mind, 1) and cry out over me: I reject the humanity of Christ, but this is not at all, as he himself also confesses, since he speaks. 2) I make Christ a mere man; how then could I reject humanity? But I recognize the true deity of Christ, and so recognize it, that for this reason one should not ascribe to it what is not due to it. I also recognize the true humanity of Christ, and so recognize that it should not be given what is not due to it. And do all this knowledgeably with the Scriptures and enlightenment of the old *orthodoxorum*, the right theologians and teachers.

For Augustine speaks thus of this place Pauli, 2 Cor. 5, 11b. l. äs clootrina 6Üri8tiäna, vap. 34.: "Behold how the apostle (though the truth and the word by which all things were made had already become man or flesh, so that it dwelt among us) still speaks nothing the less: 'If we have Christ after the flesh

we do not recognize him now.' Now he who not only gives a home to those who come to him, but has also willed to give the way to those who go to him, namely himself, who is a beginning of ways, and has willed to take the flesh to himself. This is also the purpose of it: The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways, that they which would come might receive them. Therefore the apostle, even though he was still walking on the way and following the reward of the heavenly calling, namely, the calling Lord, still forgets the things he left behind him and reaches out to those who are before him. He who had already gone before the beginning of the ways, that is, he did not lack that at which all must start and compete who desire to come to the truth and to abide in eternal life. For he speaks thus: I am the way, the truth and the life', that is: through me one comes, to me one comes, in me one remains. For if a man comes to him, he comes also to the Father; for by the like he is known who is like him, by binding and sticking to us, through the Holy Spirit, that we may abide in the supreme and immutable good. From which we understand, NB. that no thing shall keep us in the way, if the Lord Himself, according to the manner, and He hath graced Himself to be our way, hath not willed to keep us; but that we go forward, that we may not cleave weakly unto temporal things (though the same be accepted and applied for our salvation's sake), but rather walk fruitfully through the same things, that we may come unto Himself, who hath loosed our nature from temporal things, and set it at the right hand of the Father."

These are all the words of Augustine, by which we actually learn that he understands the words of Paul according to our sense; namely, that he wants to say that we should not cling to the humanity of Christ in some measure, but rather go through or proceed in this way: human nature is assumed, so that we come to God through it; and when we have grasped this, we should not cling to humanity any longer, but cling to Him alone, to whom we have come through it, until we are drawn to Him in heaven. This does not reject the humanity of Christ, but teaches us to think rightly of it, and not to pretend, as Luther does, that we do not have God's word: if one eats the flesh of Christ in the flesh, sins are forgiven; it brings with it (thus they speak) God with all his goods. Yes, Luther says: "If I give you bread, I give you God with all His goods.

1) i.e. to throw dirt at.

2) Marginal gloss: ls (in Luther's Confession) in (arc) k on (the) 8th panel. (No. 21, § 177.1

To be master over the goods of God, like the pope. Christ's body has all authority in heaven and earth, as no theologian has ever said, but Christ has all authority. Christ's body is everywhere, like the Godhead; which also no *td6oloſu8 ortioäoxus* has never spoken. But it will follow hereafter how one should hold and speak in things.

190. So now, pious princes, we have the expressed bright words of Christ, which may not deceive nor be drawn elsewhere, neither to the humanity of Christ: "Not having all ways"; "not showing here nor there"; "leaving the world"; "being taken up to heaven"; "taken from them in their regard"; "taken from you"; "he is not here"; "even the declared risen body was not there when the women sought him"; "I shall be no more in the world"; "he shall send another Comforter"; "for else know not Christ according to the flesh." Eleven irrefutable places in which Christ indicates his body's absence; which completely overturn Luther's reasons as to how it is possible for God to do so; for it is not possible for God to do contrary to his word; for that is not a power, but a powerlessness.

191 Although Luther himself now recognizes against the King of England that a *posse ad [es]se*, from the ability of God to "thus be", does not befit [to] conclude: nor must he now make use of that which he has thrown down before. If he is not ashamed to speak against his own knowledge of the truth; yes, even to put the same writings in suspicion, in that he leans on the books that he has written in four or five years: then I must take off his guest-hat 1) a lot, so that one can see him right in the face.

192. 1) The highest blasphemies of God are when He is blasphemed at His essence and nature;
- 2) Luther blasphemes him by his nature and essence:
- 3) Thus Luther also commits the highest blasphemy against God.

This is an account that is known to every Christian. For all blasphemy that reaches to the things that come to pass [*aoicksntik*] is not as great as that in which the substance itself is blasphemed, just as all contumely to the accidents are small, until man himself is attacked, as Job 1. stands. It is also the sin in the Holy Spirit, which is not venial, only for this reason so heavy, that

1) "Gasthut" probably means the same as "Hehlkäpplein" in "Luthers Schrift Wider die Türken", No. 53 in this volume, § 7.

it is essentially contrary to God's spirit and truth, Matth. 12., because, that truly by the power of God beschach, the godless admitted to the lying devil. Therefore, the first [i.e. the upper sentence] is irrefutable.

Now it is up to the other one [the subordinate clause]: that Luther blasphemes God in his essence and nature. So we prove these. To the first, of the essence. Christ says: every kingdom divided against itself becomes nothing or united. Yes, even if the devil, who is the kingdom of lies, were against himself, his kingdom and nature would not exist. Now Luther accuses God of doing contrary to his own word, and of making repugnant things true together, which must confuse and break the devil: thus Luther breaks the kingdom, power and essence of God with blasphemy. For his objection is now sufficiently justified that the words must not be understood according to Luther's gloss, but that they all indicate the bodily absence. But Luther wants to falsify this, if he wants to have him in the sacrament. For to be in the sacrament is ever to be in the world. Now "to be in the world," as Luther speaks, and "not to be in the world," as Christ speaks, are contrary to each other, as being God and not being God. And Luther wants to show up both Gods; 2) so he wants to overthrow God with the reversal of the power of God into the powerlessness of God and to turn back.

194 Secondly, that Luther blasphemes God by his nature. The nature and manner of God is that He is true, for Christ JC is not Yes and No, but Yes is Yes with Him and Amen; that is, everything that God speaks is fixed and unchangeable. Whoever then admits that God acts contrary to His own word blasphemes Him in His truth, for He is true by nature. If then Luther reviles God in truth under the appearance of omnipotence, he confuses himself and blasphemes him in his omnipotence, for he cannot do against himself; and it is a powerlessness where someone does against himself. He also blasphemes him in his truth, when he says: May God, besides the words, be a way in the flesh in the sacrament, which is unknown to us. Just as if GOD had said the words that we well understand and are clear: "I will no longer be in the world", are spoken to us, and in contrast, another is acting. This is blaspheming God in His honor, power and truth. As when I say of a man, "He speaks to you clearly and loudly, but he does another thing.

2) i.e. impose.

3) Here we have omitted the word "him" which is too much.

But Luther pushes in against this with a strong trick and says: 4) Christ speaks: "I am not in the world; but was in the world", Joh. 17. Now "Christ speaks the words, while he was still in the world. How then can the Spirit speak that the text is against the Lord's Supper?" Response. There is no text in Scripture that is against the Lord's Supper; but there are countless others that are against Luther's opinion. But these words: "I am not in the world" are Greek: "For now I am not in the world." 2) And Luther also conceals here that the Hebrew language has the custom to put *praesens pro futuro*, present time for future. So when the Hebrew says: xxxxx, 3) I come the, or I come, he wants as much as: I will come. In the same way here: "I am not in the world for the time being" is taken for "I will no longer be in the world". But it may be little of that; for there is an xxx, that is, "for the time being" which little word probably indicates that he does not speak of the present time. In addition, the words themselves prove what kind they are, namely, as one is wont to speak in all languages. One says, I am nothing; 4) another, I am dead. And the one cannot be nothing, or else he could not speak. Nor this one be dead. But each one thinks that he is close to becoming nothing or dead.

196) The words of Luc. 24 are to be understood in the same way: "These are the sayings or speeches that I told you while I was still with you. Now he was still with them but he speaks of the former time in which he was with them and walked in the flesh. And thus he will speak: When I dwelt with you before I died, I told you all the things which are now fulfilled. But if, as Luther also does not deny, he uses the word "to be with" or "to dwell with" to refer to the bodily dwelling that took place before death, it is evident that he was no longer with them after the ascension. To this, in all languages, it is customary to name that which is so near, as if it were there. So Christ speaks, he says: no longer in the world at the time of the ascension. But putting all this behind, he says in the future: You will not have me all the way; nihil enim refert, quod Graeci εχτε habent. From which future time will well be seen that also other words, which are

The words should be based on the opinion, should reach to the time of ascension. So much for Luther's one way, since he wants to introduce the omnipotence of God, that he is impotent and acts against his own word. Now we want to look at him from the opposite point of view.

From the counterchange or *alloeosi*.

197 I want to explain myself, pious princes, first around the name, what I mean by the word "counterchange". Luther asked me why I, speaking of the two natures, did not use the old tropum *synecdocham*? About this

I will answer him, and with that the NaMe of the Allöoses becomes terminable. I do not worry about the words half, as far as one rightly understands what is meant by the words. *Synecdocha* is called collective or *comprehensio* by Cicero, and is a figure or *tropus*, since one word comprehends many things, and the speaker needs a part of the same thing for the whole or the whole for a part. As, the word, "city" comprehends all houses, buildings, towers, people and possessions. Accordingly one says: "the city of Strasbourg, Costenz, Ulm, Augsburg, Nuremberg 2c. are at Esslingen on the day"; and are no more, however, than the messengers of the cities, there. Again, Matt. 3: "There went out to John Jerusalem and all the Jewish country." How could Jerusalem, the city, go? But the people who were in it went out; and yet not all, but a part. For this *tropus* can be bent so meng 5) way, that even one out of the whole assembly is named with the name of the assembly, as is first heard from the messengers. If I speak: The whole Rhine speaks Greek, there is the *SYNECDOCHA* in the word Rhine; because I want to say: all residents of the Rhine. And so I say: all the residents, is but [times] a *trvxn8*; because not all who live on the Rhine. Greek can, but some; also not at all ends, but at some.

198. *alloeosis* but is such a *trvpu8*, as the due property is confused, but in things inherited or closely joined together; as, since in the Grammatica *numerus per numero*, *persona per persona* is ge

2c. Example that is known to us: When I say: Man is nothing but dung; then I speak of the whole man, half of the word. But I do not understand more than a part of man, namely the corpse, because the soul.

1) Marginal gloss: Is [in the Luther, in the sheet] § at the 3rd plate [No. 21. § 109 inaccurately stated].

2) Oü/c ert ei/! ev i-H

3) In the old edition: xxx xxx, which we have not been able to figure out, because N2is no longer a verbal form, but a noun.

4) Nullus sum, looutio 68t.

5) i.e. various.

is a noble spiritual substance, and is ever not filth. Again, if I say that man is a noble thing that can be understood, I speak of man everywhere, but I understand only the soul, for it alone has understanding.

If the *synecdocha* can be extended to such an extent that it is also suitable for things that have no characteristic, no unity, nor similarity with one another, except the most distant, the occasion: then it has not seemed to me to be skillful as *alloeosis*, counterchange, because it is only suitable for things that are completely similar to one another. And as in the Lord Jesus Christ the divine nature and the human nature are thus united, that also Athanasius speaks in the Symbolo: "As the rational soul and the flesh, or the body, are One man; so God and man are One Christ: so *alloeosis* is more common 1) than *synecdocha*; because *synecdocha*, is much too mean.

But if Luther recognizes *synecdocham* 2) to be used by the ancients, why is he angry with us that we need a more proper name? Why does he rebuke us as if worse heresy had never been? and yet he himself recognizes [that] the ancients used *synecdocham*. Shall we therefore rage for the sake of the name alone, which all scholars recognize to be neater and more proper than *synecdocham*?

In the Latin Exegesis 3) I have spoken of the counterchange thus: "*Alloeosis*, i.[e.] counterchange, is the leap or passage or, if you like, the change, since we, speaking of the one nature in Christ, need the other name. As when Christ says, 'My flesh is the true food,' there is ever the flesh of the human nature in him, nor is it taken in that place by the change for the divine. For after that 4) he is the Son of God, he is the food of the soul, for he saith: 'The Spirit is he that quickeneth.' Again, when he says, as the legitimate right son is slain by the feudatories, he takes the right son, though it is the name of the Godhead, for the human nature; for after that he may die, and after the divine not at all. If indeed one nature is said to be that of the other, that is *alloeosis*, i.[e.] counterchange or common of properties and change."

This is not only to be understood from Luthern.

But these poor people do not see, first, that I teach nothing at all different from what their theology itself has always recognized, even though they have not spoken of it most skillfully; for *communicatio idio-matum*, i.e. commonality of attributes, is called *alloeosis*, counterchange. Secondly, they do not see that Luther speaks and does violence and injustice to me, even against himself; for he accuses me of this "place: "My flesh is the true food," that I have said that the flesh is taken in that place for the divine nature; and in so doing does not leave me without infidelity the cause that I put to it. Now that I have done this, and have also signified the cause with scripture, how then shall I make a purified man of Christ, if I also say that the flesh shall be taken for the divine nature?

But I will further interpret to you, pious princes, what I have written about it in Exegesi 5): "This *alloeosis*, i.[e.] counterchange, is so necessary that one sees that whoever despises it or does not know it, not only devastates the gospel of John, but curses the others, with unheard errors. And this is the cause why all teachers have so inclined to use this common of attributes or antitypes. That he who is the Son of God from eternity (beloved, notice here, pious princes, whether I deny humanity or divinity!) has also become the Son of man with the assumption of human nature. Not that he who was the Son of God left the essence and state of the Godhead or changed it into human weakness or diminishment, nor that he changed human nature into divine nature; but that God and man were one Christ, who therefore, being the Son of God, was the life of all men, for all things were also created by Him, and therefore, being man, was a sacrifice, that eternal righteousness, which is also His righteousness, might be atoned for." Behold, pious princes, this is the cause which has compelled all *orthodoxos*, that is, right-minded teachers, to recognize the antitype, and not from human reason, as Luther mockingly interprets to me; but that God's own Word urges us to it. For Christ calls himself "the Son of God"; he also calls himself "the Son of Man".

204. further I have spoken there thus: "But God has the two natures thus consisted into One.

5) Marginal gloss: In sxsMsi nostra, tsdula 112. <k 113.

1) d. i. more appropriate.

2) Marginal gloss: Is in [Luther's Confession, in the arc] h on the 3rd panel. (No. 21, § 127.)

3) that is, in the amica exegesis etc.. Compare the introduction.

4) "that" of us immune instead of: and.

Person joined together and agreed, that nevertheless each retains its quality or kind all the way; the some except that the inclination to sin has been farthest from his humanity, because he was not born of the prestigious 1) seed, but of the Holy Spirit, who made his mother, a maid, fertile. But the innocent burdens [onera], sufferings, punishments or afflictions he has borne on him until death, as there are hunger, thirst, heat, frost, sleeping, waking and the like sufferings" [passibilitates].

This opinion we have there, pious princes, fortified with unbreakable testimonies, and much of them. For He who is One Christ of divine and human nature, One Person of the Godhead, has made the blind see, awakened the dead, known the inward parts of the heart, foreknown all things that are to come, even those things which are called things without danger, made the consciences free, cleared the prison of the captives, and risen up mightily from the dead. These are all open effects by which we recognize him, the true God, and that he has not lost the divine power, because he has taken the human stupidity to himself. He also bore hunger, thirst 2c., and all bodily defects, except the sinful one, in Him. He grew and increased in age and knowledge; he did not know the day of the Lord; he timidly went to death; he desired to have the cup taken from him; he cried out in pain, "O my God, how hast thou forsaken me?" he died. But all this according to human nature alone. From which it is now evident that the effects, attributes, or types of both natures remained in Him, and yet He is One Christ, Son of God and Son of Man, One Person of the Son of God, an unsaved Savior.

Accordingly, I have further spoken in the aforementioned book: "What unification (understanding of the two natures in One Christ) image and language the holy men of God have sought much, so that they taught it clearly. Some have brought forth the likeness of man, which consists of soul and body (which strikes me as the most equal), teaching that God and man are one Christ. Some have brought forth a sword or iron glowing with fire. For if one cuts wood or other matter with it, a wound is made and a fire with it. And have with the likeness of any nature power, life, nature, kind and effect want to indicate." Here you see,

1) prestigious - frail, deficient.

Pious princes, that I was never of the opinion that I wanted to make two persons out of Christ, as little as man is two persons, although he has two natures of body and soul, as little as I make two things out of the fired sword. If then man is one person, who alone is a creature, how much more is Christ, who is the Creator and creature, only one person!

After that, in the proof and explanation, I have also treated the words "the Word became man" thus: "The Word became man, and God became man, is also spoken in terms of the opposite, so that He who took man to Himself is eternal God, also an eternal man after He took him to Himself. For GOD did not thus become man, that he who was GOD should be changed into man; but that he who was not man before should take man to himself. And therefore we say: God became man, who also made man, whom He took unto Himself; and thus speak [there] for: the human nature is assumed by the Son of God, As Athanasius also recognizes: 'Not that the Godhead is turned into the flesh, but that humanity is assumed in GOD?' Still in this way no one is hurt, if one speaks of the community because of the characteristics: God became man, for: man became God, or, adopted to the person of the Son of God. Behold an inviolable unity, but see also how one should not mix the attributes in the mind, even if one transforms the words or names."

Here you have, pious princes, the summa of our doctrine, although it is dealt with there according to length with many proclamations. But Luther sees how strong the truth is, and does not turn back a message that it is not so; but has enough that he speaks freely that greater seduction has never been heard. And all the ancients whom I have seen have spoken of it in this way; though it does not compel us, yet it glimmers. And I would like to hear from Luther which of the ancients he can point out to me who does not speak in this way. But that Christ speaks thus with his own word, that we must keep the difference in his words, is touched upon before and abundantly set forth in Exegesis; yet let us act an example or two, and accordingly interrogate Luther's own words; for he is of the opinion in this book and elsewhere, as will be clearly found.

209. Christ speaks John 14: "The Father is greater than I." Now he must speak true; so

He also says: "I and the Father are one thing", John 10, an unfaithful soul; he is an evil corpse; for there soul and and: "Father, everything that is yours is also mine; and corpse are taken personally for the whole man, and not for everything that is mine is also yours", John 17. How can the essence. Luther also omits the piece from the one be greater than the other, if they are one thing, if they Sophists' Theologia and defiles the mouths of the simple-have equal power? If true faith answers, as Athanasius minded and speaks:

did, "He is equal with the Father according to the Luther. 1) "When one says: God is man, or: man is the Godhead, and less than the Father according to God; here can be no *alloeosis*, yes, also no synecdoche, humanity." Matth. 20. he says: "Sitting on my right or left or some tropus; for there God must be taken for God, man is not my power to give you." And Luke 22 says: "I for man."

prepare the kingdom for you, as my Father has prepared Here I ask Luther, if there is to be no allososis, it for me; that you may eat and drink at my table in my whether he understands the Godhead in the word "God"? kingdom." The two sayings are also publicly opposed to If he says: Yes; then it follows that the Godhead is each other, and must be decided solely on the basis that humanity; this is unchristian. For the Deity is an eternal, what he himself admits extends to mankind alone; and uninherited, unsuffering good; so mankind is a created, what he himself admits must be understood as referring light [labilis], suffering thing. Says he: No; then the tropus to the Godhead alone. And is nothing the less such an is already there; namely, the pious *alloeosis*, which inseparable unity of the two natures, that, if either is teaches us that GOtt must be understood personally in spoken of, that of the other, yet alone iu vouersto or personal, uou iu abstraeto, is essential (non, non enim concreto, not in abstracto. That is: God must be taken here licet dicere: *deitas est humanitas*, aut, *deitas est crucifixa*; not only for the separate (does not mean the divine essence from the persons, but this separation is described sic neque humanitas est aeternus DEI filius, etc.).). In in the human mind, solely so that essence and person are this way, no one is hurt, nor do they speak untruthfully, recognized before each other) essence, but also for the but always so that they speak personally. person, and is undeniably called the person of the Son. Of

When one says, "God is man," it is a personal speech. him it is rightly said: God is man. Does Luther not see here Here it is certain that the Godhead is not mankind. But it that it is an alloeosis? since "God" is taken not only for is equally certain that he who is God is also man. And God, that is, deity, but also for the one person of the deity. again, "man is God," pointing to Christ, it is certain that And there the alloeosis is also indicated to him, since the mankind is not the Godhead; or else we must say that the essence is taken for the person, and the person for the Godhead would be turned into mankind. Nor is it true that Christ, who is man, is God also. But the naturally essence, and yet it is not understood differently in separate some being may not be said of another. One personal speech, neither that the person is predominant, that is, that he who is God is man; and not that the may not speak Christianly: The Godhead is mankind; for Godhead, which is also the person of whom we say, here the being is named separately from the person. The human being.

separate being may also not stand with the personal one. I will make it quite clear to you, pious princes, if the One may not say: The Godhead is man; also not: matter requires it. Twenty years ago, there was an Mankind is God. excellent Scotist, Antonius Beck, at Freiburg in Breisgau.

So we have speeches about man. "Man is a celestial He finally claimed that he wanted to maintain that there animal" is said of the soul, but it applies to the whole man. were three Gods; and that for the following reason: Father, "Man is a sow" is said of the whole man, but it is Son and Holy Spirit are essentially One God; they are also appropriate for him only half of the body. Nor is it proper personally three, so there are also personally three Gods; to speak: The soul is the body; nor: The body is the soul; for it is said of each one that he is God: The Father is God, for here soul and body are taken essentially, *pro animei-* the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God. And if one speaks *tate et corporeitate*, ut Sophistae olim verba fingebant, in this way, one does not understand personally alone (he quae in- lingua latina et germanica non competunt. But would have this befits well: He is

1) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession] in the h at the 5th tablet. [M. 21, § 133.]

but also essential, that every person is essential to God. The erroneous sophist came to this, that he did not recognize the word "God", [that it can be taken] *per alloeosim*, by the counterchange, sthan, separately, for the Godhead, but sthan for the person together with the essence.

Example. When one speaks: There is only One God; here the word "God" has the personal form, as if one wanted to say that there is only One Being and Person; but one does not want that, or else we deny the most holy three Persons, but the concretum, i. The personal word "God" is taken separately and essentially alone, and not personally; and the speech is as much as if I were to say, "There is only one Godhead"; and the personal word is taken *per alloeosim*, by the counterchange, for the separate, essential one.

Here Antonius Braß is defeated; 1) for since he wants to say that it is appropriate for him to speak that there are three Gods; for there are three persons who are essentially God: so there are also three Gods, he does not see that the little word "God" may not exist; for even if it has a personal form, it is not understood personally at all; but everyone who hears it understands it as if there were three persons and three deities; and to all of this alloeosis comes to the rescue.

Now you understand, pious princes, how Luther is missing, when he says: "God is man" 2c., there is no *alloeosis*; for if one should take God separately, essentially for the Godhead alone, then it is unchristianly spoken: "The Godhead is mankind. But if one understands "God" by the counterchange, the one who is essentially and personally God: for so it is: "God is man," that is: the person, the Son of God, who is essential God, who is man, you see, how we must depend on the person, and not on the essence; and is nevertheless as true essential God, who is man, as true Son of God personally he is, who is man. It is not yet proper to say: "God is mankind", but: "God is man".

Now we want to interrogate Luther about the two natures in our Lord Jesus Christ, and see if he confesses "that each nature has its own effect and nature, and that nevertheless one is often taken for the other", for the two pieces are the most common cause of imprisonment. Please, pious princes, take good care of Luther's innumerable words, which he needs in this matter in the present book;

for he often fights against himself in four or five lines; it is even true that "anger is a nonsense that lasts for a while"; 2) for Luther certainly does not know what he is saying in places because of anger. And even though he insists that he should be punished for a lie, the whole book is nothing but a deceptive lie; 3) for since he speaks right in one place, he turns it wrong from the beginning, so that I wonder if there is only human understanding in those who allow themselves to be led by the Scriptures. And even if we put his own words before him, he will still find good evidence from his part that he has not lied; for he is angry and speaks in anger, and if anger is *temporaria insania*, a temporary nonsense, then he has spoken out of nonsense, not out of a lying mind. Now let us hear Luther himself.

In his postilion on the epistle on the [third] day of Christ in the high mass, Luther speaks about the words "through his Son" thus: 4) "Here we are to learn to recognize Christ properly, how he is in both natures, divine and human, in which many err and partly make fables out of his words, which they give to the divine nature, which nevertheless belong to the human nature, blinding themselves in the Scriptures. For in Christ's words is the greatest authority, which are due to the divine nature, which are due to the human nature, so they are all easy and clear."

Here you see, pious princes, that Luther himself recognizes that it is a mistake to attribute to the divine nature what is human. Now, hear him further!

Luther 5) on the first panel: 6) "But you, dear brother, should keep this instead of the *alloeosi*: because JESus Christ is truly God and man in One Person, then in no place of the Scriptures is one nature taken for the other; for that is what he ([Luther] means me) *alloeosim*, when something is said of the deity of Christ, which nevertheless belongs to mankind, or again; as, *Lucæ ultimo*: Did not Christ have to suffer, and thus go into His glory?" Here he gules that Christ is taken for human nature. Beware, beware!"

These are Luther's words. Luther was not supposed to prove his point by yelling at people:

2) Marginal gloss: *Ira temporarin insanm.*

3) Marginal gloss: [Ich] does not talk this down, but wants to keep it as it is right.

4) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XII, 154, § 8.

5) Marginal gloss: Is called "the confession" in Luther's book, against which we write here.

6) No. 21, § 122.

1) In the previous paragraph: Beck.

"Beware, beware!" but he should prove: that these words, "Christ therefore had to die," must be understood by both natures, that is, that the divine also had to suffer; or he must confess, [that,] that Christ suffers, is sufficient for mankind alone. Therefore I do not want to say anywhere that Christ is not God and man. Nor do I want to say that He is more than One Person, and I want to have testified to this once enough and completely. It does not appear in a single word that I have gone thereon, or have held thereon; although Luther charges me with it. 1) But why does he do it? Therefore: With the property of the alternation of both natures one obviously learns that human nature in Christ always retains its property; before death the property of the deadly body, and after the original state the property of the declared body; and whichever way one measures the matter, it is not found, except that the body of Christ, whether it was deadly or is now declared, may not be 2) fit to be more than in one place. Then, however, it may not be in the supper, or else, it would have to be in our church in Zurich alone often in a thousand mouths once, but that may not be. Therefore, Luther says, if human nature were not commonly reported in this way, the simple would not reckon human nature differently from divine nature. Now the divine is omnipresent; therefore the simple should think that the human is also omnipresent, and thus it would be thought that the body of Christ is in the Sacrament of the Last Supper. And if the pious *alloeosis* clearly brings this to light, then he speaks to her effectively 4) as to an old witch. But if she is interrogated against Luther, he will not bring anything against her, but will stand at her footsteps. Now if Luther says: "that those are mistaken who admit that the divine nature is that of the human nature," and here he cannot say that the divine nature suffers, but only the one nature, the human nature; then Luther is mistaken when he thinks that one should beware of the decision.

Luther speaks further in the postillum shown above on the third day of Christ: 5) "Now that we come again to Christ, it is to be firmly believed that Christ is true God and true God."

Man. And sometimes the scripture, and he himself, speaks as a pure 6) man; sometimes as a pure 6) God; as when he says Joh. 8: 'Before Abraham was, I am', this is said of the Godhead. But when he says Matth. 20. to Jacob and John: 'It is not mine to give you to sit on the right hand or on the left hand'; that is spoken of the pure 6) humanity." So much Luther.

But now we want to set against it his own words from the Confession. Luther at the sixth tablet: 7) "Thou shalt not believe nor suppose that the tropus *alloeosis* is in such sayings, or that one nature is taken for another in Christ." So much Luther.

(223) Now I ask Luther whether this saying, "Before Abraham was, I am," is spoken of mankind in the same way as it is spoken of the Godhead? He says: No; so the *alloeosis*, i.[e.] counterchange, is saved. And if the divine nature alone is understood, and if Christ himself speaks, then the speech, which must actually be understood of the One nature alone, is taken for the whole of Christ, and therefore one nature for the other. And if the God is man, then the divine must be taken without the human. Luther would say that [they] are not one person. Not that we want to say that the humanity was also before Abraham, which is the same as the divinity One Christ; but that we see how it is appropriate to speak differently of both natures. The humanity of Christ was nowhere when Abraham was; nor does Christ the man speak that he, who is also God, was before him; which was of the Godhead alone. And yet the whole Christ speaks, that is, the whole person, God and man.

But if Luther says: Yes, that humanity is understood in the same way, then it follows that he was not born of Mary of virgins, because the same had never been born. It follows further: if he had been man, that he would have had two human natures in him: one, which was born before Abraham, and the other, which was born of Mary, and the like innumerable errors and blasphemies. I did not say so much here, because Luther wants to say as if Christ's body had also been in heaven, since he was assumed in the unity of the person of the Son of God, and only began to grow in the body of Mary according to the nature of humanity; for he speaks thus after many lamentations:

6) "Pur," "Purer," and "puren" is put in by Zwingli.

7) No. 21, § 115.

1) Marginal gloss: Why Luther scolded the *alloeoses*, which he himself teaches and needs?

2) nienen - nowhere, "nienen" put by us instead of "those" - anything that does not fit into the context.

3) d. i. light.

4) d. j. worse.

5) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XII, 155, § 11.

Luther at [Arc] I at the 2nd tablet, 1) from the words: "The Son of Man, who is in heaven": "A devout Christian tell me, whether it is not higher and greater that mankind is in GOD, yes, with GOD One Person, than that it is in heaven? Is not God higher and more glorious than Heaven? Now Christ humanity has been higher and lower in God and before God from the womb than any angel, so of course it has also been higher in heaven than any angel. For what is in and before God is in heaven, just as the angels are when they are on earth, as is said in Matth. 18" These are all Luther's words.

Here are, pious princes, so many errors, so many words. But briefly! so Luther falls with the argument, 3) since he thus wants to conclude: To be one person with God is greater, neither to be in heaven; now his humanity was one person with the Son of God: so it was also in heaven. This is called beautiful a a substantia ad accidens, to conclude from substance to importance by the deception of likeness. As I said: It is greater that Christ is a Lord of lords and has the kingdom of consciences, neither that he has the fleshly kingdom of David. So he is also an earthly king in the kingdom of David. Yes, of course it is a wonderful thing that he, who is one person with the Son of the eternal God without suffering, started here in time and has been suffering until the declaration after his death. For if he had been bodily in heaven, he would never have hungered or thirsted in heaven, nor would he have been scourged or crucified in heaven, as little as the Godhead was crucified. For mankind suffered so unitedly that it cried out, "O my God, how hast thou forsaken me?" as Luther himself confesses here, "that it might not have helped itself on the cross. But against the blasphemy of all is the saying of John 7: "Jesus was not yet declared.

The other argument: "The humanity of Christ is higher than any angel: so it is also higher in heaven than any angel. But Luther put 4) an importance, the ubi, into it. And that now it is true that he is bodily exalted above all angels, but that was not true then; for he was here on earth, and not in heaven. Therefore it follows as little that Christ was bodily present in heaven, as in a place, as little.

1) No. 21, § 182.

2) "im" put by us instead of: "am".

3) 4,06ns a majors tallit, onm in Zoners praostantias poooatr. Hon seHnitnr: Rsx potsst nnivorknm reZnnm vonäsro, orZo potest privatnm ynsrnHne innooontsin vonäsrs, ant stiaim trnoäaro.

4) Maybe: smuggles.

this conclusion follows: Christ's humanity was higher, nobler and more precious than any angel. God never had an angel crucified, so Christ was not crucified either. So we let up that mankind was not more noble than the angels, which is not the case by nature, Ps. 8: "You have made him less than the angels", but according to dignity and sanctification he is the firstborn, that is, the most noble of all creatures, Col. 1. Thus all the escapes that Luther seeks are enough to blaspheme God's Son and man.

228. the third. "What is in and before GOD, that is in heaven." I ask Luther whether Mary, according to the as 5) she had said to herself: ecce, ancilla domini, nun Wohlin, ich will eine Dienerin des HErrn sein! had been in and before GOtt? Now he must ever affirm that she is in GOD; "for in Him we are, in Him we live and strive." He must also affirm that she was before God; for all things lie bare and manifest before Him, Heb. 4. But was she therefore in heaven? I think not; or else she would not have suffered the hearty death stings on earth. Thus it is false that what is in and before God is in heaven. Dear, which theologian has ever spoken in this way?

But here Luther will mercifully cry out 6): Help God, the great people (whether he called us people, because he almost calls us devils, he has such a friendly spirit), and thus say: Now I have given a good explanation, how Christ is mankind in heaven; since I said so afterwards:

Luther: 7) "Yes, how? if I were to say that not only Christ was in heaven when he walked on earth, but also the apostles, and we all, if we are mortal on earth, as far as we believe in Christ" 2c. Here you can see how I mean it. 8)

230 Answer. Luther says that Christ was bodily in heaven at that time, just as we are still in heaven today. We then want to become one with him, not only about this saying, but also about the whole main point; thus: We are now in heaven with body, soul and mind (for I do not mean that Luther wants to understand "in heaven" cosmographically, as all bodies are in heaven), in God's knowledge, cognition, election, prudence. 2c,

5) "as" put by us instead of: "and".

6) i.e. to have mercy.

7) Marginal gloss: Is in sBogen] 1 on the third panel. sNo. 21, § 183.Z

8) The last sentence is added by Zwingli. Luther, on the other hand, continues: "First of all, there should be a rumbling in Zwingli's bag" 2c.

but the bodies 1) are not themselves naturally essential in it. So also Christ was there in heaven, when he lived here, and in addition so much more, that he is one person with the Son of God; still he was not himself naturally essential with the body in heaven.

But what does this see against us? Yes, but it is the ointment to defile the mouths of the simple. Well then, if Luther means it, we will soon be one. We gladly recognize that Christ's body is in the supper, as our bodies are now in heaven, that is, in the knowledge, choice and prudence of God. For whoever does not recognize Christ in the Last Supper, does not trust in Him, does not carry Him in his heart with all certainty, that He has accepted true human prestige, and with it has accepted our prestige, has made us certain children and fellow heirs of God, and therefore does not give Him thanks, emits a judgment to Himself. So we have him in the supper; 3) but naturally, essentially, and bodily, that is as little possible as having the moon in the bowl when it shines in. And it is to be taken care of, who thus say, undoubtedly believe themselves to have him in the supper, neither milk nor moon, as [the] proverb reads, in the bowl.

232 But that Luther wants to be understood as "being in heaven" is indicated by the messages he sends in after much reproach, in which "being in heaven" is taken in Hebrew for "heavenly" or "divinely minded," as one is in heaven, and as we pray: "Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven. As also Isa. 27. xxxxxx, in war, is taken for warlike or fienklich. 4) Equally as one also speaks: we were yesterday in paradise, for: We were in friendly yet great joy with lovely company, song, instrument 2c. Paul speaks of such an opinion in Eph. 1: "God has gifted us 5) (Luther, however, makes "bless" out of it) with all kinds of spiritual gifts in the heavenly places in Christ." Here "in the heavens" is taken for "with heavenly gifts," and that with Christ, as the following words indicate. Thus Luther also misconstrues the other sayings. So Luther does not want to have Christ in heaven any other way, neither we are up there, except for

the personal union, in the word: "The Son of Man who is in heaven"; so it must not be necessary; we are one. But then he must recognize that in the word "the Son of man who is in heaven" the word "is" is not taken essentially; namely, not for "being essential," but only in recognition of 2c. being. And then the word in the supper, "This is my body," may also mean that in thanksgiving the body of Christ is in the mind 6) and that the signs signify this. But if he does not want to let this go, he must confess that the *alloeosis* is here, and that "the Son of Man" is taken for "the Son of God. And so this, it follows that the humanity in Christ is not *alloeosis*, since the Godhead is. Summa, taking the "is" as he will, he lies in the word, "The Son of man, which is in heaven."

Lastly, he says: 7) "Just as the angels are in heaven and on earth, as he proved in Matthew 18," meaning the saying: "Their angels always see the face of my Father who is in the heavens. Here I ask him if he wants to say that the angels were once 8) essential on earth and in heaven? He says yes; therefore write. He says: Matth. 18. There Christ does not say that they are at one time 8) in heaven and on earth, but he speaks thus from word to word: "For I say to you that their angels see in the heavens all the way" 2c. Hie is "in the heavens," *ἐν οὐρανῷ*, sine articulo, non enim dicitur *οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ*, from which something would like to be *zeiset*. Now it is not new to see from one place to another, but not to be there; for Luther needs it also in this matter, that I am surprised that he did not think of it here. The glorious word of Stephen is a witness: "I see the heavens open, and Jesus sitting at the right hand of the power of God. Now Stephen was not in heaven; but the eyes of the soul look up; yes, according to Luther, just so that we do not quarrel, the bodily eyes also saw the appearance that God opened to him 2c. Much less must the angels be in both places, and still see the Father above, and work their *Empfelch* [command] here.

Now we come again to Luther's word from the Postil, since he said for the other: "To sit on the right or on the left is not mine,

1) Marginal gloss: bodies for: the people who are still in the

2) i.e. weakness, frailty.

3) Marginal gloss: How Christ is body and blood in the night meal.

4) hostile (?).

5) Marginal gloss:

6) Marginal gloss: How the body of Christ is in the night meal.

7) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession, in the Arc.

1 on [the] first panel. [No. 21, § 180.]

8) d. i. at the same time.

to give you" 2c., be spoken of pure humanity." Then I must ask him: If I thus spoke: This is spoken of mere humanity; whether he does not reasonably suspect me of separating the one person? Yes, of course he does, although it has never occurred to me, and yet I have never used the "pure" that I know of. But Luther is right: It is spoken of the pure humanity. And if, nevertheless, Christ is uncertified, and if, nevertheless, Christ has spoken, then the whole Christ alone is taken for the one nature; or else, if he is uncertifiable, one nature for the other; then the innocent *alloe0- sis* is saved. And stand fast, that every nature in one person keeps its quality eternally.

Luther continues in the same postillon: Luther: 1) "Just as the same could not help her on the cross. However, some here want to prove great art with their sinister interpretation that they meet the heretics.

Luther speaks against this: 2) "Thus says the Holy Spirit, John 3: God so loves the world that he gives his own Son to it. Rom. 8: "He did not spare His own Son, but gave Him for us all. And so from then on, all works, words, sufferings, and what Christ does, does, works, speaks, suffers, the true Son of God" 2c.

237 See here, pious princes, whether Luther does not deal with anything but dyeing and dazzling. In the previous speech from the postillon, he publicly recognizes that mankind could not have helped itself on the cross, and speaks here that everything that Christ suffers, the Son of God suffers, and does not want to let up on the *alloe0sim*, the counterchange; so it followed that the person of the Son of God had died, that it could not have helped itself.

238 But I hope you, pious princes, see that he, blinded by anger, refutes what he himself holds. For in the previous speech it is said that mankind did not like to help itself on the cross. But when he speaks in this book: The true Son of God suffers 2c., he ever wants to blind as if he also suffered according to divine nature. And he does this with the word "truly". It is true that he who has suffered is the true Son of God; but he has not suffered, indeed, he does not like to suffer, because of his divine nature. He still goes about it in such a way that the simple are confused and can distinguish between the two.

1) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XII, 155, 8II.

2) Marginal gloss: *Is sim Bekenntniß, Bogens ü an [ders I. Tafel sNo. 21, § 123.]*

The people of the world do not quite decide, and like to leave them in the misconception that God's Son also suffered according to the divinity itself; only that next to him, they assume that mankind is also, as it were, the divinity everywhere. Should not one explain, when he says: The true Son of God suffers, that he truly did not turn to suffering, but to the Son, so that he, who is the true Son of God, has suffered; but not according to the nature which is named here, but according to the other, which is with this One Christ? Thus, when it is said, Man is dead, all men understand that the body alone is dead, for the soul may not die; nor is it said of the whole man, and yet the superior part may not die. That is ever sought with violence darkness, and the darkening, which is before cheerful rejuvenation.

But since someone would say here: Luther explains himself 4) soon afterwards thus:

Luther: "Because you have to say that. The person 5) (shows Christ) suffers, dies. Now the person is truly God; therefore it is rightly said: God's Son suffers. For although one part (that I speak thus), as the Godhead, does not suffer; nevertheless 6) the person, who is God, suffers in the other part, as in mankind. Just as one says, "The king's son is sore; yet all his leg is sore" 2c.

240 As much as Luther. Here, behold, pious princes, I well recognize that Luther speaks rightly and Christianly; insofar as by the word "person" he understands "Christ", not that which is most prominent in the person, "the Son of God" 2c. For otherwise one is not wont to say: The person suffers; and I would not wish the words themselves otherwise. For they are entirely of our opinion, namely, that when one speaks thus: God's Son suffers, dies; that there God's Son is taken for mankind in Christ. As when one says: Man is wounded, and yet only the body is wounded; so "man" stands for "body" here. What can be said more clearly in this matter? If we are now completely one in this place, why are we not one everywhere? Because Luther does not stay with it, and now speaks one thing, and soon another. And there are many more simple-minded people who are thus confused by his words, 7) so that they now do not have any up-

3) d. i. clearly asserted.

4) Marginal gloss: *Is sim Bogen ü on the 2nd panel. sNo. 21, § 124 f.)*

5) *Viä6, Hurn varist In*

6) nevertheless" put by us instead of: "accordingly".

7) Perhaps: to adhere, to look at bullishly, to stare, to be blinded; like the English: to *stLrs*. The expression is repeated in § 472 of this writing.

whether he is equal to himself and exists, but rather they 1) just want to come forth and maintain with Luthern: The humanity of Christ is everywhere; it was bodily in heaven before the ascension; it is bodily essential in the supper; the Godhead is also sufferable; and the like. And if one looks at Luthern thoroughly, his own words are able to do otherwise. But he speaks no less clumsy words, so that those who believe him fall into error. Isn't that a workaholicism? If he is long and insistent, then the truth forces him to be time-barred against himself. Look at the words:

241. Luther [in the bow] h in the first panel: 2) "For if I believe this, that human nature alone has suffered for me; then Christ is a poor Savior to me; so He probably needs a Savior Himself" 2c.

242 Behold here, pious princes, the words against the forerunner, which please us so well! There he says publicly that although the Godhead does not suffer, humanity does suffer 2c. Here he speaks with such a form of words that it cannot be defended; for he speaks exclusively that where he believed that human nature alone suffered for him, he must not be his savior. What can be said more blasphemously? If God may also suffer, then he has also died; for suffering is here taken for dying. Is he no longer the only undying God? 1 Tim. 6.

243 By these words one sees that Luther wants to darken by force, and to swim away in the fog, that is, to speak such words, which are understood differently before the simple, neither he wanted to have spoken them, if one asked him for it. Is this honest? Are we speaking two different things from one mouth? If we build up again that which we have broken, we open ourselves up to be derogators or transgressors 3). Gal. 2.

244 So now Luther says white, soon black, he undoubtedly wants to think that it is to act with God's word as ringferig (frivolously) as one plays in the Brennter 4). And that is a wonder that in the unfortunate speech (for I am sorry from the bottom of my heart that he gets into such error) he has not been so careful that he would have thought so: Well then, if your adversary were to say, "If my God were to be a suffering God in some way," then he would have to say

he will not be my God. And I say for myself: If Christ Jesus would be suffering according to the Godhead, he would not be God, he would not have to be my God either. Abel 5) Let it be far from us that we come to the point with quarrels 6) that we, to the screen of error, also blaspheme God! Augustinum's quarrel also involved that he spoke something about co-suffering of the Godhead, contra Felicianum. He explains himself in such a way that he only understands the soul of Christ, which would have suffered sorrow in the dying of the body according to the word: "My soul is sorrowful until death". But where will Luther turn here, if the popes will accuse him of having spoken: The divinity of Christ has also suffered death; and if this is spread to him with writings, will this not be recognized in eternity for the most blasphemous, foolish error? For even the philosophi have recognized τὸ θεῖον ἄ-ίávarov, numen esse immortale, which is GOD, that must be ohntödemlich. Now when it is said, Christ suffered for us, by "suffer" is understood to suffer death; for with his death we are made alive.

If Luther says of the suffering of the Godhead, as if without it Christ should not be his Savior, he must understand that it also died; for if he would have understood that it suffered in hunger, thirst, scourging, crowning, and not in death, it would not have suffered, since the most powerful sum of the suffering was: "with his death we are made alive," not with hunger 2c. The same things he hath well borne for common remedy and consolation of our temptations, but the payment is death, as is invented in the 2nd [Epistle to the] Corinthians Cap. 5. and throughout the Epistle to Hebrews. I should not scold in such a cruel matter; but I may well say to Verschupfung 7) des Irrsall: If Luther insists that the Godhead has suffered, and therefore must have died, then the pope is still right that he wants to be his governor. For Paul also says in Hebrews 7 that the chief priests of the Old Testament were many because death did not leave them. If now the eternal Son of God has died to us according to the Godhead, then the pope is justly his governor. And in the darkness, Luther has lost himself badly on a stick. We still want to question him further, so that he may not complain.

1) d. i. hatch.

2) No. 21, § 122.

3) Marginal gloss:

4) with fire (?).

5) Marginal gloss: L-c ^d. h. gehWm hangman).

6) i.e. any, "ienen" put by us instead of "jenen".

7) "Verschupfen" - to avoid, to spurn. Verschupfung - avoidance.

Luther in the previous postillon: 1) "So is the man Christ, when he says, 'The Father is greater than I.' John 14: The Father is greater than I," John 14, Matthew 23: "How often have I gathered thy children together like a mother hen under her wings? Item, Marci 13: No one knows about that day, neither the angels nor the Son, but only the Father. Is it not necessary here to use the phrase: The Son does not know', that is, he does not want to say it. What does the gloss do?"

247. so much Luther. Behold, pious princes, whether Luther weiß was 2) say otherwise, neither we have ever talked or taught with the pious *alloeos*? Nor do we want to hear him further.

Luther in the aforementioned postillon: 3) "The humanity of Christ, just like another holy natural man, has not always thought, spoken, willed, noticed all things, as some make an omnipotent man out of him. The two natures and their work in each other are not evident. As he has not seen, heard, felt all things at all times, so he has not looked at all things with his heart at all times, but as God has led him and brought them before him."

249 So much Luther. Look here, pious princes, at each piece in particular, so that the speech we want to set afterwards will be all the clearer to us.

I. The humanity of Christ has not always thought all things 2c., like another holy man.

II. That some do wrong without a doubt, who make an all-powerful man out of him.

III. That they also do wrong who mix the two natures and their works together.

IV. That he did not look at all things with his heart at all times:

V. But as God has guided and directed him.

In this, however, we are one, even though there are some words that we have not presented in such an uncouth way; Luther is still right in his opinion. For all the differences that we have with one another, of two natures and effects, are known here again by Luther. If the humanity of Christ has not at all times thought, perceived, spoken, and willed all things as another human being, then it is distinguished from the divinity according to human nature and effect. Just as man consists of soul and body, so each is of one essence, nature and effect, but with a difference,

that, although the body has its own nature and essence, it does not have the continuance of its essence without the soul; for as soon as the soul is from it, it has fallen away; and as soon as the soul is added to it, it is again raised into *existentiam*, into a state 4) as will happen in the last judgment. Now the two natures, body and soul, are nevertheless one man and one person, although the person is composed of two beings and natures, but not of two beings, each of which has its own special permanent existence, but only the one, the soul. So in Christ the essential natural Godhead is also the essential natural humanity One Person; and the one nature, namely the human, is not of its own continuance and abstinence in the person; but as the common man's body has its continuance and abstinence in the soul, so the whole humanity of Christ, body and soul, has continuance and abstinence in his other nature of the Godhead.

251 But Luther did not say that this was taken from the juggler's bag, for this is how Scotus and John Picus Mirandola write on the measures, and all theologians de ente et essentia, et de essentia et existentia; so we now bring the proof. Christ says John 10: "I have power to take my soul from me (I know that soul means life to the Hebrews, but the soul gives life) and to take it to me again. Now Christ's soul cannot be any other soul than an essential natural soul. But in these words we see that it has its continuance, abode, and retention in the Godhead, when he says: "He has power to add the soul and to take it again. For the human soul, which is like the sustainer of the body, has no power to put the body down and take it away again. Therefore in Christ there is a stronger sustainer and sustainer of neither the soul, who also can put away and take again the soul, who is the Son of God. Item, Col. 2: "In him dwelleth all Godhead bodily." I do not want to say here at length whether "bodily" means "essential" or whether "bodily" means xar xxxxxxxxx.

The word "human" is taken to mean that the full Godhead dwells in humanity, for Luther does not like to hear it. But as the soul is said to dwell in the body, yet the body dwells in the strength and preservation of the soul; so also here the Godhead is said to dwell in the humanity of Christ, 6) since the humanity, in its

1) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XII, 155, § II.

2) i.e. something.

3) Walch, I. c., § 12.

4) Marginal gloss: Lsss st sxistsrs.

5) "Also" here stands for "and".

6) Marginal gloss: xao'

The first thing is that the divine nature and person is taken up, remains in it, exists and is preserved. And this is *personae constitutio*, 1. that which makes a person, through all creation, when two natures come over one and into one stock. (*rationalis creaturae individua substantia*.)

Now it is heard enough that the body comes to the soul, it has its own being and nature, but not a retaining power, but the soul is its retaining power. *Unde et philosophi²) actum vocarunt aut potius actionem*. Therefore the name "person" is assigned by us to the holy three names, not that the holy scripture calls them "persons," but that, as a person consists in the soul, since the corpse is also a part of the person, therefore the three, which otherwise have not special beings, but special qualities, are Father, Son, Spirit, One Being. Therefore, the three who are One God are called persons; not according to the quality of Scripture, 3) as also Augustine *ās oivit*. Ub. 7. oap. 4. but according to the comparison of the God-fearing mind, which desires to show us the divine unity of the three in One Being. Have I ever had to indicate, pious princes, for it helps to reject Luther's error; he speaks of things not only darkly, but also unjustly and very seductively, as will come. And now speak Luther.

Luther in the Confession [in the Arc] h at [the] 4th tablet: 4) "For where the works are divided and separated, there also the person must be divided, because all works or sufferings are not assigned to the natures, but to the persons; for it is the person who does and suffers everything, one according to this nature, the other according to that nature; as all this is well known to the learned."

Here I urge that Luther's word be measured carefully, neither the silver nor the golden predicates; for one will see that he is not only not one with the superior words from the postilion, but also speaks publicly against himself in the words themselves that are there. First, he says here: where the works are divided and separated, the person must also be divided. Here I ask Luther: which theologian has ever taught that the difference of works separates the person? or whether he does mean in his heart,

that it is thus? No, he does not mean it seriously; for he says immediately in four lines the contradiction, as will come. Or whether he means, that *neißwa* [anyhow] is such a confused mind, which believes this? For what man does not recognize that the corpse eats, and drinks, and wakes, and swallows, and heals, 2c., and does not describe any of these in the soul; and yet they are only One Person. The soul, however, understands, calculates, thinks, judges, 2c., none of which the corpse is capable of, and yet they are only One Person. And all theologians have always recognized that not only the effects but also the natures do not separate a person. For if this were the case, then man would be two persons, one the body, the other the soul; and Christ would be three persons, one the Son of God, the other his soul, which is created, the third the corpse, which grew out of the lineage of Abraham. For this reason, too, theologians judge from God's Word that His humanity, that is, true body and soul, is included in the continuance and preservation of the person of the Son of God; that His divinity and humanity are not two persons, or else there would be four persons in the divinity. But Luther speaks immediately as if he had never known what the difference is between *singulare*, *suppositum*, *individuum* et *personam*. If he now says in the postilion: The humanity of Christ, just like another holy natural man, has not always thought, spoken, noticed all things, 2c., then I ask Luther: whether the divinity of Christ also, like a holy natural man, does not always think, will and notice all things? Will he undoubtedly say: the Godhead is knowledge, light, clarity, wisdom, power itself; how could light not be light, knowledge not be knowledge? 2c. It also follows that the human will of Christ, the human mind of Christ, has had its own human natural kind, just as our body and soul have their own kind, which is different from the kind of spirit that God knew in us, Rom. 7.

255 Probation. Christ says: Not my will, but yours be done, 6) and nevertheless remains only one person, although he has his own will, according to mankind. But this alone, because mortality is attached to his body; after the declaration of the original state, the weakness and contradiction is accepted. 1 Cor. 15: "If the fragile attaches to the unbreakable, and the mortal attaches to the undead.

1) Marginal gloss: vn-ä[T-am?.

2) Marginal gloss:

3) Marginal gloss: *^s^so-r* pistatis vosakulum, Hon scripturas.

4) No. 21, § 130.

5) In prepared edition: "the".

6) Marginal gloss: How the declared bodies will be obedient.

Then the saying that is written, "Death is swallowed up," 2c. For the weakness and fear of Christ was because of death; but if the fear of death or of going into mischief is accepted, not only does the will of Christ not resist his divine will, but our bodies will not resist the soul either; for since there is no fear of mischief, only then is the body helped to peace and rest. Therefore Paul also cries out: "I wretched man, who will deliver me from the deadly body? The grace of God through Christ" 2c. Now if Luther so publicly indicates in the postillon that the works of the two natures are so different that the divine cannot be given that which is human, and says here that the works separate the person, it follows that he separates the person, not we. In short! Luther has stretched out his neck, he does not care what he says, how he speaks against himself, how he speaks against God's word. May God pardon him!

This becomes even more obvious when we consider the next words of the confession in relation to each other. To the last he thus insinuates: "For it is the person who does and suffers everything, one according to this nature, the other according to that nature, as the scholars well know. Behold, pious princes, how this rhymes so well! In the beginning he says: he who separates the works separates the person. And in the end he separates the works with such proper words, that I let them stand out in the face with large letters 1). And says: the person does and suffers all things, but one according to this nature, the other according to that nature. Oh God! What do we teach and speak differently, because the last words are! Do we not say that God and man are One Christ, only One Person? But the natures are distinct, each with its own quality and nature, and the difference cannot separate the person. And is herewith our woe, lamentation, and cry; "for who shall be vexed, that it may not burn us ?" 2 Cor. 11. Yes, our woe is that Luther just speaks in four lines against himself, and urges him 2) God to speak against his presumption, and to ever confess the truth. And the solemn deceivers (I should have said teachers) do not want to see that Luther in no place throughout this whole book argues so hostilely nowhere against us, God forces him to recognize the undefiled truth with us, thus,

1) Zwingli thus refers to what is printed locked in § 253.

2) "him" put by us instead of: "in".

that the whole of Scripture is nothing else at all, neither a message that Luther has been overcome, nor that he does not like the truth. Says someone: Why do you write with so much work against him? Answer: Only so that the quackery, that is, the dishonesty, the dishonest and confused way of being in the matter, and the false teaching, may be well recognized and henceforth be forgiven. 3) For all the brethren must know this. For all the brethren must inform me that I have been blasphemed by Luther for the fourth time with open words, and yet I have tried to write against him, 4) all in the good hope that God would open the light for him to see the truth; but he sees it, yes, he forgets it, 5) and does not want to see it or to understand it. As Isaiah, Cap. 6, Christ, Matth. 13, indicate.

257. II. This becomes still more clear when the words in the postillon are considered more truly, since he speaks thus: 6) that some do wrong who make an omnipotent man out of him; and if the humanity of Christ were extended according to the Godhead, as Luther says, then the humanity of Christ would ever be omnipotent; for omnipotence is from the infinite. And may nothing be omnipotent at all, but the united infinite good, and what is essentially infinite, that is also omnipotent. Now if the body of Christ is everywhere where the Godhead is, it is essentially infinite; if it is essentially infinite, it is also omnipotent. I will prove all these disorders with Luther's own words.

Luther [in the arc] i [at the] 2nd tablet: 7) "So it must follow that he also be and may be according to the third, supernatural way everywhere where God is, and everything be full of Christ through and through according to mankind; not according to the first, bodily comprehensible way, but according to the supernatural divine way" 2c.

Watch! This is a wonderful theologian! Who then mixes the natures? All theologians say that "being everywhere" is the inner nature of the divine being, and they are right. For the word Jer. 23: "I fill the heavens and the earth," may suit no one but the one divine being. Now he admits it to mankind, regardless of all the Scriptures that contradict it: so he must ever mix the natures and make an omnipotent man out of him. 2, from the prophet David:

3) to forget - to beware of.

4) i.e. abstain.

5) i.e. he confesses it.

6) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XII, 155, § 12.

7) No. 21, § 143.

"You will not let my soul go to hell." Now the Godhead is essential and powerful everywhere, also in hell, so also the soul of Christ, and therefore the whole mankind, would have to be in hell; contrary to the proclamation of David and Peter. For this is the way of the declared bodies, to have eternal joy in heaven or eternal sorrow in hell with the soul. And if Christ were humanity in hell, but since the Godhead is unsuffering, Christ would have to suffer humanity in hell: such a glorious thing followed from Luther's teaching.

Luther speaks the same: 1) "And where you would show a place where God would be and not man, then the person would already be separated" 2c. Answer: yes, we have shown it now. In hell is God, Ps. 118. And is the man Jesus Christ not in hell, as is now heard. And the person is no longer separated at all, because the soul went out of him when he let the spirit (that is, the soul and the life) out of him or gave it out, Matth. 27, and the soul went out of him, Joh. 10. The soul of Christ was separated from the body, but the person was not separated, because it was always One Person. So also the person is not separated, since mankind is not everywhere, where the Godhead is.

But on this he brings a still greater error, and Luther speaks in the same place: "Because then I could say with the truth: here is God, who is not man, and has never been man! Not to me of God" 2c.

262 Here you see, pious, wise princes, well 2) a beautiful sophistical little pellet Luther tears! how he concludes from the accidens (importance) to the substance (or essence), and chases the mayor with the red pants 3) around in the bath. He first spoke thus: Where you would show a place, where God would be, and man would not be, the 2c. dissected, there is in every place the ubi, that is, the "where", or place; so here he omits the udi finely and puts the substance instead, and says: Here is God, who is not man! See how he has put a "the" for the "there", which points to the substance! but there he should also have put the "there" for mankind and thus have spoken: Here is God, since man is not! and not: who is not man. For since God is in hell, since mankind is not, God is nevertheless man. The Emperor's mind is in Milan, and he is in Hispania and not in Milan;

It does not follow that he is a man. The sun is in its celestial circle; and there is no sunshine nor day in the whole world, it is from the one sun, and is also called the sun; nor is the *corpus*, the body of the sun, here. And so the power, the shine and the brilliance of the sun can be everywhere; and the body of the sun is not everywhere, but only in one place. So the divine being is everywhere, and where one can say: There is God, there one can say: There is God, who is man. Behold, how I now add "the" to God and to man! But you cannot say: Where God is, there is man.

263 Here Luther leads 4) a long Stempei 5) from the Sophists armory, as a thing in looo, that is, in one place is, understandable, incomprehensible and supernatural. Now I leave it that he has not quite verteutschet 6) *circumscriptive, definitive, impletive*, and will alone indicate 7) that he has also not quite read the Sophisten Güsel. [To the first: Circumscriptive, that is, "to be comprehensible (will also use his words) in one place" is, if a body is whole and with all its parts in one place, that it and its parts may not be in another place or exterior. This description alone befits the corpse of Christ, and Luther alone excludes it [I] do not allow myself to be mistaken by his wild examples, which he now brings forth, and thus proves the "being comprehensibly in one place" of the corpse of Christ. But "comprehensible" must not be understood that I and everyone comprehend the body, but that the body is of such a kind that it is in one place alone, with all its members, although no one ever grasps it. An eagle bends all its days in the air, that no one seizes it; nor is it circumscriptive, that is, comprehensible in one place.

264. andexn, so the whole description of the comprehensible place befits the declared corpse of Christ. Well, if we wanted to loosen Luther 8), he is not in a place so grossly corporeal, as his straw bag, and the sheriff with the red pants in the bath. But circumscriptive, that is, 9) um-

4) Marginal gloss: Is fim sheet) 6 on [the] 7th panel. No. 21, § 135 ff.)

5) "Stempei" - useless talk, put by us instead of "Stempny", according to Col. 1287, § 139, and § 107 in No. 26 m this volume.

6) i.e. Germanized. In the old edition "verteuschet," a printing error, as can be seen from the following paragraph.

7) Marginal gloss: Oirournscriptivo esse in looo.

8) d. i. listen.

9) Randglosse: So one should oirourn^rixktivs teutschen^

1) No. 21, 144.

2) Maybe: which?

3) This refers to No. 21, § 88.

1) he should not thus understand bodily, oorporalitor, nor verteutfchen bodily. But he teutschet and gropes around in all things, like the young dog in the child bath. I leave to 2) all who are reported to sophistry or philosophy, whether circumscriptive should be verteutschet: corporaliter.

Thirdly, the declared bodies of men are contained, circumscribed, and prized in one place only; not otherwise do all believers know. Proof: We are beautifully introduced by Paul, 1 Cor. 15, into the knowledge of the transfigured bodies through the heavenly bodies of the sun and stars, which are also bodies, and are circumscriptive, that is, encompassed, circumscribed and prized in one place, and yet are not as coarse bodies as the coarse sheriff in red pants in Luther's stable (Forgive me, all believing hearts! I can't help it, I have to speak shamefully about things, when I see Luther's laborious intercourse, since he becomes so gouty 3) that he doesn't know how wildly he should speak). So also the declared bodies of all men are prizes in one place. And if the corpse of Christ is according to the original state, as ours will be, then it is also only in one place.

266 If this proof also serves for the article "seated at the right hand," then we want to set up two works with one proof. One, that Christ's body is embraced; the other, that he is at the right hand of God. Although the right hand, that is, the majesty and power of God, is everywhere at work, his body is not everywhere bodily present.

That Christ's body is embraced.

267 Gal. 4.: "GOD sent His Son, who was born of a woman (see here at a pretense, GOD's Son, per alloeosim, by the counterchange, actually called only humanity; though it is true that he who is born is GOD; and Mary gave birth to GOD; but not according to the Godhead, but the man whom she bore is also GOD; and [she] is GOD's child-bearer, therefore that her child is GOD's natural son; as the princess of Bavaria is said to have said, she gave birth to princes, not counts or lords) is made." Now if the humanity of Christ is made by a woman, it is encompassed, umzielt, umprisen.

1) "Prisen", "geprisen", "umprisen" - restricted, circumscribed. Compare "zupreisen" - to ascribe, Col. 323, note 5 in this volume.

2) "to leave on" - to refer to.

3) Maybe: toxic?

4) Perhaps: Example. Cf. § 87 of this paper.

268. Philippenses 2: "He emptied himself (emptied himself, that is, forgave his divine glory, as all believers have ever understood) and took the form 5) of a servant, and became like men, half a man in nature and walk, like another man"; βῆχματι εὔρε&εῖς ὡς ἄνθρωπος. Annota primum verbum *inventus* hebraice poni pro *fuisse*; secundo *ut homo*, hominem poni sine articulo, unde naturam potius et speciem significat, quam individuum. Transtulimus ergo: *homo sicut alius homo*. De forma σχ-ῆ-ματι non est monendum, quod nonnunquam ponitur pro *forma*, quae dat esse *rei*, nonnunquam pro *persona*; ideo tam late exposuimus: "of the being and change half" 2c. Now if Christ is fully human like us, except for the sinful, as will follow, and we are umzielt Und umprisen, then he is also so, or else he would not be true man like us.

Hebr. 2. chapter: "He has to be compared to the brothers in all things" 2c. Behold! in all things, except the sinful. Now we are included, so is he.

270 There: "If therefore the children of all are of flesh and blood, he is also partaker of them. Behold! He is partaker of them as we are, and we are included, so is he included.

Hebr. 4: "We do not have a chief priest who may not have compassion on our infirmities, but one who is skilled in all things, as it were, like us, except sin" 2c. Behold, pious princes, if Christ's body had been in heaven and on the cross at one time, as Luther raves, he would not have been trained in all things as we are; for ever in heaven the stapling of the nails, the painful lifting up, would not have hurt him 2c. So it follows publicly that he was embraced, embraced and embraced, as also every man is.

But Luther wanted to say: Before death Christ was included, but not after death. Answer: It is sufficiently evident about the word John 3: "the Son of Man who is in heaven" that Luther says: he was then also in heaven bodily; that it is a seductive error.

Here, pious reader, is the nonsensical blasphemous speech that Luther leads. Item [Bogen] k⁷) on the seventh and eighth tablets, and what he also

5) Marginal gloss: De". evbebrswe pro s'nnrrH, par, ant KōAEUs.

6) Randglosse: xeEv<üvr?/ce ryx <7a/)^6x "at "t/rarox.

7) In the old edition, L is missing. It is No. 21, § 175.

says, he brings no other scripture, because: Luther: In gelte in dieser Sache gleich so viel, als über, außer, durch und wieder herdurch und allenthalben 2c. Behold, how so finely köppisch 1) and gauklerisch Luther can speak of it! And that the simple are blinded, so that they do not inquire about anything; so he sighs 2) deeply on it, and cries, "Oh, what am I talking about such high things!" Here he should have added, if I can do nothing at all with it. We still want to show him the fullness of it, and, according to the original state, to prove that we have embraced the body of Christ.

(274) Luke 24 says himself: "Behold my hands and my feet, that I myself am"; or "that I am the one"; understand "one" for "actually". With which words he wants to say, he is the one actually himself, who was before with them, and is again with them. Now, if he is umprisen before death, he is umprisen also after death, or else he would not be the actually himself Christ.

There he speaks further: "Attack me, and look at me; for a spirit has neither flesh nor bone, as you see that I have. If the body of Christ has allowed itself to be attacked, it has certainly been embraced; for that which is not embraced cannot be attacked. In addition, "having the flesh and the bones" is a definite description of the body that is embraced. For what has parts is targeted; even more so what has limbs. For the legs need not be as large as the whole body; likewise the flesh alone need not be as large as flesh and leg, veins, nerves, and all the members with one another. I know well that the declared body of Christ is not to be understood so roughly as flesh and blood and bones, like Luther's proud body in red pants; but I understand that Christ with the miraculous attack wanted to make them understand his whole true humanity; and that he would bring back his true body, which he brought into the world from the handmaid Mary, even from the dead, yet declared; not made infinite or all-embracing; or else they would not have been able to reach over a finger, a hole of the nails. And not I alone have the understanding, but [also] Ambrose and Augustine, yes, all believers; yes, Luther himself. For I firmly believe that all his life he never intended that the body of Christ should be everywhere, until the quarrel brought him to the point where 4)

he stands there so miserable and sweats like one who is beating the last shell of his father's inheritance.

276. Paul speaks 1 Cor. 15. thus: "The first man is of the earth, kätin (of dung, earthly) or stöybin (stäubin, of dust: The other man (see! "Man" and "the other man," that by the contrast thou mayest know that he is true man, as Abraham was; wherefore he is called the other Adam here in this chapter) is the HEART from heaven. Now as the celestial is, so must the celestial be: And as the celestial is, so must the celestial be. And as we have borne the likeness of the cothine; so shall we bear the likeness of the celestial." Here you see, pious princes, through all the burden and weight of the words, that Paul makes Christ our firstfruits, and us the offspring; so that as he rose from the dead, so he presented to us an image, that we also may become the offspring. If then Christ's declared corpse would be everywhere, our declared bodies would also have to be everywhere. It follows also, per conversionem simplicem: we shall have declared bodies, as Christ has; so also Christ has a declared body, as we shall have. Now ours will be encompassed and circumscribed; so also Christ's body will have to be. Know ye also how χα>^' αλληγορίαν Paul's words may be understood as an exhortation that we should live heavenly, but the fundamental meaning is that of which we speak here. So Luther misses the point about the body of Christ, as he takes it to mean that he wants to either send or extend it to all ends and everywhere, according to humanity as well as according to divinity. Now it is at the right hand.

From the right hand of God in heaven.

Luther speaks of the right hand thus (is [in the arc] h in the 5th tablet): 5) "Item, because they do not prove that God's right hand is a special place in heaven: so my indicated way also still remains firm that Christ's body is everywhere, because he is at the right hand of God, which is everywhere; although we do not know how this happens, because we also do not know how it happens that God's right hand is everywhere."

278 Answer. Since Luther claims that he does not know how the right hand of God is everywhere, we want to tell him the same thing first. The right hand of God is taken everywhere in Scripture for the majesty of God.

5) No. 21, § 132.

1) i.e. after his head.

2) Marginal gloss: Oroeoäili laerimae.

3) Marginal gloss: avT-öx.

4) Marginal gloss: Is only an insult; but paints Luther's despair well.

The authority, power and might of God. So Isaiah 48 To one [i.e., to the first] of human nature half reckon. For speaks in the person of God: "I am the beginning and the Christ having in him two natures, according to the divine, end; my hand has made the earth firm, and my right hand it may well be said, Christ is at the right hand, and the right has measured the heavens. I called unto them, and they is universal; so Christ is universal; all is right, yea, stood with one another." Ps. 43. (44,4.): "Their strength according to the divine nature.

hath not cut them off, 1) but thy right hand." And 87th 282 Luther says: They are one person, which is Psalm: "Lord, make thy right hand known," that is, show inseparable. This is also true; but does it follow that each thy power 2c. Matth. 20: "Promise me that my two sons is a quality of the other? Says Luther: Yes; for it is said: will sit next to you, one at your right hand and the other" God has suffered, God has died, God has risen. Answer: 2c. Here also rights is taken for glory or majesty. Now if we have spoken enough of the saying, namely, that the Luther knows how the power of God is everywhere, his speeches have force for the reason that he who has knows how the right of God is everywhere; why then suffered, died, and been scourged is also God; not that does he say that he does not know? He wants to blind therefore the Godhead has suffered, 2c., as Luther himself without doubt.

279 Therefore look up, pious princes, when he says: only one of Solomon's fingers is sore. But here we speak as we must prove that God's right hand is a special place of the "also-at-himself-being of the distinct nature"; as, in heaven, or that Christ must be everywhere; so either when one speaks: God suffers; whether the divine nature with the right hand or with the body of Christ he must give itself suffers, or whether the speech must be understood us one over the eye; and therefore let us put his only personally? that is, well spoken of the person of the syllogism in order, if we may see wherewith he blinded two natures, but pertaining only to the One Nature.

us. Luther says: such speeches are appropriate for both

- 1) God's rights are universal;
- 2) Christ's body is at the right hand of God;
- 3) Thus Christ's body is everywhere.

(280) Here the first (major) cannot be deficient; for the right hand, that is, the power or authority of God, is universal. So we must see what deficiency the other has. Thus we find 1 Thes. 4: "And so we shall be with the Lord always." Here "to be with the Lord" means to be with Him in another way, neither is He halfway; or else we would have to say that our bodies also are halfway. And therefore sq "the creature being with God" is not to be spread out according to the infinite of the Godhead; for if so, the creature would not be a creature, but God Himself. For the one God is infinite and immeasurable. Job. 9: "He alone hath stretched out the heavens." 2) is a creature, it is not possible that it is always 5) not a creature. If then "being all" is only of the one Godhead and And (Cap.) 23: "He alone is, and none can turn aside his counsels." Now "to be omnipotent" is the vein and origin of omnipotence; now if the creature were omnipotent, it would be the Almighty, and therefore the Creator, and not the created.

On the other hand, we are half ashamed of human nature that we do not recognize it as a creature. And this does not serve to disgrace Christ, but it is the marvelous thing of which David says that the Son of God, through whom all things were created, has also taken to himself the creatures which he made. Now if the humanity of Christ is a creature, it is not possible that it is always 5) not a creature. If then "being all" is only of the one Godhead and Creator, it follows that the humanity of Christ is with God as a creature, although the highest creature that is in heaven and earth; and that it never leaves the kind of creature. Hominem, quem adsumpsit, from amigit the

Behold, pious princes! all this would come from our ancients have spoken; and we before with the word: "He saying, The right is universal; so is the humanity of Christ risen, and is not here", and in this place, have sufficiently universal. Therefore the defect is, that if we say, Christ indicated, that is at the right hand of God, (we) should not be able to

- 1) unburden - redeem.
- 2) i.e. extended.

3) This "so" seems too much.

4) "for" put by us instead of: "to whom".

5) evermore - ever.

he had true humanity in him in all ways, and was not everywhere when the angel spoke this 2c.

285 Let us make the matter still more pure. Christ says John 14: "We," that is, I and the Father, "will come to him who loves me and have our abode with him. From this we will now see an account that will not suffer the other saying: Christ's body is at the right hand of God, to be understood differently, neither that it is at the right hand of God, as a creature is with God. Thus.

- 1) God is everywhere;
- 2) Whoever loves Christ, with him is God:
- 3) So is he who loves Christ everywhere.

Here you see well, pious princes, where the defect is, namely, that of being with God, or, God being with man. For if God is with man, he remains everywhere; and the creature nevertheless remains in one place, and is also with God. Thus the humanity of Christ remains with God as one creature, and remains in one place; but the Godhead is everywhere.

287 Another calculation made on the life in heaven alone:

- 1) We will be with the Lord all the way; ¹⁾
- 2) The Lord is everywhere:
- 3) We will also be like this everywhere.

It is equally as false as the previous one. For "to be with the Lord" carries with it the secret connotation or touching, as the creature is with God. But it does not follow that the creature is with God, as he is everywhere. All this teaches us even more clearly that Christ speaks John 17: "I will, Father, that where I am, there My servant may be also. Here is a loud "where"; so I will now bring it out unconcealed:

- 1) We will be servants of Christ where Christ is. ²⁾
- 2) Christ is everywhere after mankind. ³⁾
- 3) We will be like this everywhere.

Behold, pious princes, how Christ himself instructs us that he is not everywhere after mankind, but in one place, when he says, "We shall be with him. Now it is certain that we will not be everywhere where the Godhead is; so it must follow that we and he are in one place after the body.

So here with the humanity of Christ. Paul speaks Phil. 2: "For this reason God has given him to be.

hear." Understand therefore that he suffered for us. If then suffering is a cause of exaltation, he is never exalted, so that his humanity is universal, as Luther says, before death. But if after death he is all things to all men, as he is to the Godhead, what need has he to go to heaven if he had been before all things?

But saith Luther, How may these things be? Answer: Are you a master in Israel and do not know that one should not know more than the true fear of God teaches? Or can you not take from the visible things a figurative knowledge of the eternal invisible* things? Consider for me 4) the sun! It is a body, a body that is surrounded, surrounded, surrounded, which is not at all in two places; but at the same time it illuminates and shines through the whole world, so that there is neither an end nor a place of air, whether in it, under it, around it, since its light is not. The Indian sees the sun, which the Hispanic sees; the Muscovite is in the sunshine, in which the Moor is, but the body of the sun is in none of the places. It is also none of the places or people with the body of the sun.

Thus the Sun of Righteousness, Christ Jesus, true God and man, is everywhere with the appearance and splendor of His divine power and being. But the body of mankind is alone in one place and is recognized and seen throughout the world with the eyes of the soul and faith. It is enough for us, if he is bodily only in one, his place. We do not wish him to come down, as we do not wish the sun to come down; it is enough for us in its place. There would come a Phaeton or a Luther, who would want to confuse, mix and confound it all. Let Christ sit there and let the light of his grace shine down to us; let him give light, joy, delight and pleasure to those who are above and around him, and yet be in only one place, and be seen and worshipped by all creatures. For after that he is one creature 2c. which cannot be separated 5). So it is with all the parables that Luther brings in.

The voice or sound is heard 6) a hundred thousand times a hundred thousand people, or as much as Luther wants. Still, the man or bell is only in one place, whose voice or sound is heard so far. So Christ is word and knowledge in the whole world, and he remains in one place.

1) Marginal gloss: 1 Thess. 4 [v. 17.]

2) Marginal gloss: Are words of Christ.

3) Marginal gloss: Are Luther's words.

4) Marginal gloss: A pious example.

5) It should probably be read "ausgetennt", that is, extended.

6) In the old edition: include.

The eye sees far; but the eye is in One place alone, and comes [not], 1) whither it sees. So Christ is in one place according to the eye, that is, according to humanity; but with the face, that is, according to the Godhead, he is everywhere. Since Luther says of the opalo, he shows himself that he klinim, lib: 37, oap. 6, either has not read or has not understood. Let it be, however, that the gold migeln 2) appears through the whole stone, and yet is only on one oertlet; but that is how it is for us.

294 "That Christ's body passed through the sealed tombstone," says Luther, not the Schrist. "The angel has taken away the tombstone," says the evangelist. Then the declared corpse did not have to penetrate through the tombstone. Luther's sheriff in red pants, the coarse knob, would like to come out. But that is the miracle in the original state, that he himself has risen. And shall we not make miracles, since they are not; or else the blind Jew may mock us, that we seal up the penetration for a miracle, and be it not in our Scripture. But be it so, nor prove it, that therefore the body of Christ is more than in one place. So, that his body went in to determined doors, that it penetrated through the substance of the door, the Scripture also does not say. And we must not help the power of God with our lying; for there are many other ways by which one may understand the declared body of Christ to have entered. There is not a place in the world where there is not air, God gives, how well one may refrain from preserving and obstructing anything; nor does air come into all places and ends. Therefore, if the declared corpse's ring-ready 3) and obedient ones are more flexible than the air, and if we are not aware of the purity of the air, then the body of Christ, like the air, would like to come to a place. But be it as it may, if it has passed through the door, it is not yet proved that it is everywhere, or that it is no more than in one place, since it has ever been.

So now the account "the right hand of God is everywhere" 2c. The reason for this is the deception that mankind is at the right hand of God, like the Godhead; but this is not so; but it is at the right hand of God, like a creature (Luther compares

even the humanity of Christ to another holy natural man, as is heard), but it must be in One Place. Just as God, who is everywhere, is in us, and yet we are no more than in one place; and we also will be with God, who is everywhere, but we will be in only one place. For he must be like us, his brethren, in all things, Heb. 2, except the sinful, Heb. 4. But we also want to have proved herewith that the transfigured bodies are circumscriptive, that is, encompassed, circumscribed, and circumscribed in one place, ex parte locati not of the air or other circumstance half, non ex parte locantis in circumfuso aere; for we are well provided that in heaven it may not be of the air, but God it is all in all. Still the bodies will be in eternity, that they will be one, and in one place, and no more. So also the body of Christ 2c.

Now we come again onto the track, and we have insurmountably proven that the body of Christ is encompassed for eternity, and we care neither for sophists nor for Luther's refutation; for we have proven that we are encompassed with God's Word, not with philosophy, even though philosophy is also with us.

297. Now follows further in Luther's art: 4) "On the other hand, let a thing be *definite in* one place," [the^ he translates "incomprehensible". So Christ is in the gravestone and wooden door (it is good that he does not make it isin [iron], or else we would first not come anywhere through with him), there he makes him 5) definite, that is, 6) final and certain in one place; for that is *definite*, final, certain to be in one place; as when an angel, soul, or spirit is in a cloud or in a body, there the angel is certainly present; but he is final, so that therefore he is not everywhere. And the soul holds the body, and is nowhere substantial outside the body, and the body does not comprehend or embrace the soul, but the soul leads and holds the body. And since the body loses a thigh or arm, the soul loses no part of it, for it has no lying parts or limbs. It is still so endowed that it is in only one place, whether it is in the body or outside the body.

298. on this explanation, which Luther cannot deny, we ask him thus: whether Christ, since he penetrated through the gravestone and door, as they say, would have taken the declared body to himself.

1) The inclusion of the "not" seems to us commanded by the context.

2) Luther, No. 21, § 160: "a little spark, flame or bubble in the crystal". "Migeln" perhaps formed from mica, a little bite.

3) i.e. ease.

4) Marginal gloss: Is sim Luthers im Mögend ü lan ders 7ten Tafel. [No. 21, § 136.]

5) "him" put by us instead of: "him".

6) Randglosse: So much vermag dsünitiv".

or not? He says: Not; then he was circum-scriptive, corporaliter, localiter, that is, encompassed with bodily manner, of body and air half, in one place, and not like a spirit, soul or angel. And Luther is wrong in saying that he was definite, that is, final, like a soul. He says: Yes; he has already taken the declared body to himself. Why then does he say afterwards: 1) he is repletive or impletive, that is, supernatural, as he tollretschet, 2) all over? Did Christ also have two declared bodies, one that was only in one place, like a soul or angel, the other that was everywhere, like the Godhead? Behold, Luther's doctrine is as good as if one put an oxen's handle into a dog's pen. Should the unclean woman Chätinen [Käthen], the Sophisterei, be led into the holy scripture, and should she therefore not really be needed? Is that honest? But for the sake of it:

Know, your dear, pious princes, that no declared corpse, much less the corpse of Christ, can be definite, that is, terminal (understand, like the spirits), in one place! Cause: to be final in one place is only of the louder spirits, which are creatures, and lead and govern something body. What does now the transfigured corpse of Christ lead? Yes, he is led by the Godhead through the means of the soul: So it is not so final, definite, in one place, as the spirits, as Luther speaks of it; so it is not supernatural all over, as is heard, or else we should also be all over; for as the declared bodies are in one place, we do not call supernatural; for we have not otherwise from Scripture, than that the declared bodies shall all have one kind, though one clearer than another; even as men have all a common form, but one is more beautiful than another: but Christ hath ascended to heaven with his declared body, and sitteth at the right hand of God according to the nature and kind of all declared bodies. For if this were not the case, we would be deprived of the hope of the first rites, the transfiguration and the ascension. Now if his body were everywhere, as Luther says, and we well know that our bodies will not be everywhere, for Christ says, "In my Father's house are many mansions" (many mansions receive the infinite), then our security would ever be weakened, for we could never think that we would be declared to heaven, like Christ, when

He would not come to heaven in any other way, nor would we. But if he be the firstfruits of all them that die in faith, 1 Cor. 15 Cap. it is certain that he is now as we shall be, and we shall be as he now is.

After all this, we return to the words of the postilion in which he said that some do wrong who want to make an omnipotent man out of the humanity of Christ. And give him his words to consider carefully, which he sets forth in the Confession:

Luther. 3) "But now he is such a man, who is supernaturally with God One Person, and apart from this man is no God" 2c., which follows, serves for the *impletive or repletive esse in loco*.

Here I ask Luther what he wants with the other part of the words (for we are one with the first), since he speaks: "and 4) apart from this man there is no God"? So I ask him: whether God was also before Christ became man? I mean, yes: God was God without human nature at that time. But if he wants to say: he is talking about the form when he took man to himself, then I ask him what he wants with the word "except"? If he wants to say: that the Godhead does not extend further, neither mankind (therefore words must ever be used in things), then it follows that Christ had to know, to order, [to] like all things 2c., but against this are his words, which we have heard. For if God is everywhere, and according to Luther mankind is also everywhere, then it follows that he sees, may, order all things 2c. It also follows that he suffered no more than on the cross, and had joy elsewhere 2c.

If by the word "apart" Luther means that God is nowhere, since he is not man, then we are one; for God is in no place, since he is not man. If, however, by "apart from" he means that God is nowhere, humanity is also there, he is mistaken, as has been sufficiently shown. It cannot be reversed in the *dialectica either*: God is man where he is; so mankind is where he is. It is not proper: Louis is king where he is: so is the kingdom or queen where he is; for if he lies captive, the kingdom is not where he is.

I alone indicate that the wretched fools who carry Luther's book so high see that they are much more foolish, neither he is evil. For he speaks that everyone may grasp that he only seeks colors to talk himself out of. For who has ever so-

3) No. 21, § 143.

4) Marginal gloss: Vüw, HUÄ6 verdorum praesti^a!

1) Marginal gloss: [Luther in the arc] h on [the] 8th plate. [No. 21, § 138.]

2) tollretschet - toll schwatzt. The word is formed by Zwingli to say "dolmetscht" mockingly. Cf. § 111 of Scripture No. 23 in this volume.

speaks: "Apart from this man there is no God"? He wants to go away with his hand in the air, God give! was 1) he would come; the gaechs do not want to see that. And so this speech: "outside this man is no God", is not only childish, but falsely blasphemous.

But if our answer would turn out to be too much, if we should answer all errors according to necessity, then after such a clear explanation we will let everyone open his own eyes in this matter. And we do not want to add anything more here than some more repugnant words of Luther, and thus conclude the matter.

Luther: 2) "And it should remain for me a bad Christ, who would be no more, than in a single place, at the same time a divine and human person" 2c. Behold, pious princes, what strange birth of new senses and words! First of all, who says that Christ is a person only in one place? Do we not say that God is a person everywhere? And where God is, there He is 3) man? Only this we exclude, that the 3) man is not bodily everywhere, where God is; because he was not bodily in heaven, when he died on the cross, and this does not break nor weaken the person.

Take an example from the rapture of Paul. This was the person of Paul, when the mind was immediately raptured in the third heaven. The other example of us: We will be with God, who will fill us [with] all joy and gladness, delight us, and satisfy us; and he will be everywhere, and we not; but we will see him who is everywhere, and how he is. 1 John 3: "Beloved brethren, we are already the sons of GOD: but that which we shall become is not yet opened: but this we know, when the same shall be opened, that we shall be like him, and shall see him as he is." The third example: that we see the sun shining over the whole world, and yet the sun is not of one country or man, but of all, and does them all good. The fourth: that each one of us sees the whole sun, which is greater than the whole earth; and though none of us be with the sun in all places, yet each one sees it enough.

307. so if he is with us, let us go up to the humanity of Christ and see how he is God, pervades all things, and the man who is supreme at the right hand of God sees all things through the divinity that is personal to him.

is united, himself, God and man, and man in the Godhead, so that nothing at all is hidden from him according to the declaration; for according to it he said, "All authority is given to me in heaven and earth," all through the Godhead. Before he did not know some things; but as he [as] man sees all things, so therefore he is not all things according to mankind, as is heard; and this separates the person [as little] as it separates the man, that with knowledge he sees the whole world', and yet his body is no more than in One Little Oert of the world 2c.

308 Secondly, first of all, who has ever said that Christ is both a divine person and a human person? Christ is at the same time a divine person and a human person? 4) He who says this makes two persons. We say, then, that two essentially distinct natures are One Person; and "essentially" here is distinguished from 5) "existing" and "preserved. For just as the human body is essentially a part of the human being, but does not maintain and exist on itself, but in the power of the soul: so human nature is essentially a part (so Luther also speaks, and there is no power in words, if we can only grasp the understanding rightly) of the person of Christ; but not that it has its own continuance, ὁμόστασις, but its continuance and resounding is the divine person; therefore the divine and human natures are only One Person, as has been sufficiently heard. Now what does Luther want of the quackery? Yes, I also want to think that he has seen how much he wants in Scripture, so he is not yet sufficiently reported to speak of the person of Christ. But if he is reported, and brings such hurtful speeches, then he is a 2c.

Luther (Is in the [arc] h on the 5th panel): 6) "For if the *alloeosis* existed (then see, pious princes, how he raises [to] fear their strength!), that one nature would be taken for the other; such would nevertheless concern only the works or transactions of the natures, and not the essence of the natures."

Behold, pious princes! what does he bring us here! Luther does not yet see that where the theologians say "two natures," they do not mean that each nature is not its own essential thing; rather, they only shun the word "essence," and put nature for it, so that one does not fall into it, as if human nature had its own existence and its own preservation; and then there would have to be two persons.

1) d. i. whereupon. Cf. § 82 of this paper.

2) Marginal gloss: Is in [arc] i [at the] 2nd panel. [No. 21, § 144.]

3) Marginal gloss: He and The.

4) Luther did not speak like this. Compare No. 21, § 144.

5) Marginal gloss: Lsse, adLn-osi-Hvat

6) No. 21, § 133.

But actually to speak, if you understand "essence" as we have purified, for "true nature and quality," for a thing that can be received and is its own, but does not have its own continuance; so mankind is essential in Christ, and suffers essentially, that is, rightly as a man who is man alone. And suffers, as the corpse of the pure man suffers essentially, which nevertheless has continuance and preservation in the soul, that the soul therefore does not suffer. Now I do not want to teach that therefore someone should say "two natures" for "two natures", because the word xxx<rra "r-5, being, as also Jerome recognizes, is dangerous; for not everyone knows what difference there is between "being", if it is able as much as "being"; and if it is able as much as having its own being and existence. Example. To be wise is also a "being"; yet it has no existence of its own, neither in the mind of man 2c., and therefore I leave it enough with two natures.

312 But if one nature is taken for the other, this concerns only the works and transactions of the natures, not the essence, as Luther says. This is nothing but an obscuring. For if he means to say that the nature taken for the other is not the essence of the other at all, that is, it is not the other nature at all, then he is speaking Christianly and rightly, and we are once again one, for we should not mix the natures. But why then does he make two things of essence and nature? But if he does not mean the work and business of natures, but that each has its own work and business, but if he means to say that each work is essential to the other, he means to deceive us either by the word "essence"; for if it be taken for "subsist" and "maintain," it is true and certain that everything which the humanity of Christ suffers, suffers therefore, that it has its continuance in the Godhead. And therefore Scotus, I mean *super tertium*, is forced to recognize that everything, so Christ suffered, is wonderful, as if 1) it also is. Ps. 117. [118, 23.] But it is nevertheless a nature of its own, like the body of the pure man. But if he does not seek escape under the word "nature," but thus says: If one nature is taken for another, then that which is said of the hidden nature is not actually said of it, he is mistaken; for there is John 3: "The Son of man which is in heaven"; if the "name" is taken for the "divine nature," and the divine nature was truly and essentially in heaven.

However, such obscurations are nothing else, neither blindings of the bad,

- 1) "Whether" seems to be too much.

and spy out how one might escape. And therefore we want to set the words here and those before [in the arc] k on the 4th panel 2) against each other. Luther: "Because all works or sufferings are not assigned to natures, but to persons." Luther [in the arc] L on the 5th panel: 3) "If it existed that one nature was taken for the other; such would nevertheless concern only the works or transactions of the natures" 2c.

Behold, pious princes! whether the two speeches do not look together like the devil and the seven-pointed star, like a proverb? But it shall happen to one: he who does not remain on the chariot must walk in the mud afterwards.

Accordingly, we will continue to hear him from word to word in those places where he was not ashamed of the truth. Luther, in the foregoing place of the postilion: 4) "He was full of grace and wisdom, so that everything that occurred to him he was able to judge and teach; therefore, the Godhead, who alone sees and knows all things, was personal and present in him. And finally, what has been said of Christ's abasement and exaltation is to be added to man; for divine nature can neither be abased nor exalted."

Behold here, pious princes! [First, how Luther admits to the Godhead alone, since it sees and knows all things. Second, that he admits to humanity that it "can" judge and teach all things from the Godhead for the sake of personal union; but he has withdrawn from it the foreknowledge beforehand, and not unjustly. Thus it follows that the humanity of Christ did not know all things before the Declaration, although it took all judgment, doctrine, and truth from the Godhead. From this we can see that the Godhead thereby reserved for it the foreknowledge in several things and made it known that Christ was true man, who therefore was not made infinite. 2c. Thirdly, Luther recognizes, just as we do, that everything that is said about the lowering and raising of Christ is to be attributed to human nature alone. For this is the reason why people quarrel here when he sometimes says: "God suffers"; as if the simple should understand: the divine nature in him suffers. Yes, he himself says it publicly, as has been heard.

317. read what follows in the often-mentioned postilion after the words: "Which He set

2) No. 21, § 130. So that the reader is not misled, we advise him to read Luther's writing himself!

3) No. 21, § 133.

4) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XII, 155 f., § 12.

has to an heir of all things"; 1) so he finds even clearer that we say of Luther that he holds of the two natures that are One Christ wholly as we do.

318 If we, pious princes, have saved our doctrine of the allosis or counterchange against Luther from God's Word, and if there is much disputation and sparring, in which something dark might easily be spoken, which we nevertheless do not mean to be dark or erroneous, then I will explain myself in a summa [i.e., exponam], as I hold it of both natures in Christ; thus:

I know that the eternal, almighty 2c. Son of God true, whole, prestigious, without the sinfulness, deadly humanity, which is a created sea! from heaven, and a natural body, created by the pure handmaid Mary, and born of the conception of the Holy Spirit, thus joined to Himself and to Himself in the unity of the Person of the Son of God, that they are One Christ, One inseparable Person, and yet each nature of the unified Person retains its nature and characteristic; only that His humanity does not have its own existensexistentiamrwiam, that is, existence for itself, but in the Person of the Son of God; just as in us humans the flesh has its own nature and existence, but does not exist for itself, but is maintained in existence by the soul. I also recognize 2) that the two natures in Christ can never be separated from each other, that they are not one person. And although the humanity is taken up into the unity of the person through the means of the soul, as through the suitable part (for God is also a spirit), and therefore the soul is separated from the corpse in death, so that his holy corpse lay there, like another body that had been disembodied, or (as we speak) made lifeless, truly dead, truly lonely, truly powerless: still so is the person as little separated in the separation of the body and the soul, when soul and body were with each other. Cause, the soul of Christ is not the sustainer xxxxxxxxxx, of the continuance, of the human Nature, but the Godhead is the sustainer of the existence and permanence of the body and the soul, both parts of the whole mankind. And therefore the person of the natural man is in that place an inadequate example of the person of Christ. For when the soul of the natural man is separated from the body, then the man is no longer a person. Cause, that the soul, which is an inheritance

is the sustainer of the human person, is no longer with the body; and is therefore no other nature that keeps it in unity with the person. But in Christ the Godhead is the "sustaining nature", which also surpasses his soul, as holy as it is, with power and holiness, as far as God and the Creator surpass all creatures; therefore in it not only the soul, and through the soul the body, but body and soul are sustained. Since his body and soul were separated from each other, the person was not separated, since the parts of the one nature were separated; because the whole mankind consisted in the Godhead with body and soul. I see also from these reasons that the humanity of Christ must eternally be the assumed nature, before and after the original state; for otherwise there would have to be two assumptions of human nature; one, that humanity would have been embraced before death and would have been assumed sufferingly; the other, after the original state, that would have made humanity infinite; but there is only One humanity, and only one is [once] assumed, which also exists in the Godhead, and not in it itself. Therefore the Godhead, which is infinite in all ends, is to her, mankind, all sufficiency, all light, all knowledge, that mankind may be to no work nor deed everywhere; but, as the elect in their place, where God delights them, have all sufficiency and delight in God, who is equally everywhere, and they are only in One place: so also the mankind of Christ is with them, and is satiated so much higher in all power, knowledge, being, joy and delight, as much more there is. Being a person with GOD, neither being only a creature of GOD. I also recognize that it is impossible for human nature to be all-essential; it is impossible for there to be more than One God. For God's intrinsic quality is that He alone is omnipresent; and if the creature were omnipresent, then God Himself would be; and then there would be many Gods. Again, I perceive that, although the humanity is not omnipresent, as the Godhead, yet the person is not divided, yea, less divided, neither if it were omnipresent: for if it were omnipresent, it would now be perverted into the Godhead, and would no longer be Christ; for Christ is eternal God and man, that is, the person of whom we speak. Where now the received nature would be reversed into the receiving nature, the person would be gone; for the person Christ must have two natures, one "receiving" and one "received". Now if Christ were to be humanity everywhere, this would have to come solely from the fact that it would be inverted into the Godhead.

1) Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XII, 156.

2) recognize - confess. Cf. § 368 of this writing, where Erkenntniß - Bekenntniß stands.

it would no longer be the "preserved" nature; and therefore the person of the Son of God alone would be the divine nature, and not the human one, and Christ would not be a true man for us in eternity. I also recognize that, for the sake of personal inseparable unity, the natures are taken for each other and exchanged, and nevertheless remains to each nature its characteristic, and only One Person. God remove all error from all living hearts! Amen.

This is, pious princes, the sum of my explanation, which has been sufficiently proven with writings before, also so irrefutable that no theologians may bring anything against it. For even among the ancients the difference between the two natures was so well investigated and founded in Tertulliano, Hilario, Ambrosio, Augustino, that in many hundreds of years it has not come onto the track. track has come. So far at this time, Luther makes humanity a deity, and needs for this the absurda, that is, the clumsy arguments of the Arrian heretics; as is invented in Tertulliano ad Praxeam, and in Ambrosio, de sacramento dominicae incarnationis. Has indicated to me Heymrich [Hcinrich] Bullinger: but the Anabaptists say he is a prophet, and not the natural Son of God. But be unconcerned, pious princes! they must all break and lie down. I have no doubt that Luther will seek something so that he will not give up the war so easily; but it will not help.

From the place: the meat is not useful at all.

Now when Luther wants to take this in hand: "the flesh is not useful", he rumbles before, and says: 1) Luther: "Therefore be an analem", and curses, where it is said that Christ is born of flesh" 2c. As if one of us said that the humanity of Christ was born of sinful flesh, and did not realize that it was conceived by the Holy Spirit in the pure body of the virgin Mary, and there became flesh or man. And thus rumbles between the two names of the flesh, since "flesh" means the sinful conception and kind, and is also called the immaculate beautiful human nature and image of God, as Adam was a man before the fall, and as Christ is man, who brings back the fall.

322. for this he does with many words, like

1) Marginal gloss: Is [in the arc] I on the 7th panel. [No. 21, § 192.)

as if "the flesh of Christ", whose seed is the spirit, did not take its bodily origin and growth from the pure field of the virgin body, but was only a spirit (as he 2) speaks); all this, however, is enough to diminish the divine goodness. For the more truly God is recognized as having taken on human nature for our sake, the more surely we see that we are dear to Him as our Aeti [i.e. Father].

But we recognize that it is a Marcionian heresy, as Luther says: that the flesh of Christ is a spirit; for how can it be a spirit, which with such pains is united to the cross, 3) that it cries out: "O my God! how hast thou forsaken me"? But the fact that Christ's whole action leads us and brings us to spiritual life does not mean that he is a spiritual substance according to the nature of mankind, but a bodily man. Summa! These are all arrows of the mocking Arian heretics, as indicated before.

But you, simple, pious Christian, will be able to beware of the wagging dog, which beats with its tail now on one side and soon on the other. You know well what we think of the true humanity of Christ; you also know well what we think of our desert flesh, that we do not suspect the holiness of Christ's humanity anywhere.

(325) Yes, says Luther, even the Holy Spirit is pure poison where it is received without faith. 4) As if the Holy Spirit were a thing enjoyed or received by unbelievers. Lift up the magic of thick words, through which the simple may not see.

326 And therefore, putting all circumstances aside, we will now depart safe and sound, and give you, pious princes, to hear thus. We have honestly scolded Luther for omitting a few words of "that" from the words: "The flesh is of no use at all. But he is responsible for this in such a way that we would now like to scold him even more. For as the Greek language has articles and pointers, like the German, the Latin does not; so Luther needs speed: he interprets 5) the Greek words: x "üx xxxxxx xxxxx, first into the Latin: Caro non prodest quicquam, so that he can interpret from the Latin words:

2) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther, in Arc] 1 at the 7th plate. [No. 21, § 194 deceptively listed].

3) i.e. extended.

4) Compare No. 21, §197 to this statement by Zwingli.

5) Marginal gloss: Is [with Luther in the bow] m [at the] first panel. [No. 21, § 199.]

"Flesh is not useful": so he should also translate from the Latin: "the flesh is not useful." 1) For to the word "spirit" he thus says, "The spirit"; and not, "Spirit is he who makes alive." Thus he should also, *virtute antitheseos*, by force of contrast, have made from the Latin *oa.ro* "the flesh", and not "flesh".

327) Notice further, pious princes, that Luther does not yet recognize the articles, which I have misinterpreted, that they show all the way. 2) For although they do not always show demonstratively, that is, grossly presently (as, if I say, with a long "The 3) woman has denied the rebirth; and point with the finger at her), they do always show the actual thing that is spoken of before; or they bring forth a thing well, of person or being; therefore I have rendered them "pointers", not "pointers". When I say that a woman should be obedient, I am not pointing to any particular woman, for this is short; but I am pointing to the nature and status of women, and the little pointer means that it belongs to every woman that she be obedient. Here the article separates the essence from the person; for one does not speak of this or that particular woman, but of the whole sex. But when I say, Marc. 6: "Is he not the carpenter?" Here, the more obvious one indicates the person, namely, the person of Christ, whom they all knew well, according to his handiwork. And the little pointer is able to do so much that we see that he was personally known to all men.

Before I go any further, I must nevertheless indicate that it seems to me that Luther may not have understood me there; for when I made a virgule 5) over the other one, *accentum gravem*, the printer took it for an ä, and made "där"; I also never noticed this until Luther did so desolately; then I also looked at the print, and thus find: Där Zimmermann; but it should thus say: Is he not the carpenter? 2c. But that the little pointers also point to the thing, of which spoken before

1) Randglosse: Viäe, xarnrn aoyue a^ant Uutirerani, ynum aäeo maligne turaultuontur!

2) marginal gloss: eximiura et nobily kaeiunt
a-r^eoece/e-rs, esse-rör'anr.

3) In this doubled the Zwingel has used in the autot^po in the middle to both times a Greek iota with a Cirkumflex (x) to make the emphasis of theprononrinis sierLonstrativi quite clear. (Walch.)

4) Here Zwingel has characterized his, in order to distinguish it from the preceding with a circumflex, m in the middle with an iota and accent (x) to indicate the article par excellence. (Walch.)

5) virAula - a small stroke.

and yet not be relativa, or subjectivi articuli, is thus evident that no leaf in the Greek language is ever written on which that is not publicly invented, that distorts me to indicate example therefore; but let us train ourselves with little.

329. John 1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God". Here, the little pointer in the first place is a pointer of the person, namely, of the Son of God, whom he calls "the Word", or "thing", of which he wants to speak. In the other place, however, it not only points to the person, but also 7) äfert, as if it thus speaks: The same word; that one sees that it does not speak of another word, but means the very word, of which is also said before, and is nevertheless not relative to.

330. there: *rd φως Τό ἀληϋόν*, "the Light was the true light. Here the first pointer can do so much as a demonstrative, a finger pointer, and is not a finger pointer with the Greeks, but only a small pointer. But it can do as much as the light, of which I said, or, just the same light. And the other pointer is able to bring forth the essence that the light of which it says is the right true light.

331. Joh. 6. this observation, that is, with diligence noted piece, becomes quite obvious. When Christ began to say to the Jews and disciples, "What is the true bread from heaven?" he said to the last: "I am the bread of life. Here a short "that" is only a pointer; nor can it do more than this: I am the bread of life, of which I have said unto you.

332 But after this he says: "Truly I say to you: He that trusteth in me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life." But here is a little pointer, "that", nor is it able to point and point to the bread, 7) which is spoken of.

333 Soon after, it says: "I am the living bread that comes down from heaven. Here, the first "that" can be seen as pointing to and referring to the bread of which the speech began. The other "that" is a striking out of the essence, namely, that he came from heaven.

334 So it is also with the flesh. Luther says: In the words "the flesh 8) is not useful at all" the little pointer "the" points to the

6) Here and in the following places Zwingel has designated his d as with an aeeentu Zravi. (Walch.)

7) d. i. repeated.

8) Marginal gloss:

evil way of the flesh. 1) And seeth not that it yieldeth to the flesh for and for, whereof it was spoken before. So Christ spoke before: "And the bread, which I will give you, is the flesh mine, which I will give for the world. Here the little pointer stands in the "the flesh mine" to indicate the being actually.

335 Soon after this the Jews said, "How can he give us the flesh 2) to eat? Behold! Here, pious princes! the little pointer "the" stands so dear and strong, and points to the flesh, of which Christ spoke (although his opinion was not that it should be eaten bodily, as the Jews assumed), that the Latin interpreter has made a being out of the Greek that, and thus interprets: How may he give us his flesh to eat? According to this, the pointers for and for stand at the "flesh", so that one can see that all speech is of One flesh; although the Jews understood otherwise, [that] it would be said of it, neither Christ carried out. And therefore he also gives an answer to accept their error, and says:.

336. "It is the Spirit that gives life; the flesh (x -a^E) is of no use at all." Here the little pointer "that" runs along all the way, and misleads Luther (just as a pious servant keeps her wife, that one may not do anything rude with her), that he does not like to deal with the words, as lust teaches him, and points hard to the flesh, to which it has pointed before for and for, and points to the flesh, and says: "The flesh", of which you only want to understand, as if it must be eaten, that is not a thing that is useful to eat. For the eating, that is, to be put off, of which I say, the one spirit must do. And that in this place the little pointer "that" should and must be put forward, we want to prove first with Christ, and then with Luther's words.

337 Christ thus saith, The Spirit is he that quickeneth. Then I ask Luther: whether here the little hands "the" and "he" may well be omitted, as with the flesh, as he says? he will have to say: that they may not be omitted; for the Latins have a *Latinis in relativum translatum, ne putet nos temere loqui de vi articulorum, το πνεῦμα ἐστὶ τὸ ζωοποιούν*. But why do the little hands not like

be omitted? Therefore, that they actually and personally point out what is understood by the Spirit here. "The Spirit is that which quickeneth," or "the Spirit is that which quickeneth. If one were to omit the "he" and say: Spirit is that which gives life, then the word "Spirit" would stand in the common, and it would not be clear that it alone would be taken for the divine Spirit essentially and personally. But if the double "the" is there, one sees that he speaks essentially of the particular Holy Spirit, and not in the common of spirit, that is, of spiritual being, life, or discipline. For the latter does not make us alive, but if we are already alive in the Holy Spirit, we live spiritually.

338 If then the little pointer is not to be omitted from the Spirit, because it speaks of the special Holy Spirit of God, then the little pointer is also not to be omitted from the flesh, because it points to the special flesh of Christ, which is of absolutely no use to eat bodily, because it is an antithesis, a contrast.

339] As if one of Paul, 1 Cor. 3, said to the bishops, "Behold, all your buildings are nothing but pure gold! and the stingy bishops wanted to understand: they should see that all their dishes and housings were golden (as they unfortunately have done!), and say: Who would bring about so much gold? They would be answered: The clear, undeceived truth is that which is to be built by you; gold is of no use at all. Here you can see that this word "gold" means, first, that it should be built, but not according to the mind of the stingy. Secondly, gold is rejected, which is also named before, but not according to the mind of the miser, and is rejected according to its meaning, that it should be of no use at all for the building. 4)

340 Now Luther's proof follows. He speaks of the urge, 5) since we had written: as far as Christ spoke of the evil kind of the flesh, he would not have answered the disciples to their error, since they thought that he had spoken of bodily food, and therefore did not murmur against the mind of the fleshly kind; for nothing at all was spoken of it.

Luther [in the arc] m at the 8th panel: 6) "Ah! it is indeed vexatious Dina, with such boys in God's word act. We say that the disciples grumbled both against the mind of the

1) Luther did not say that. Cf. No. 21, 88 210 and 227.

2) Marginal gloss: rHv

3) In the old *autotypo* stands *praepositium*, a print error. (Walch.)

4) i.e. to serve, to do.

5) i.e. the distress [into which he had got].

6) No. 21, § 214 f.

Spirit, and against the bodily eating of the flesh of Christ; for they understood none rightly. "2c.

342 Here I will enforce from Luther, if it must ever be enforced, that Christ speaks of his own flesh, that he is not useful to eat; thus: Luther confesses that the disciples murmured against the mind of the spirit, and against the bodily eating. Now spiritual understanding and bodily eating are not of one sex, unius generis, so that they may be understood together. And therefore I ask Luther: is neither 1) the right understanding? For the Scriptures, as he himself confesses, must have a proper sense. If he says: this is the understanding of murmuring, that they murmured against the spiritual food, then we say. How could they murmur against it, if they had not yet understood it? For he has never named the word "spirit," therefore they murmured only out of lack of understanding. Secondly, they grumbled against the spiritual mind; why then does Luther add that they also grumbled against the bodily food? Because the Scripture must have only one meaning. If they murmured against the spiritual mind and against the bodily food, it would be publicly against each other; for if they murmured against the spiritual mind, they would never eat the bodily food.

343 But putting all the requests aside, Luther recognizes that they have grumbled against the physical food; so this is the most prominent cause of their grumbling. For Luther would not have put it where he could have escaped it by some way; but he did not like to do so, for the words were on his neck, which are thus, "But the Jews murmured on his account," περὶ αὐτοῦ, "that he had said: I am the bread which came down from heaven; and said: Is he not the Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how then does he say: I am come down from heaven?" These words are so bright that no better would be set for us, that the Jews grumbled, "How can he who eats his flesh have eternal life, if he were a natural man, well known to them by his parents? Behold, they speak not against the manner of the spirit, nor against the manner of the flesh, but against the bodily eating, which they supposed to be false.

344 If Luther recognizes that they also murmured against the fleshly food, then it is undoubtedly the right thing to do; for he would not have denied it where he might have done so. 2)

1) i.e. which of the two.

2) i.e. to resist it.

If, then, the Scripture must have a proper natural meaning, it follows that it is the one that Luther also recognizes; namely, that the Jews grumbled against the bodily food (although not rightly understood) and not against the common doctrine of the spirit and flesh, which is not dealt with here. *est enim favorable dicere: plurimum prodesse, si spiritu vivas; esse contra exitiale, si secundum carnem, juxta verbum apostoli, Galat...*

345 Since it has been established that the Jews did not grumble on account of spiritual or carnal understanding, but on account of the fact that they mistakenly thought that Christ wanted to give them his body bodily to eat, it is also evident that Christ's responsibility extends to removing their mistaken opinion, so that they see that he did not speak of a bodily meal at all when he said, "The flesh is of no use at all," that is, to eat, because he wants to exclude the bodily meal from them. And if this is of no use at all, they see that he did not tell them about the bodily eating of his flesh. Therefore the disciples also said, "Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we know it, and believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Behold, pious princes, the faith, and the falling away of the erroneous opinion! and [they] do not remember with a word, that they said, but the unclean flesh hath the poison of death, or the like.

346 Summa, we have previously indicated this place with many strong causes, which prove [that it] must be understood according to the sense which is now indicated, not to be elicited again here. In addition, no Christian has ever been of whom I have heard or read that he understood the words "the flesh is not useful at all": the carnal evil kind is not useful. For it is 4) too easy to all disorder and contradiction that Christ should say: It is not useful; but he had spoken much stronger, as Paul Rom. 8: "The prudence or wisdom and manner of the flesh is death"; so also Luther has in all his previous books our, that is, the right sense known; therefore we are in all ways stronger neither he.

347. but that he presents me as if I had done violence to the Greek articles or pointers half to the teachers, he does as truly as he says on me: I have the words "that is my

3) Marginal gloss: Lutcia I, utūci [that is, a rank of Luther^Λ.

4) Marginal gloss: Intellectus I^Λutūci est contra āccorin xcronas Owristi.

corpse" poor miserable words. I may well have scolded the poor miserable people, who dare to keep the dead letter so idiosyncratically, which they do not understand; but that I have thus scolded the words, that is an open denseness. But half of the pointers read Luther O^{ri}Uum, lib. 1, cap. 4. But there is little in this; we have presented open examples of Scripture for this reason. And herewith let fall the denunciatory gloss, foreign to Christian teachers, which he says about the words: My words are spirit and life, and says, it is so much: I must have spiritual disciples. That is where we come to, that we say what we want, it rhymes or glues itself, when we become so great that one believes us what we say. I also let him put the rule in sackcloth with others, since he explains to himself: Where flesh and spirit stand in opposition to one another in Scripture, "flesh is not taken for the flesh of Christ; for where does he prove it? or where does he find in Scripture a place that is like it, so that he has learned from many places to cast this rule? It is the children's game, if they want to lose the nut, they say: It does not apply so. Show me Luther a place of the Scriptures or a teacher, from which this rule is measured or taken! it is all aörör id est, Burkhart has called it.

348. the value is that he writes in the [arc] n on the seventh panel thus: 1)

Luther: "But Christ does not speak here of His own Spirit, which He has personally; but, as the text reads, of the Spirit that quickeneth, that is, of the common Spirit, which is in all believers; though Christ giveth the same, and Christ is Spirit" 2c.

Behold, pious princes, how beautifully this is spoken! Yes, if the words were the words of a dissolute prankster, who thus wanted to sweet-talk with old women. Tell us, Luther, who is the Spirit that Christ has personally, and that the same is his own Spirit? and who is the other Spirit that he does not have personally, that is not his own Spirit? and thirdly, who is the Spirit that gives life, that Christ gives, and is not his personal Spirit?

In short, they are famous 2) caps. The Holy Spirit is who goes from the Father and the Son, and sends him the Father and the Son. He is the third divine person, and is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, indeed, the bond of them both. He is the Spirit who is in all believers; and

The son is not personally called the spirit, nor is a personal spirit, which, differently, is his, admitted to him. But it is the death sting of one who wrestles with Luther. He sees in the little pointer: "The Spirit is that which gives life" that Christ says of the personal Spirit, who is God; and presses him on, [that] the flesh also must be taken personally; and therefore he convicts it with a cake lump, that one does not know it rightly.

351. Since he tells us to show the analogy of the bread to the body of Christ, if it means him, I do not say anything else, neither that he reads the sixth chapter of John; and if he has read over that, he does not find the analogy, that as the bread strengthens the body, so the only strength, comfort and food of the soul is Christ, so let us fill an egg in water for him, if he wants to eat something; read also Lactantium Firmianum lib. 4. de vera sapientia cap. 18; Augustinum in Ioannem, tractatu 26. et tractatu 13.; and afterwards Oecolampadium.

But the similarity of the chalice, he means, 4) we may not indicate. So let us see! In Jeremiah's 26th vision, God gives the prophet a cup or goblet to give to all the nations to drink with; and Jeremiah takes it and waters all the nations with it. And the watering is nothing else, neither the punishment nor the sorrow that would come upon them, 5) as it is shown afterward to every nation in particular. Each cup is taken for suffering.

353. ezek. 23, 31. "You will," O Haoliba [Ahaliba], that is, Jerusalem, "drink the cup of your sister." But there[times] cup is taken for suffering. For he means to say that the kingdom of Judah must suffer what the kingdom of Samaria also suffered, being destroyed and carried away captive 2c.

354. Isaiah 51: "Arise, arise, Jerusalem! you who have drunk the cup from the hand of the Lord" 2c. But [times] cup is taken for suffering and punishment; for he wants to say that Jerusalem is punished by God 2c. In the prophets are innumerable messages. But [times] in the New Testament.

355. Matth. 20: "May you drink the cup that I will drink?" that is, through such a body.

3) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther] in [arc] q on the 2nd panel. [No. 21, § 255 ff.]

4) Marginal gloss: Is in [Luther's] q [not B] on [the] 7th plate. [No. 21, § 266.]

5) In the old autot^{po} it says "gon ward", i. 6. iturus ernt; in the eonjuZatione xerixkrastiea. (Walch.)

1) No. 21, § 228.

2) i.e. dressed up.

Who will come to such honors of the right that you desire, since I alone will come? Soon after: "You will drink my cup", that is, be killed and suffer 2c. Here he calls their suffering his "cup"; for that which is of the members he makes his.

356. John 18: "Wouldest thou that I should not drink the cup which the Father hath given me?" saith Christ to Petro. Did you want me not to suffer death according to the will of my Father?

357 And Luke 22: "Father, if it is possible, take this cup from me; not my will, but yours be done. This is the most open place, since cup is taken for death and suffering. So the cup in the supper is a symbol, sign, form and figure of the suffering and death of Christ, which he himself called the cup. And I am surprised that Luther looks at it with such a poor request.

The fact that he uses "to break" in the words "which is broken for you" and "to give" in the words "which is given for you" on bread, which is broken and presented, and not on the body of Christ, and says: even though he does not say so, yet let someone keep to the interpretation, is just like other things, in which he introduces a fictitious sense in addition to the natural sense. But I wonder very much what kind of Christian people these are, who see and read such an inverted book, which has so many confused teachings, that they do not see from themselves to what dishonor and diminishment of the suffering of Christ it reaches? As if all the prophets were not full, since "to perish" is taken to mean to suffer and to perish? Isaiah 24, 19: Confractioe confringetur 1) terra etc., "the earth, which is utterly destroyed", that is, glorified 2) and punished. Ezech, 5, 11.: "So will I also commit crime 3) and will not communicate mercy." And not only the xxx is there, but all the words that are called to them are called to be broken. So here "broken" is taken for killed and perished. If Luther does not know this, it is too impudent that he speaks so strongly of an unconscious thing.

359. "Surrender." Rom. 4: "Christ was given for our sins and rose again. John 3: "God so loved the world that He gave His own Son that we might live." Why then is the word "to be given" so strange to Luther that he uses it for the presentation of the bread? Why does he not show a

What is the reason for the predecessor, if he brings anything that serves to diminish the honor of Christ's great suffering?

360. 4) Scholars also see how rightly this is understood 1 Cor. 15: "Why are they baptized for the dead?" since he makes "for" into "before," and wants to have proved thereby that the body of Christ was broken before the disciples, makes "for" into 5) "before": but the Greek language has not a little word which is called for and before, as the Saxons need for before; but ὑπέρ/ for or κατέναντι, or ἔμπροσθεν etc., before; since ver Luther hides behind the stove in the corner of the jack's box.

Luther 6) condemns 7) some who say that faith must have a spiritual aspect; but he takes one of his pieces 8) and says: How then would we believe that the world was created by God? without doubt, that the world is a bodily thing. As if Luther did not understand what they (I think it was the pious Silesians) understood by "believe"; namely: trust, that is, that the treasure and sight of human trust must be "spirit". And is the faith that I believe heaven and earth to be created by God, not the faith that is the "firm trust" in the highest good, but only a "lesson" from faith, because those who called the Historiam, have also spoken something. But Paul Heb. 11: "By faith we know that the world was created by the command of GOD." There we see that this knowledge is a fruit of faith; and not faith, since we trust in GOD: therefore Luther's struggle is kürbsin. 9)

362. But I would like to ask him: whether his finite [ultima] and thorough confidence stands in another thing, neither spirit? So we are confident in Him who says, "God is a Spirit," John 4; and if we recognize Him, we see that all things are not only created by Him, but are also sustained and nourished. Yes, faith cannot suffer that it does not settle on a mere creature; therefore also the theologians have halfway spoken of Christ as distinguishing human nature from divine nature.

4) "Besehind" is in the old autot'po, i.e. vickeunt, Which indicates emen optutivum. (Walch.)

5) "for" nota ^aese-r^rcrce/ "before" denotat ^ron(Walch.)

6) Marginal gloss: Is sim Luther in the bow) t at [the] 5th panel. sNo. 21, § 33 l.)

7) huppen - to scold meanly. Compare the note to Col. 1205.

8) i.e. unclear piece. Compare § 89 and § 91 of this paper.

9) i.e. like the gourd of the prophet Jonah. -

1) Marginal gloss:

2) i.e. devastated.

3) Marginal gloss:

it should not be worshipped. To be worshipped is only of the good in which the soul unquestioningly entrusts itself. Thus one relies on Christ, God and man; therefore we recognize by faith, not only that we have trusted in Jesus Christ, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born 2c., but we say beforehand that he is the only begotten Son of God, and is our Lord and God. For this reason he also proves his divinity everywhere through the gospel of John, so that people may see that they can trust in him without doubt.

363. I also do not want to rumble very much that he speaks: 1)

Luther: "Here it is said of the one Godhead that it is threefold, as three persons" 2c. In which his words, as in all of them, throughout the whole book, are erroneous; for the Godhead is not threefold at all, but only one; and the holy three Persons may never suffer themselves to be threefold; but they are called *trias* or *trinitas*, Dreiling or Trinity. But no *orthodox*, that is, jurist, has ever called them threefold; for they are thus one being, that they are three pure ones, neither mind, memory, and will being one soul.

I completely understand that Luther has entered so many oddities in this note that one may be forgiven for all uncleanliness. For to what purpose do the unchristian sayings serve, that the Godhead is threefold? shall not the simple learn that there are three natures of the holy three persons? and if there are three natures, then there are also three Gods. How can he let such words go out of his mouth? Are the scholars in Saxony blind? or are they such sleepy dogs that they do not bark at the foreign words? or, if Luther speaks unchristian, may they not speak against it? In this book I feel as if I were looking at a sow in the flower garden; so unclean, untheological, so inauthentic is his talk about God and all holy things.

And you theologians (I will name you all across Germany) keep silent, just for the sake of quarreling? Can you not think that even if Luther were right, it would still be better 2) to hang millstones on our necks and sink us, neither that we let such aggravation proceed unchallenged? Yes, I know those who say: Oecolampadius and Zwingli will not leave it unanswered. Is therefore the trade not yours? or are they the ones in whom you have believed? Have not also the apostles all for

themselves, yet One Opinion and from One Spirit, preached?

366 I must also indicate here that Luthern's quarreling brings him to the point that soon afterward he himself recognizes everything that he has fought about before of the two natures, and here of the three persons half; and thereby indicates that he is dealing with quackery. But interrogate him yourself!

Luther in the [Arc] u at the 2nd panel: 3) "Who makes here, 4) that two different natures become one being, and one is spoken the other? Without doubt not the essential unity of natures (for there are two different natures and beings), but the personal unity; for although it is not one being according to the natures, it is nevertheless one being according to the person. And so from this arises two kinds of unity and two kinds of being (as, a natural unity and personal unity), and so on. From the personal unity arises such speech that God is man, and man is God; just as from the natural unity in the Godhead arises this speech that God is the Father, God is the Son, God is the Holy Spirit; and again, the Father is God, the Son is God" 2c.

Behold, pious princes! these words have slipped my mind above, although I had distinguished them. But Luther never made such an acknowledgment 5) above, but put it here behind that, as it would go, he could still saw: I have spoken thus; and this has also been the cause of our forgetting.

Here Luther gives reason why the sayings: God is man, and man is God, are true; and says no other, neither of which we have shown anywhere; therefore that two natures are one person. But above he did not decide between the two natures; 6) but mixed them up so that he said: The divine has suffered, and the human has gone out into all infinity, where the infinite Godhead is; yes, all speech was carried out so, as if he wanted to make mankind omnipotent and the Godhead. He also recognizes that there are two distinct natures and two distinct beings of natures.

I have thanks, Luther! Wohl knows that Luther does not want to understand this word "essence" for "to exist" or "to be a person of one's own" and stasis 7); but for a real, essential, and essential nature.

1) Marginal gloss: Is [with Luther] in the [bow] u an [the] 2ten Tafel. [No. 21, § 342.]

2) d. i. better.

3) No. 21, § 343.

4) Marginal gloss: This is quite a Christian summa, in which we are completely one.

5) i. Confession.

6) d. i. distinguished.

7) Zwingli writes:

For he saith, Though they be not of the same nature, yet they are of the same nature according to the person. There we have two 1) natures: The first is called the quality of the essential natures; the other is called the hypostasis, the self-existent person; thus the two distinct natures are One Person. But when he says, "Two kinds of unity arise here," he understands the one, since the holy three persons are One God, and calls it natural unity; what then may he do with the word "three kinds" above? The other unity he understands the unification of the two essential natures in One Person of Christ. He calls the two different natures two beings; as his examples themselves indicate.

Behold, pious princes! if not Luther's verse in this place at a letter with us helle [consonet, agree], in the long explanation of the Allöosen or Gegenwechsels matter droben gethan.

If only the human nature of a human being, or quality (I take care to put quality, especially, actually, or "nature" for "essence," so that I may not be suspected of making two persons); then the human nature must not be spread out according to the divinity; it must not be everywhere, but be in one place; as this befits the essence or quality of human nature. And Luther is at one with us; and only the seductive, arrogant guests who want to be of an opinion from Luther's book, of which Luther is not at all, last me. However, the fact that Luther waffles now and then should be brought out and corrected, for the divine spirit does not teach that one should give way to the truth with quarrels and bickering, but with discipline and fear.

Accordingly, Luther comes even closer to us when he admits that 2) "the bread is the body of Christ, just as the fiery flame or cloud is the angel, or the dove is the Holy Spirit. And in sum, 3) "so between the bread of the supper and the body of Christ there is a sacramental being". Now the cloud or flame is not the angel; nor the dove the Holy Spirit; so it follows that even according to Luther's position or opinion the bread is not the body of Christ.

374. But that he comes with praedicatione identica is not masterly even in sophistry, as he needs it: 4) Nam sub identitate com-

1) d. i. twice.

2) Marginal gloss: In [Luther's Confession, in the arc v an l'nder] 5th panel. (Ro. 21, § 3474

3) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's writing, in the arc x on the first panel. sNo. 21, § 357.⁹

4) Marginal gloss: distinZuo, yuaru Leotistae.

prehenderet *identitatem corporis et panis reali, essentiali sive formali; personali, an rationali?* Non *reali*, nam ea est, ubi res est eadem; formae autem, hoc est, *virtutes*, sunt diversae; ut: *intellectus, voluntas et memoria* sunt eadem res, distinguuntur tamen virtute; alia enim est vis *intelligendi*, alia *propendendi*, alia *memorandi*; attamen istae vires omnes sunt una eademque anima rationalis. Non *formali* aut *essentiali*; sic enim conjunctiora essent corpus et panis, quam humanitas et divinitas; eadem enim formaliter et essentialiter sunt, quae definiuntur per eandem formalem et essentialem differentiam. Non *personali*; nam alio- qui Christi persona constituta esset ex filio Dei, filio hominis, et (ut sic dicam) filio tritici; atque ut, quicquid est creatum in Christo, passum est in cruce, ita oportuisset panem quoque crucifigi

375 Sequitur ergo, quod solum *rationalis* est identitas inter *panem et corpus Christi*; qualis est omnis denominativa: synecdochica, translative, sive metaphorica, transsumptiva, sive metaleptica identitas. Sic vir *canus* est *canities*; sic *belligerat Gallia*, cum rex belligerat; sic *lapis* et Christus sunt eadem res; sic *calix* est testamentum; sic *pati* est mori Christum etc.. En! ut omnia ista non vere sint ea, quae esse dicimus? Attamen ratio invenit, aut cognationem, aut viciniam aliquam, qua, quae non sunt eadem, aliquo modo faciat eadem; quumque vere nunquam sint eadem, eisdem tamen nominibus adpellentur. Nam quod alii dicunt, quaedam esse eadem genere, specie et numero, in hac divisione ampliter comprehenduntur. Unde nihil imperitius potuit a Luthero arripi, quam ut per praedicationem identicam tentaret, *panem esse corpus Christi* contendere. Sed jamdudum donavimus ei ista, modo non gravius peccaret...

376 And therefore we leave the same to the Scoto, Brulifer and Capreolo. And let us say recently of the sacramental unification; for that is also touched upon above. Sacrament 5) is made by the Latins several times from *mysterio*, 6) a Greek word, which means something secret, something external form, figure, or being, but which means a great secret, divine, or serious dina. And so in the New Testament we find sacramentum for the secrecy of the divine council, since he has before him to redeem man with his Son. But when we need it here, for a sign, form or

5) Marginal gloss: Kaerarusuturu.

6) Marginal gloss: //ve/nov.

Figure by which we form and signify a great thing, we do not find the name Sacrament in the New Testament; for that Eph. 5. stands is called *per allegoriam sacramentum*. And sacrament, thus taken, is described in two ways. Sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing; or: Sacrament is a visible form or image of an invisible grace. The first description is the most general, although the other does not mean anything different from the first, namely, that it is a visible sign or form of divine grace, which is not visible. Thus is the divine grace that gave us Christ. The grace is invisible to us; but to the grace we practice a visible symbol or sign, the supper, to praise and extol the grace (proved to us). And is but as much, as a sign of a holy thing.

If the bread and the body of Christ are only sacramentally one, they are no longer one, because each sign is one with the signified. But the image of the honest Coclitis, who is called Cocles himself, is not; therefore the image for the sake of his honest deed is put on the market for him; so the image after his death is called after him, since he has never been in many hundred years. So now the signs of the emperor and the French in Neapolis are the emperor and the king; for when one sees the emperor's and the king's eagle and gilts 1) one says: This is the emperor, this is the king; but they are only their witnesses with their signs. Thus the royal scepter is the king; thus the keys are the power. For if one gives the scepter or the key to someone, he signs that he is the king, or the magistrate and the authority. And the scepter and the keys are neither king nor authority. So the morning redness is a redness, that it means a future redness; and the evening redness is a beauty. So the paschal is the passover, and can be nothing but a sign of the passover. And the bread is the body of Christ, that it may be a sign to us that Christ suffered death for us 2c.

378 In sum, to be sacramental is nothing else at all, neither to bear an image of a sacred thing, since the sign is not the sacred thing; but because it signifies the sacred, it takes the name of that which it signifies. It does not follow, however, that the body of Christ is where the sacrament of his body is; for baptism is also a sacrament of the sacred.

Death of Christ. 2) Therefore, if Christ had to die wherever one baptizes, it would not now be a sign of a thing that has happened, but a sign of a thing that is happening in the midst. But the bread and wine in the supper are signs of the dead body and blood of Christ, therefore the body and blood are not there; for if they were, they must be killed and sacrificed, or else they would be there for nothing; unless our adversary relents, that they are only there in remembrance, and in the hearts of the faithful; then we are one.

379 Probation. If the sign and the signified are together, as our opponent says, then the suffering must also be present; for the sign, the sacrament, is a sign of Christ's death, as they also recognize. But if they confess that the sign is indeed there, and the sign is also essentially there, but that the sign is presently suffering, that is not so. So I ask them: Why is this supper instituted? Must they ever admit to me: to commemorate the death of Christ. For thus speak Christ and Paul; and not: of the body of Christ, especially [separately] without the suffering. Now if the suffering is the chief thing, wherefore this remembrance is signified, and the thing signified should be there at the sign: then Christ should ever suffer there, and be offered; or else that which is chiefly signified, that is not there. This account, founded in God's Word, we have to indicate, so that the simple may be well paid to the sacramental unity or presence; for it seems to me [mihi videtur] that they are blinded by the word "sacramental", so that they do not know what sacramental presence is.

380 But from these explanations it will now be seen that it is nothing else at all, neither a divinely chaste gathering of the people or Church of God to the body of Christ, that is, to the thanksgiving of the death of Christ, which is therefore called his body, that one remembers and gives thanks for his death and torture in it; in which thanksgiving one carries around the signs of his body and blood, as an external sign of his and our love.

381 Now we see that the body of Christ is sacramentally there. Just as the emperor or king is in Neapolis, because his signs are in it, and the one is in Hispania, the other in Gaul: so Christ is here in the hearts of the faithful with great joy and gratitude that he has taken on true human nature.

2) Marginal gloss: Rom. 6. [V. 3. 4.)

1) "Glichen" is unknown to us; but one recognizes that it must mean a sign or standard.

He became our brother and with his death redeemed us and made us his co-heirs. But essentially his body sits at the right hand of God. And the bread and the wine, which are partaken of together in this memorial, are called the body and blood of Christ, according to the noble thing that is done here, which is the thanksgiving of the death that he suffered in the body. Neither are wine and bread any more one thing with the body and blood of Christ, for the signs of kings are kings because they show the authority of kings.

382. nor has there ever been a sacrament that made present what it signifies, but 1) it has indicated and testified that what it signifies is present. So circumcision did not make God's children, but those who were God's children before, according to the promise, took circumcision as a sign and testimony of the covenant in which they were. So the paschal lamb did not bring the transgression with it, for the same had only happened once, but those who gave eternal thanks for it testified to it and brought their believing, thankful hearts to the lamb; and in their hearts they carried the transgression. So baptism does not make children of God, but those who are children of God before take the sign and testimony of the children of God.

So the supper of Christ, or the bread and wine in it, does not bring the body or death of Christ present, but those who recognize the death of Christ, which was suffered at first, make it their life, 2) bring it into the supper in their thankful hearts, and thereby take from their members the sign which Christ appointed to be taken from them, and testify that they have seen his death. But that in this theologians 3) err, cannot be accounted for; for they do not recognize the saying Eph. 5. and Titum 3. of the cleansing of the washing away with the word, and of the bath of regeneration xxxxxxxx 4) being; that the signs are admitted to signify only, as is now sufficiently indicated. For ever that is without doubt, that purification is of the soul of the united spirit. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." For this purpose also the remission of sin is admitted to the apostles, that they may

1) Marginal gloss: The sacramente show and witness; make not present.

2) That is, those who recognize that the death of Christ is their life.

3) Marginal gloss: Lror LkeoloZorum, quoā saerarnsnta ali'ulā eonksrant.

4) Marginal gloss: LvaX/la?al, i. ss.) Lnarnutatlonss vsloorumutationss munsum.

preached the word of salvation and indulgence; for otherwise all believers well know whether no one else 5) gives them rest of conscience, neither the comfort in God.

384. But that Luther says: 6) "The bread is like the body of Christ, as the dove is the Holy Ghost, and the flame the angel" 2c., and says of a new being, et quomodo quidam fallantur,⁷) quod de unitate totali per unitates partiales, et econtra syllogizant, we leave in its value! that is, that it is not worth a light one, except that he recognizes there that the bread is the corpse of Christ not otherwise, neither the dove the Holy Spirit. Now the dove was not the Holy Spirit at all; for it was not a natural dove either, but only a *spectrum*, an appearing figure, which was wonderfully created for the present action, 8) and after the action it left again. Therefore, the dove and the flame are not like the bread, which is a sacrament in the night meal, and an essentially natural bread; not miraculously created, like the dove. Neither is the dove, flame, and cloud a sacrament; for sacramenta are things half used of signs, 10) common, known, which are manifest to all men: so such miracles are unused, strange, unknowable things; therefore the arguing of miraculous signs to sacramental signs is an error, quia non sunt ejusdem speciei for they are not of one form nor kind. We have said enough in previous writings that miraculous signs are not of one kind with sacramental signs, but Luther and his followers do not want to see this. Oh God! Behold, how the good man would like to help himself! but it must be. 11) Either he must break, or we will chase him from this book, as we chased him from the previous one. And do not admit this to ourselves, but we will do it with the iron rod of God's word, with the sword that pierces limb and limb 12).

5) d. i. no other, "neißwer" put by us instead of "neißwar", because "war" means "whereupon". Cf. § 303 and A 82 of this writing.

6) Marginal gloss: Is in the fLuther, in the bow) u at [the] 5th panel. [No. 21, § 347.]

7) Marginal gloss: Imtksrus ixnorat, totRE kit, st, auia "photo aā delicate, st contra.

8) d. i. created.

9) i.e. tough, hurried.

10) used - common, frequent.

11) Marginal gloss: kia 68t kasc sonüdentia.

12) In the old edition: equal. But it seems to us that "equal" must be a noun, in the meaning of "joint".

385 Consider also, pious princes, that he says: 1) "Even if their text were uncertain, it would still be safer if one were deceived by God 2) neither by a man" 2c. Here we see how the devil climbs up. Since Luther errs in the understanding of the words, then God shall understand him. And if he dazzles and seduces with brights and bounces 3) as [, as] I well realize, his own conscience tells him; so he makes him a secret exit here, through which he may flee. Namely this: 4) If I am deceived, then God has deceived me, because I have insisted on His word; but do not think that the pope 5) and all heretics could say thus: If I err in my power or opinion, God has deceived me, for it is written plainly: "What you bind" or discharge 2c., "that is bound" or discharged. Or it is clearly written: 6) "The Father is greater than I." For this reason, however, no one is excused; for the truth is presented to us enough, but we do not want to accept it. But if God rejects us altogether, and lets us fall into reprobum sensum, that is, into a wrong opinion, we must nevertheless point out. May the God of peace grant that we recognize and accept the truth so unanimously that we all give glory to God with one mouth and heart, amen!

386. so much, pious princes, from the first part, in which we have let many impractical teachings and speeches run through the hand, and seen from that alone, that the most noble pieces would be thoroughly fortified, as: The absence of the body of Christ; to be priestly about the body of Christ; to be at the right hand, and yet remain true man; that God is not able to do contrary to His own word; how the body of Christ is in the supper; that the places of Scripture, which we have for our shield, have not been rejected by Luther 7). If we should now reject Luther's erroneous understanding, let us first put Oecolampadius' short, but quite virtuous Christian answer; and then put the other part of our understanding of the words, with rejecting Luther's understanding; and lastly speak of his faith. And therefore go [listen], pious princes, while Oecolampadio is listening, so may I with the other two

The more you come, the better. He lets himself be looked at childishly and badly, but you will find a man behind him, if you prove his veins and legs, that is, the sense of the words and spirit right. 8)

[Johann Oecolampad's response to Martin Luther's Confession of the Supper of Christ.]

Johannes Oecolampadius Huldricio Zwinglio Grace and peace from Christ our Lord.

Here I send you, faithful brother and fellow servant in the word of the Lord, my distortion, which I have placed on Luther's confession of the Lord's Supper. You may append this to your responsibility, if it seems good to you, so that men may see 9) that there is no repugnant spirit in us, as Luther pretends, and yet the one in his most audible proof 10) is one, so that he may make our doctrine suspicious; although it is denounceable and he himself gives evidence that it is one opinion and only other words. Search in his book, in the letter s [at] the first [leaf]. 11) Now I have never contradicted you, nor have you opposed me; indeed, I have used your words myself, just as you are not ashamed of mine. Our listeners are also not so deaf that they would raise a chipping and splitting because of us in this.

Now that the little books are here, and our unanimity is sufficiently denounceable, I will not answer for the same, as well as for many other disgraceful words and mockery words; for whoever is well with these, he does not yet want the truth. I do not know how to edify anyone with this; if the truth is recognized, it is all accounted for with honor. In the meantime we are no better than our Master Christ was. It should be a small thing to us that he wants to teach us the puerile logicam, yes, it should be dear to us, because his companions have long reproached us, we need too much of them.

(3) That he scolds us fools, and is foolish in his language, is a responsibility of his, that others attribute so much malice to us. That his best words are: "Fools, boys, devils," and the like, should be a reminder to us of how silly it is for a person,

8) proven" - tests.

9) Marginal gloss: Conordia inter Zwinglium et Oecolampadium.

10) Probation - Evidence.

11) No. 21, § 285.

12) gach - abrupt, hurried.

1) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession, in the arc] x at the 4th panel. sNo. 21, § 362 inaccurately stated).

2) Marginal gloss: Viās, quam impiurn prasstiZiuiū!

3) Probably, "to show off and to boast" is meant. "Prächtchen" - to let splendor be seen, also occurs elsewhere in Zwingli.

4) Marginal gloss: lmtBsri prastxtns.

5)- Marginal gloss: kontiūois xrastxtus.

6) Marginal gloss: ^rnil prastxtus.

7) i.e., dismissed from the way.

whom wrath overcomes; are we yet the better nor the more wicked.

(4) But because many are angry and offended by this, we have no other way to turn it around than to excuse ourselves in the most chastening way for the sake of doctrine. The Lord wants to test how dear the truth is to everyone. I know of no trade that has so freely opened the secrecy of men's hearts, some of them glib, and some of them confessors of the truth, as the matter of the Sacrament.

5) God will not be angered by the blasphemy that he is committing against us, and against you in particular, the *alloeosi*. 1) I have not yet found anything different in you, except that you are confessing a one God and man. I have not yet found anything different in you, except that you confess one Christ, true God and man. One has soon forced words back and forth to turn one's doctrine upside down.

(6) But that we are called enemies of the sacraments, strikers or desecrators, we have hardly been accused of anything more unreasonable. For all our writing and teaching is directed toward keeping the sacraments, 2) what is proper to be kept of them, and that their proper honor be proven to them. Even if we do not act so carnally, so crudely, so capernaïtically about sacraments, we are not sacrament strikers for that reason. Some scold us, who do not know what we believe or teach; even if it would mean life to them, they would not say: what sacrament? why it is used? and how it should be used? Should we therefore be sacrament strikers, that we do not confess that the bread is essentially the body of Christ, then all popes must be sacrament strikers, yes, even the Lutherans themselves now fall away from it, and say: Under or in the bread is the body of Christ.

(7) If we are enemies of the sacraments because we say that the matter of the bread remains in its essence, then all Lutherans are also sacrament strikers. If we are sacrament abusers because we do not accept miraculous, unspeakable miraculous signs in the sacraments, St. Augustine was an arch enemy of the sacraments who wrote so publicly. If we have desecrated the sacraments by not administering them with great pomp, with much ceremony, and according to the commandment of useless human statutes, then Christ and his apostles are guilty of this, who was pleased with simplicity, if we believe and preach the word of faith, of which it is written in Romans 10, by which the sacraments are sanctified, and sacraments, if we teach them, are made invisible by visible things.

1) i.e. to move up, to impose.

2) Marginal gloss: *^nisintsnerainSnroi^ninvrsiliostDs*.

Things; not to put hope in the elements, to make the likeness of faith in everything, to take the mind captive to the obedience of Christ, that the truth may be known when we compare spiritual things with spiritual.

8) How may we be sacramental strikers? If we took the promise from the words of the supper, and would not allow the bread to be a sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ, poured out for us, as some do, we would be suspicious. If we denied that Christ, the Son of God, did not have his power to work with the sacraments as with words, and did not also work miraculously, it would be no wonder that we were opposed.

9) But it does not have the opinion. We proclaim the mystery of faith with the sacraments. That which is given for revelation shall not be obscured to us: so also our adversaries must admit the sacramental union, and even put a figurative speech in words which they do not like to circumvent, though they stiffly deny it, and yet one grasps around and around them that they accept it.

(10) Also, if they say that the body of Christ is not as a body in the bread *circumscripively* or *locally*, but otherwise incomprehensibly, but which may be admitted to the body as little 3) as to the spirit flesh and bone: one should well think whether divine zeal, or brotherly love, or Christian discipline move them to let other insanity creep in, whether already some miss their grosser and proclaim us as the most harmful enemies of God. Being an Anabaptist is not so harmful to them; seven times it would be better to listen to Popes. Pope Nicolaus in his condemned verdict has held his own, but Zwingli and Oecolampad have eaten their livers; they should be shouted out like this. And yet, in all that those who write against us dab at us, they have not understood us in one thing, which is so very unpleasant.

O! if it were done as right, as it is not; and if it were well with our hearts, as good fug we had in many places: how would we thus pay them off with abundant measure, and be again for them? But to whom would it be useful? to ours? No; for they desire the truth. The opponents? No; they would be the more embittered. To matter itself? No; it would be the more obscured. Our desire for revenge? No, that shall not be; God is judge.

3) In the old edition: "may admit".

The best thing will be to answer in humility and bear the shame for a while. It has come to this in the world that one does not know who will be scolded or praised. For dishonorable men are set on high by flatterers, and innocent hearts are burdened with all manner of mischief; but the day of the Lord shall open it, and the children of light shall know who is in the truth, and shall not think less of us. What do we care about the judgment of the children of darkness? We know well in whom we have trusted; if he be with us, what can all flesh do against us? The truth is strong, it shall avenge itself on our enemies. Why should we lose our patience? Enough is enough, simple and true, to answer the shortest to the matter. God grant His grace that it may be done with fruit! Amen.

Here you have my list, but I order you to do what you think is useful in it. I know well that you alone will refute it all. But I have done my part, because I am now also so completely in the game. With that, God be commanded. From Basel, on the 10th day of July, Anno 1528.

Johannis Oekolampadii's Answer to the Confession of Mart. Luther, on the Lord's Supper.

1 Paul, the holy apostle, when he reproaches us with the controversy of words, which some suppose to be carried on by us, does not want us to be completely silent about it, or either not to explain the words of Scripture correctly or, if they are presented badly, not to punish them. Without doubt, however, he wants us, if we want to attain the truth, not to be divided about the words, even if they are not produced with the same wisdom, so that we do not puff ourselves up harmfully with art, but rather create piety in the love of our neighbor. This is what God wanted my adversaries to do in the matter of the Sacrament. For I would like to think that in many things we could be compared in one mind, if one wanted to take note of each other properly. Unfortunately, it has not been possible so far. Well then, I pray to the Lord that nothing will happen to me, and that their angry defiance may be stopped with a gentle answer.

2) First, so that I may be understood, 1) I insist on using the words of the evangelists "the

is my body": this is a sign or meaning of my body, just in the sense in which it is commonly said: "The bread is a sacrament, or a holy sign of the body of Christ. From which speech no one who has had an understanding has yet been offended: for nothing has been taken away from the true body of Jesus Christ, that it is the true body; but it has been added to it, that it is signified and signified by the bread. And so the bread is a sign, but the true body of Christ is a signified thing. And as the bread is truly bread and a sign, so the true body of Christ is truly the true body together, and also signified.

3. this now takes D. Mart. Luthern, as if I were rhyming, and it rhymed as little, as if I were saying: Christ would be Belial; says: it could not and should not be, and is quite a wrong trope, in all languages uncommon 2c. To this I shall now answer these three pieces; [I] first, that the trope is customary; [II] afterwards, that it should and must be used in the interpretation of the words "this is my body"; [III] lastly, however, rejecting some of Luther's counter-accusations in the words of the Lord. Well, dear reader, you must not let yourself be misled by his mocking words and scolding words; they do not serve here. You will see that this interpretation of mine is not a matter of courage; it can and may well be without any distortion. But so that you may understand the matter, notice that the words we call figurative or "abominable words" he calls "renewed words" and "of a new interpretation," for the sake that they take on new interpretations. And those we call "natural" and "non-figurative" he calls "words of the old, or first, interpretation. There he sets such a division and rule: 2) "The words of the old or first interpretation show the thing that is the new likeness; and according to the new interpretation they show the new right thing, or being itself, as in this saying: 'I am the right vine.' Here the word 'vine' has become a trope or new word, which cannot interpret back the old vine, which is of the new likeness, but interprets for itself the right new vine itself, which is not a likeness. For Christ is not a likeness of a vine, but again the vine is a likeness of Christ" 2c. We want to examine this explanation and revelation of his, as much as it is useful here, whether it is thoroughly appropriate and sufficient in all figurative speeches in which figurative words are invented, or whether it is repugnant to us.

1) d. i. confirm.

/Signa trifariam dicuntur [i.e. that which is signified is spoken in a threefold manner].

The words are to be divided into two parts. He divides them into two parts. But we will divide them into three parts.

(5) First of all, the words of the signs, when spoken *proprie*, that is, actually and ohnfigürlich, indicate the things for themselves, as they are in their nature, without all attention, that they may be likeness. As when I say: The lamb has four feet, the hare has two long ears, I understand only the natural hare or lamb. These are words as Luther calls them, namely of the first and old interpretation.

(6) Secondly, words that signify their nature by themselves also carry with them the meaning and likeness of other things. They indicate themselves together with their meaning, thus: if I point to a lamb, and say, The lamb is the patient Christ, the natural lamb is not excluded, for I point to it; but with it I also show how it bears the likeness of the true Christ. Thus, when Christ took the bread and said, "This," he pointed to the bread, leaving bread in its nature, but with it he also wanted to show the likeness of the bread, how the bread had a likeness of his body. I call these words sacramental here for the sake of two interpretations, a new and an old interpretation.

7) Thirdly, words that drop the interpretation of the natural essence, and show a new essence, the likeness of which is invented in the old meaning of nature. As when one says: Christ is the Lamb of God. There one points to no lamb of the flock, but to the new essential, which is Christ Himself, who is figured and signified by the lamb of the flock. Luther calls this word renewed words, and the other interpretation; but we call them figurative words. This distinction will be necessary and useful.

Signata trifariam dicuntur [i.e. that which is signified is spoken in a threefold manner].

8. again, you may speak in three ways of that which may be figured or signified by another.

9. first, as it is in its essence, without any appearance of any likeness, there is no likeness or figure, and are words of the first meaning, as: The body of Christ is born of Mary.

(10) Secondly, something is called as it is in its nature, and as it is figured, as: The body of Christ is the paschal lamb; that is, the body is a body, but is figured or signified by the paschal lamb.

11) Thirdly, without interpretation to the natural, but to the new essence, taken from the likeness; as, so the teachers call the body of Christ at times the sacrament of the body, and for the sign, and not just the true body, as Augustine indicates in *epistola ad Bonifacium*.

If Luther omits the other part, *et peccat in divisione insufficiente*, that is, divides up what is to be divided, it is no wonder that he lacks his rule, when he says: All tropi in Scripture interpret the right new essence, and not the likeness of the same new essence. The reason why it is lacking is that when one points to things that bear likeness to them, that is, to sacramental ones, they are not excluded with their natural essence for the sake of interpretation, and the likeness to it is accepted; this I will clearly show and prove to you.

You speak of St. Peter's picture: St. Peter is colored yellow. There I gladly allow that the new and figurative word stands in a new essence, only for the painted St. Peter. But where you say: St. Peter is the St. Peter who preached the Gospel; then understand by St. Peter in *subjecto*, in the first word, not only in its new essence, as a painting, but also with its likeness, that it resembles the true St. Peter; and but the word St. Peter in *praedicato*, since it is mentioned for the second time, understands us the living St. Peter and not the painted one. But if this were not the case, it would be said that the painted St. Peter had preached; and one does not therefore drip back, as Luther mockingly says; but he took little notice of this, indeed, he omitted it altogether.

(14) Luther did not quite understand the opinion of my interpretation, or did not want to understand it. For he pretends that I say "body" should mean "sign of the body" in the saying "this is my body," when, if I had wanted to follow Scripture, I should rather negate the word "body" so that it means the true new body, to which the natural body of Christ would be a likeness. And as he says after many words, "Let this be said: 1) This is bread; as if here the body meant the bread, and not bread the body. With this he goes around, garnahe through his whole book. And his helpers have also done it, and have failed me against the world. Now it is not so for him; for I say, and have said it, that here the "bread" is a "body."

1) Marginal gloss: RtzZula in 6xpon6N(ii8 relative^).

Sign of the Body. For by "the body" I understand the true body of Christ, the Son of God, born of Mary of virgins; although it is true that the word "sign" in (the) interpretation falls on the body, as it happens in the *relativis*; but this does not make the true body of Christ a sign.

(15) Take an example: I say, Solomon is a son of David. The little word son refers to the little word David. Now therefore it is not thought that David is the son; but he is the father, and Solomon is the son. Otherwise, even in the Holy Trinity, one would mix the persons and make the Father the Son; and again. So also here I say: This is the sign of the body, so the word sign leans on the little word body; and therefore is not to be understood that the body is the sign, but it is the true body, which was given for us; but the bread is the sign.

(16) I would give you a thousand and a thousand examples, and all the languages that can do it. But let it be enough in one! Ezek, at the 4th it says: "O son of man, take a brick, lay it before thee, and set the city of Jerusalem thereon, and sausages 1) against her bulwark" 2c. But 2) in the 5th chapter he says: "This is Jerusalem, which I have set among the Gentiles, and in her surrounding countries, and she has resisted 3) my judgments more than the Gentiles" 2c. Here the thing can be seen. In the 4th chapter, Ezekiel wants the city of Jerusalem to be "torn down". Mark, the true city would not be torn down on a brick, and stand substantially on it; but the figure and likeness of a city, as the tropus in the third account is able. Afterwards in the 5th chapter he says: "This is Jerusalem (that is, the torn brick with the form and shape is Jerusalem), which I have set among the Gentiles." Then I wanted to hear how they interpreted this to me. Did they want to say: The cracked brick is essentially Jerusalem, which is the city of God: this is not; for it would not confess on any small brick. Or would they say: Jerusalem is the "renewed" word, as they call it; how would it then rhyme that the other Jerusalem, according to the renewed word, had angered God more, and had been set in the midst of the Gentiles; this would now be clumsy. Our interpretation, however, is the simplest and purest, that the Jerusalem of the brick is a meaning of the true Jerusalem;

and therefore the true Jerusalem is not the figure, but the demolished Jerusalem on the stone, as such is achieved in the best possible way. 4)

17) Give examples from wherever you want 5), you will not lack them. So also the seed is a figure of the gospel; the lamb, the rock and Passover a figure of Christ; will be constant around and around; yes, also outside of Scripture, Sanct Peter, the painted one, is a figure and sign of the true one. Summa *Summarum*, Luther says what he wants, so it is clear that the first words in the speeches are the figure, but the epilogues are the figured ones, although in the interpretation they are based on what is figured. Therefore, they are vain and useless speeches, which he has poured out with great splendor: it is not possible.

18] The fact that Luther cites many examples is to be disregarded, because he turns them all unreasonably and without order, contrary to all logic. For it is to be interpreted in a far different way, if one puts the sign before it, and the renewed or figurative word after it; for if the sign is displaced, thus: If one says: Gospel is the seed, or: Christ is the rock; then it is proper to interpret it thus: The gospel is signified by the seed; Christ is signified by the rock. But if I preside over the rock, and say: The rock was Christ, I say rightly: The rock means Christ, the seed means the gospel. Here, 6) Luther's conversion or reversal in the ground is not meant. 7) Example: The ripe is a sign of the wine, that I wanted to burst on it, that the wine Hergegen is also a sign of the ripe. So Luther does to him; when we say: The rock is a sign or figure of Christ, he turns it around unfaithfully and says: Christ is a sign of the rock. It wants to suffer this reversal: The rock is a sign of Christ *ergo* the sign of Christ is the rock. This followed also: The lamb is a sign of Christ; reverse it, it reads: Christ is signified by the lamb. I may certainly not be surprised enough that the scholars dwell on such obvious things, and want to grieve and distress us with sophistry.

19) Luther also sets another rule: 8) "Where the little word 'is' is introduced in a speech, one is certainly speaking of the 'is' of the speech.

4) Maybe: *eräuet?*

5) We put it instead of "nümmen" (no longer) in the old edition, which does not fit here.

6) i. e. capable.

7) In the old edition: "im bodennichs".

8) Marginal gloss: *vuplsx esse, naturals st intslsuals*.

1) i.e., storm bucks.

2) In the old edition: "Aller".

3) *befzen* - bark.

essence of the same thing, and not from its interpretation." But how does he prove this rule? Exactly with the previous unhelpful rules, by way of example. However, it should not be completely rejected. For just as he can have two meanings in every word, he should also be able to invent them here in the little word "is," thus: some things have their nature and essence in themselves in nature, of each of which it is rightly and well said "is essential. Some have their essence in part according to the calculation of reason, whether they are already quite nothing in nature, so that it comes about that one may also ascribe the "is" to the void 1) and say: nothing is useful; and all important things have their "is" "in their value," 2) therefore also the little word xxxx xxxxx and xxxx xxxxx.

id est, "with us", or "that is", is so much said, [it] wants to serve to interpretation, and is "one means is" also "one is", has also its essence after its kind.

(20) Now, as it is said in the above-mentioned things, that some things bear with them, and are clothed with the interpretation; so the interpretation, as things multiplied and mingled, is also a being to them. Just as one may ask a thing what it is according to its nature, so one may also ask what it is according to its meaning. One may ask in a common way: What is image? and answer: It is a uniformity; so uniformity is in itself a being. Thus the common name "essence" extends far, and the word "is. Therefore it is not necessary to ask two questions, one about the essence, what it is, and the other, what it means, as Luther says. There should be no answering where the time is not thus uselessly entangled. It may be that, 3) when one desired to know the nature of a thing and then its meaning, one asked two questions for the sake of distinction. But if the natural essence is denounceable, and the meaning is inquired: what is it out of the way, if one already inquired the meaning of the significant essence by the "is"? Therefore, I also contradict him in that, it could not be equally valid: This is St. Peter; and: means St. Peter.

21. Let us prove these things further with examples. One has made a triumphant fire; one asks: What is this? one answers him: It is a fire. With this he has not done enough for the questioner; for he knows this beforehand, and he will

he hears something else, namely, what does it mean? he nevertheless asks: What is it? But if he is answered: It is a fire of joy; then he may well accept what it means. It is the same in the sacraments; one does not ask what bread is in substance, but in meaning. The disciples knew in the supper before that bread was bread, or even breaking bread; they were not to be taught that. But the significant essence was to be revealed to them, and [they] would not have known it either if it had not been interpreted to them by the words which give them such essence as it is ordained to be, that the bread is a sign of the body, and yet the body is understood to be the natural body of Christ. For the name "sign" is understood of the bread, although it is placed after the "is" to the "body".

(22) This would be a good answer to all the other gossip that Luther uses in the interpretation of Luke. For as I leave the blood in Matthew and Mark to be the true blood of Christ, so also in Luke and Paul; but that the word of interpretation stands before the word "new testament," namely, that the cup is a sign of the new testament: not that the new testament is the sign, but the cup; not the body the sign, but the bread. Therefore it must not be answered there, if he reproaches that 4) I am not confessed (*confitens*), although he gives me a suspicion that he has well recognized this interpretation and otherwise makes a good man out of me.

23 After this, whoever wants to see, may do so without complaint that I am not deceived in the saying of Tertulliani. He acts as if I understood Tertullianum de figura sermonis in Grammatica, which he has never guessed; even if I speak of figurative words back and forth, I do not say that Tertullianum points to it; for it is as much as "sign", as he himself gives to understand lib. 5. adversus Marcionem, where he calls a "sacrament" of bread and wine, which he called a "figure" before. Luther should also say at once: *Sacramentum* would be a figure in the *Grammatica*, so that one would see that it was mockery. He otherwise indicated enough, the "Zeichelei"; what would it need here the "essence"? Nor is it that Tertullianus has led me to speak thus of the Sacrament. But if I should thank a teacher on earth, for the sake of my understanding in this, then I would thank Augustino. But this does not serve here.

24 After this, Luther has other bad objections, which he brings forth with impudence and impudence, and would like to present them more graciously;

4) "deß" put by us instead of: that.

1) In the old edition: "also dem void".

2) In the old edition: WERD.

3) marginal gloss: per est? quasri-
tur ubi naturule esSs manitsstnil.

but I think he thinks it suits him just fine. Let's put them after each other.

(25) The first: Where it is said that the Lord's bread and wine are set up for the remembrance of Christ's death alone, we have nothing of the text; we have enough in what we read: Take, eat, this do in remembrance of me! Or: what is the use of the text? May the death of the Lord be remembered (which is the main and some cause of the Lord's Supper) without such a text. 1) Answer. We say that in the supper there is not only remembrance and thanksgiving, but we should also praise and thank God in all places and at all times, as the Psalm says: "My soul, praise the Lord, and do not forget all His good deeds. In all the place of his glory praise the LORD." And again, "I will praise the LORD at all times." But this should also be a common thanksgiving, which is not commanded at all times, nor 2) with special ceremonies. For this reason a sacramental sign has been instituted for us, for the agreement of the people, in which it would be proclaimed to us in what and why we give thanks with one another, namely, we are thankful that we have been redeemed through the death of Christ, and that His merit is also granted to us. But this was to be commanded in an outward sign. But if the signs alone had been presented, and not interpreted, who would have told us wherein the thanksgiving was? Who would have told us what the bread meant, and what Christ meant by it? If Christ had not interpreted his action in words, how would we know that it was a sacrament? It is not valid to invent such necessary sacraments from one's own head; therefore such a text was necessary for us, since the sacrament was instituted and the command was given with a convenient interpretation.

26 Secondly, he asks: 3) Why Christ should teach the meaning (Luther mockingly calls it interpretation) just this once 4)? Answer: We do not say that Christ must do it, but that he should do it reasonably and wisely. For at that time the new ceremonies were to be instituted, since the old ones had now ceased; and since Christ was still here on earth in such a way that he would begin and end the new ceremonies.

than ours. And since they started, they should also be explained.

27 Thirdly, he asks: "What is the use of knowing that the bread means the body of the Lord? What good is such an allegory to faith, which even the wicked and devils could invent? What harm would it do if I never knew that the bread means Christ's body? We could have invented it from ourselves, especially since there is no *analogia fidei*. Answer: If Christ alone is the one whom God raised from the brethren [quem deus ex fratribus resuseitaturus erat] according to Genesis, 5) to renew the law, to change the ceremonies, it was also right for him to declare them. For even though others might have accepted such a likeness by his inspiration, one would not have been assured that this was his will and no other. But the allegories in the sacraments and in others have another form. The sacraments hold the secrecy, revealed by God alone to the true believers, the word of the cross, which is not recognized without benefit, not despised without harm. But if the devil already knew something, should Christ not teach it?

28) Now 6) Christ has included in this words of promise, as a core and heart of the sacraments. But who can give us promise in a sacrament but Christ alone? Here is the promise that Christ died for us and did enough for us, as it will follow afterwards, and has made this known to us as 7) well by signs than by words. Whoever then may say that the outward word is not useful, may also say that the interpretation of the sacraments is not useful. Whoever then may say that the words of promise do not lead to faith, and are unlike faith, may also say that the words of Christ fall short of the *analogia fidei*, and do not lead us to faith. Or, to recognize that Christ died for our sin and rose again is not the word of faith? One shall see, if God wills, who misses in the matter and words of the sacrament of faith. But Luther presents it worse and more bluntly, because 8) it is taught by us.

29. fourth: Why, after all, Christ did the

1) Randglosse: Haars neskaria verba käse: Zoo "sr oorxms nrtrnr.

2) This word not has come here probably by mistake in the autot^xuin, because it causes a quite adverse mind, because of the thanksgiving at the Sacrament is spoken. (Walch.) -By "ceremonies" is to be understood the distributing, eating and drinking of bread and wine, as follows.

3) Marginal gloss: Huars Mo tsnoxors sxposita vsr5a.

4) "dasmal" set by us instead of: deSmal.

5) marginal gloss: Clirwtsrat,

kaerarosn-

tui".

6) Marginal gloss: Lxpluatio saernsuti "Ms.

7) "as" set by us instead of: all.

8) "for" put by us instead of: when.

acted with hidden 1) words with his apostles? I will drop the Lutheran pebbles. Answer. It was little hidden to the apostles than that they were led by the paschal lamb into the memory of the execution from Egypt. The way of speaking was not unfamiliar to them; they knew that bread was bread. But they were also to learn what bread meant. Therefore Christ explained to them what he meant by the special ceremonies, after he had already drunk the last with them. 2) And what a difficulty was it for them to learn the meaning of bread. And what was the difficulty or the hardness of it, if he had told them before often the suffering with words, and now proclaims it with a sign and accompanying explanatory word? The Lutheran mind, which some dream here, that the bread should essentially be the true body of Christ or that he should be bodily in or under the bread, could not come into their minds; otherwise they would have let themselves notice it with the least, since they left nothing else unasked.

(30) Fifthly: Where is such equality in bread and wine, so that the bread means his body given for us, and that the wine means his blood poured out for us? He asks the question with much circumlocution, which I would not have used to him, who so far has so faithfully and Christianly pointed to the promises. Well, he denies the equivocation. But we want to show that with the help of God.

31. answer. There is a serene 3) likeness in nature and in Scripture; for bread and wine are created for food and drink, for the sustenance of life, and for the knowledge 4) and joy of the heart, as the 104th Psalm says, "That thou shouldest bring forth bread out of the ground; and wine maketh glad the heart of man, and the form thereof gloweth with oil; and bread strengtheneth the heart of man." But how the bread is to be eaten, we have also. As long as it is decided 5) before the servants, it will not feed, but it must be eaten, as the wise woman, *Proverbior.* 31: "Sre has given the food to her household." And the bread is divided and broken, that it may be sneezed upon. The grain also is ground and broken, that it may become meat. It is the same with wine: as long as it is in a barrel or in a large jug, it is not eaten.

drunk, but when it is poured or poured into the cups. And initially, as long as it is in the grapes and skins, it is not a drink; but when it is pressed and trodden in the winepresses or troughs, then it is poured out. No one can deny the parables, they are evident in nature.

32 Now let us see if they are also added to Christ. No one can deny that the body of Christ was ordained for us spiritually as food, and his blood as drink, if he reads the sixth chapter of John, where he calls his flesh bread and food, and his blood drink. This bread was for a time as much as decided 6), and was a bread of angels, unknown to men. But when Christ gave himself for us in death, then he became food for us; then the bread was broken, so that it might be distributed to us for food, as it was provided by the Father for eternity. Of this giving, the Lord Christ himself says, John 6: "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Is not this clear enough compared? For it is ever certain in the words that He asked Himself to be given in death as a sacrifice for the life of the world. This has never been denied by Luther in his writing or by any Christian until now. How often does the Holy Scripture tell us this, Rom. 8. chapter: "God did not spare His own Son, but for us all He gave Him up." Gal. 1: "He gave Himself for our sin," and therefore He became our food in the first place. When the grain of wheat rotted, it first brought forth fruit; and when he was lifted up, he drew all things to himself. If one does not want to recognize the parables, one will certainly not recognize any.

(33) I say the same of his blood. We cool and refresh our hearts with joy that our sins are forgiven us through Christ, as with a spiritual drink. And for this purpose the blood of Christ Jesus is ordained, by which also the covenant is secured, and with it he, a supreme priest, entered the holy place once to make atonement for the Father. Now as long as the blood was not poured out, not enough was done for sin; but at the trough [winepress] of the cross, the blood was poured out and poured in for us to drink. Is not this also a likeness? How can something similar be said, how the bread becomes edible and the wine drinkable?

34. sixth: If the *tropum* is not set on the words: Effet, nehmen, brechenet, danket 2c.,

6) i.e. closed.

1) Marginal gloss: Verba ooenae axostolls elara.

2) and - as.

3) d. i. clear.

4) i.e. refreshment, revival. In Z105 of this writing: "the dead erkickt"

d. i. awakened.

5) d. i. - closed.

"What does the likeness serve here? It must be likeness not be, now that the blood has already been shed, which in bread and wine, as it was given and martyred for sin, [i.e. of which] we should hear: Christ is to be sacrificed. or else the likeness shall 1) not?" Answer. In parables 2) But 4) it is that there are signs, showing that we are now not all works and qualities have to appear in all the same satisfied, and giving thanks that this has already been in the things that are compared. Some works and qualities fulfilled, and that no other blood is required. Nor do we are compared, work against work, quality against quality. allow that the ceremonies 5) of the old law, which were As, in the seed, whose [grains] are small, inconsiderable, done with blood and involved living animals, were clearer. and bring forth much fruit. He, the natural seed, should it was known to very few of the Old Law how Christ was not therefore be mocked by the Pharisees, and spread signified in the paschal lamb or in other sacrifices; for among many people, and convert them. Also the gospel there were no such clear words that such sacrifices should is like unto it, and therefore must not be cast into the field point to Christ. How was the Old Testament clearer? Now, by the husbandman, nor sowed, nor bear fruit. So here is with the help of the interpretation, it is a thousand times a characteristic of the bread, to be edible, and to be given clearer that Christ is sacrificed than it was before without and broken beforehand. In the body of Christ, again, it is the word. In addition, Christ himself is the light and the also "to be edible" and "to be given and broken" in its own truth, but his ceremonies are not, which in themselves way, namely, to be humbled to the uttermost. Oh, how this would be just as dark as those in the old law; but through bread is cut before us with thorns, cheek strokes, rods, the addition of the words of interpretation they are also and scourges, nails and spurs, so completely humiliated, clearer and point much more to Christ.

that it might be edible for us! But what is it that we do not 37) But should the breaking of bread and the cup be put the *tropum* on the words? It is enough that by themore valid than the paschal lamb, since there is no life in tropum it be known which word has the likeness; then also the bread and no blood in the cup? So let baptism also be the works may be freely compared. And is far more blamed and punished, because circumcision takes away beautifully spoken, than if he had said: This is my body, the flesh of the body, and baptism alone takes away the which is martyred for you. From the shedding of blood that unclean things. Why is it not seen what power there is in follows, it was well to note how the body was to be broken, bread to give life? Dear! according to the meaning. 7) Is so that it might be acceptable to us for food. that more noble, which loses its life and may not give it to

35) To the seventh: "If Christ would have instituted another, or that loses its joy and may not give it to another, supper in which not his body and blood, but only a than that which may give life and joy to another? I think it likeness of his body and blood were in it, he would have is more noble that gives life or joy. Well then, the bread left us the old supper of Moses with the paschal lamb, and the wine will be much more noble because of their which from the measure and all around most delicately meaning, for their quality is to feed for life and to keep signified his body given for us and his blood shed for us alive, and to drink for joy, and thus to turn away for the remission of sins. And if ever the new testament displeasure. That is why they are so gloriously the be a light against the old, there is found the contradiction; heavenly bread of life.

and yet there is a living lamb and blood, which is far 38) Shall this take away the likeness, because the clearer than bread and wine." bread is not alive, and the cup is not bloody? Thus the

36. answer. It is clear why 3) the old sacrifices and bronze serpent is a figure of Christ, or the grain of wheat ceremonies should cease: because where they would still that rots in the ground, or the grape that the scouts carried be pregnant (Christ would have set them up for a new on a pole. For this reason, of course, one should not lead one), Christ would still have to be sacrificed; the foreign Christ to school. Enough light is there, yes, to him who has innocent blood would still have to be shed. This shall now eyes to see.

4) d. i. better.

5) Marginal gloss: Osromonias vetsrss novis non "uitt elariores.

6) i.e. more indifferent, lower.

7) Marginal gloss: "ovilius-ro-r vrvr/koo.

1) i.e. serves, benefits.

2) Marginal gloss: Ratio similitudinum.

3) Randglosse: Lsssatlo votstrum saerilolomva.

(39) Eighthly, Luther has an objection, how the breaking may not be compared to the death of Christ, or to crucifixion; for it is "teaching the unknowable through the unknowable. To this has already been answered. Because Christ 1) so clearly says that his blood is to be shed, it is good to know that breaking it in the body of Christ would cost life. It is also easy to understand how a body breaks' as we have a common saying: You must do this, and should you break or burst at it, that is, come to the last extremity; and therefore must not give pieces. But how can this be so strange to us, since we read in the 22nd Psalm: "I am poured out like water, my bones are broken, my heart is melted in my body like wax," and we also say: "The grain of wheat has decayed completely," and other such sayings.

40 The ninth: It is the same breaking, since he says: He took the bread and broke it, and: This is the body which is broken for you. Therefore crucifying may not be understood by this; for Christ did not catch himself, as he ought to have done, where breaking is so much as killing; for he took the bread himself, and broke it with his own hands.

41 Answer. That it is one word, no one may deny; but differently the bread breaks; and differently the body breaks, but still have their comparison among themselves, that they are broken to the benefit of 2) others, and in that it is the same. I still do not see that may prevent that the crucified may not be called "broken". If one let the broken body be only in the other number of the figured things, of which said above, then the force would be found fine, that the body has a breaking after tropical speech way; and we have not excluded the breaking of bread. I do not like to insist on my writing; but I have no doubt that the content of the word would not be unrecognized.

42) But that it is said: 4) "Christ broke the bread, but he did not catch himself and kill himself. Answer: How? if we open our eyes, do we not see that he gave himself up, sacrificed himself, and, being willing, gave up his spirit, humbled himself to the point of death, so that he might give himself to us, that we might receive him as food? That is why God the Father says in Zechariah [13:7]: "I

1) Marginal gloss: 6orpus Oüristi kranZt.

2) In the old edition: "to good".

3) In the old edition: "find".

4) Marginal gloss: Huomoão Oüristus suuru eorpus kreZlt.

I will smite the shepherd," and Christ says, "He is the good shepherd, which setteth his soul for the sheep. [So, of course, he himself broke our bread; indeed, he gives it to us as well, as the heavenly Father, because they are under his control. Of course, it is not necessary for Christ to kill himself, so that the likeness may exist.

43) The tenth: "How can it be a parable, if there is not the main part of the parable, namely, that for us the bread may be broken and the wine poured out for salvation? That must also be there." Answer. But this is a new right, that the comparison must be in the highest. So be it! 5) Is not the likeness quite abundant, if the bread contains life, and man lives in the bread, and the wine restores the heart from fear; as we also have found life through the death of Christ, and peace, joy, rest, and rejoicing of our conscience and soul through his shedding of blood? Is the salvation of consciences derived from any other source than the forgiveness of sin and the knowledge of the covenant with God the Father in the blood of Christ Jesus? What is lacking there? We have in the antitype life and joy as the highest pieces, and is well abconterfeiet.

44. eleventh: "They also liked to say, John writes [Cap. 19, 36:] 'Let no bone be broken in him, that the scripture may be fulfilled.' Therefore the Scripture does not read that breaking should be rhymed with Christ dying." Response. It is not said 6) that Christ's leg was broken, but his death is nevertheless called breaking, since soul and body were separated, and the whole was divided, so that it might be shared with us in its entirety. For one must not be concerned about the name "breaking", since he calls himself a worm, and is called Medyko (xxxx) in Isaiah in the 53rd chapter [v. 5], that is, a crumbler than in a mortar, and that for the sake of our sin. And so, this likeness exists in all free, unweakened and constant.

(45) The twelfth: "Neither is the cup like unto the blood, that it should be poured out for sin. This has been answered enough. 7) It is inherent in nature and scripture, and is quite common, since one reads in Genesis chapter 49: "He shall wash his robe in the blood of wine. So if the wine is washed

5) Marginal gloss: Keopus saeramsuti.

6) Marginal gloss: IranZirur, nou ossa.

7) marginal gloss: 6 toroulari fűrtslma sa-r-

not only because of the color, but also because of the expression, that the juice in the grape is expressed in the same way as the blood that dwells in the veins. So also the prophet Isaiah in chapter 63, where he speaks of the shedding of the blood of the wicked; God compares Himself to one who treads the winepress alone, and says: "I have treaded them in my wrath, and trodden them down in my fury; so their blood is sprinkled upon my garments, and has defiled all my vesture." There the prophet compares shed blood with wine that has dried up, which ever has its likeness with the blood. Why then may the likeness not exist here? But see, 1) in one place the wine and the blood defile, in another place the wine cleanses; but the blood of the wicked defiles and makes unclean, for it is dead and died. Therefore the blood of the goats in the law could not cleanse. But Christ's blood, which is pure and living, washes and cleanses, where it is no more than sprinkled. Therefore the saying in Genesis 49 is to be understood that Christ washed his garment (that is, his spiritual body and church) from the impurities of sins with his precious blood, when John says: "His blood has washed us from our sins. [Revelation 1:5.]

46 Therefore, believers are called "sprinkled with his blood for sanctification," as the epistle to the Hebrews, Cap. 9:13, 14, powerfully indicates. But what is the forgiveness of sin but the washing away of stains and blemishes? And if the wine has a washing and cleansing power, it also has in it the likeness of the forgiveness of sins. Let no one be surprised, the Samaritan pours wine into the wounds of the wounded man at Jericho to cleanse them 2c. We also have baptism by fire; therefore in all things it is good to see that without all the mockery of Christ there are sufficient likenesses according to nature and Scripture.

47 And so the objections, however mockingly they are made, are sufficiently resolved. And now it is established that the *tropus* may persist here; so, too, God willing, the sacrament may well remain unchallenged.

The other part, that one must assume the *tropus*.

48. up to this point it has been shown that this way of interpreting ours is possible; Luther does not want to have enough of it, so it is also suggested to him.

1) Marginal gloss: *l'r-rAnr lavat "t totzäat; sie et sa-r*

shows that it must be so for him, which up to now has also acted against him and only tremendously; but what he imposes against it, we also want to consider, and it is to be found null and void, as that which is now heard.

(49) Three rules (2) have occurred by which it should be proven that our understanding is created right. The first one is also Luther's: One should stick to the dry, clear words of the text and let them be valid, what they interpret according to their kind; and give them other interpretations, unless a public article of faith compels. The other I have set: Sacraments should be spoken of sacramentally. The third, which is ours, is: one should not accept anything against the articles of faith. Here, Luther intends to make us defenseless in all three rules; but you will see that he does not succeed.

50 The first rule does not serve him at all: for I have taught him that the words, "this is my body, which is given for you," are dark and not clear according to his! For I have not said badly that the text is not clear, but if one gives him such an understanding, as Luther, namely, that the natural bread is essentially the naturally invisible body of Christ, which is visibly presented for us. But my interpretation is: 3) This natural bread is a sign of the natural body of Christ, which is given for us; and this is clearer, where one looks at the purpose of the text. You may well see this from the same example as that in Ezekiel: "This is Jerusalem, which I have set among the Gentiles." It is a clear saying, but to whom? to him who knows how the Jerusalem that was torn down was a figure of the other Jerusalem on a brick. But if someone would be so last-headed 4) that he would think that the painted Jerusalem would be essentially the real true Jerusalem, then the right mind would not be clear to him. So also, those who know that here is a sacrament of the true body of Christ, the text is clear to them, and my interpretation is quite certain. But those who do not know that here is a sacrament of the natural body of Christ, to them this and other sayings are obscure, not only in that they do not believe it as it is in itself, but also what the true content of the words is; and Luther must not consider me so simple-minded as if I did not know how to distinguish between *difficultatem intelligendi ih re, et difficultatem in-*

2) Marginal gloss: 1r6s rsZulus sxxoukuäas scripturas.

3) Marginal gloss: Huidus vsrda eoenus Clara.

4) i. e. wrong opinion.

telligendi in vocabulis. For I say that also

This word will be incomprehensible to the best speakers and those who understand the language, because they take the bread as a sign of the body.

In the other part of his book, Luther argues: "If we had the choice, we would not want to make a clearer and 1) more comprehensible text, 2) and as one put it differently, one would want to break a hole in it in all ways. Response. Yes, of course, it is well put, and if I had the choice, I would not put it differently, because I would have to give some people an understanding. However, he does not fasten his mind on Luther, but on ours. For two things may be understood if one asks: What is that? or if one says: That is that; either what it is according to its "essence" or what it is according to its "meaning. Now if the essence of a thing can be announced, and one asks further, then it is a sign that it carries a meaning in it, which one desires to know. Or if one answers: this is it; one says, what it "signifies": When St. Peter, Acts 10, saw the face with the harness, like a large linen cloth full of all kinds of animals, and he heard: Arise, butcher and eat 2c. And when it was taken up again, he doubted with himself what it was. Here Peter had knowledge that the vision was a vision, as it seemed to him; but he was not ignorant of what it meant. There the Scripture says: He stumbled, or was troubled in it, what it would jochs 3) be? that is, what God meant by it. The same questions are also with Zachariah and other prophets, that they ask: "Who are ine?" They were well aware of what the visions were essentially; but they desired what was meant by them.

52 Now this also was in the supper. The disciples knew what bread was, or what the cup was, and what was in the cup; but what Christ meant by this they did not know until he gave them to understand, as he had done several times, when he took the children to him and put one in the midst of them; they knew that the child was a child, but by this he taught them something else. Now I do not say this to prove the tropum, but to show what diligence the Lord had in teaching his own. And the words are plainly spoken, and no man would speak them more plainly himself.

(53) If I gave a penny with my image on it and said, "Take it," I would give it to you.

have you my face; or: this is my face, keep it in my memory! if I already had a power to change my face into the coin, would one therefore also have to have a clear word that the coin was essentially my face, and not rather this be a clear word, 4) that it was an image and memorial sign? There would probably be other decent words spoken, which would not deny such presence.

But here one would like to say to me: Lug, drive 5) beautiful, learn Luther's opinion daß! He does not want to say that bread is thus essentially the body, as the Father and the Son have a natural unity in the Godhead: Neither does he want 6) that a personal being should be understood here, as God and man are one person in Christ, since one says: Man is God.

55. answer. I am at it, and have fought against the opposition; for some have been so stiff-necked, and have been allowed to say: "Let there be dry words; let all reason depart; let all things be possible to God; if the priest speaks the words, the bread is like the body of Christ, as born of Mary; Mary bore Christ once, we bring him every day from heaven in the bread. I did not want to remain silent about this, because I am allowed to preach; for it is not similar to faith that the Son of God took another creature into a person than the seed of Abrahah, therefore I am well satisfied in this. But if one wanted to insist on the dry words without distinction, then one would not want to silence such screamers for a long time. For the true and right essence 7) is that some things are either of one nature or one person. I cannot consider other unity to be self-consistent and quite essential. Whether the Spirit of Christ is already in the believers in Christ, yet they are not a natural Christ or God, notwithstanding that the Psalm says, "Ye are gods." But some may boast that bread is the natural body of Christ in such self-consistent essence. 7)

56. item: It is also not Luther's opinion that there is a real unity, as it is said of angels [Ps. 104, 4.]: "God makes his angels.

4) "be" put by us instead of: "be".

5) "Lug" - see to, notice. - In the old edition: "Lug fhar schon", which Walch explains by "d. i. siehe aufer". But we do not think it right to take "fhar" for "aufer". Cf. § 85 in this writing of Oecolampad, where the word "Fahr schön" is repeated.

6) Marginal gloss: Imtūern of xonit nnionem natiralein vel personalem in saernento.

7) Essentiality - beingness.

1) So put by us instead of: ohnbegreiflichern.

2) Marginal gloss: ^xempla: esse xro sr'Anr/koa'e.

3) d. i. yes also.

to wind, and its dimers to flames of fire." And it is said of fire: this is an angel. Nor is it a formal or spiritual unity, as is said by the evangelists, that the Holy Spirit descended upon Christ in the form of a dove; for the Holy Spirit wished to manifest himself in such a form. Nevertheless, he does not want to have said that there is such a unity here; and yet it is said of the dove that it is the Holy Spirit, and the fire is the angels.

57 Answer. Here we would almost come to agreement, especially because it is said that the dove or the fiery tongues are the Holy Spirit. For the creature is not taken in one nature or person with God, only it has meant the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit has been no more agreed upon than other 1) creatures. So if one were to come here, 2) and speak of the bread in such a way that it is the body of Christ, it would by no means be against me. For I have reported this in my first letter. But that the sacramental agreement, like the real revelation of the angels in the fire, is not yet proven to me; because the angels made and held the fire anew. The bread is made before, and yet Christ does not work the bread in the believers' hearts. But Luther does not say the same.

Furthermore, I do not dislike the fact that Luther sets up a sacramental unification, and for the sake of this one should say "this is my body" and thus the two come into one being. He also gives such a rule to be spoken in all languages: "Where two different beings come into one being, one also includes such two beings in one speech; and as one looks at both beings, one also speaks of both with one speech"; and gives examples of all the unities now reported, so they are to be kept; also here in the "this is my body". And when they come together, they are called one being, even though each has its own being.

59. answer. I would also be satisfied, 3) because there is no way against me where Luther, with his strict refutation, does not obscure the name "sacrament" for us; for we must fear that he understands something else by sacramental unity, or sacramental essence. Does he want to understand it that sacrament means a sign of a holy thing, i.e., that in the case of a visible

if matter is understood as something invisible next to it, it is not against us; then the being will be a significant being that takes on matter, because it carries a new meaning through the word. "For when the word becomes an element, it soon becomes a sacrament," as Augustine says. It is a "being" that receives the meaning, but not a self-perpetuating being, and are two different things. But if the thing has become a sacrament, it is a significant being in relation to the one part. So it is not wrong to say, "This is my body. And this is exactly what I said at the beginning in the first explanation. Why do we quarrel with such great harm to Christianity? Let us understand one another, for it is not a matter here of which one is considered the more learned; but that the miscarriages, of which there have been many in this sacrament, be stopped, is still a matter of daily concern.

60) But if Luther confesses the simple agreement, 4) then why did he fight so hard that the bread does not have the likeness of the body that is offered for us, and now says that it is a sacramental union? I cannot compare Luther in this, and must not accept him there, because he presents himself so ultimately before.

But now I want to have brought this by force, that the words, how dry they are, will not serve him from the essence, in their first interpretation without all tropes and figure in the speech. For he must assume *synecdoche* in the union; and where the same figure is, there is not exactly the dry letter. 5) He must nevertheless assume the *synecdoche*. He must nevertheless accept the *synecdoches* thus

He is the one who helps us to confirm our cause, no matter how much he fights against us with words. And so he helps us to confirm our cause, however hard he fights against us with words.

Luther thinks that his interpretation is all the more obscure if one must understand the invisible body in one place and the visible body in another. But I do not see that it makes him any clearer where one thing is, and one should understand two properties, and that without all explanation and proof.

63 Further, I am said to have missed him also in saying that it does not rhyme in the words of Luke or Paul, who add, "which is given or broken for you," for if the body, as Luther says, is invisible, it follows that when I say that it is also invisibly given and given, it is invisible.

4) Edge gloss: pnMat soourn.
5) Edge gloss: reeipit

1) "others" put by us instead of: others.
2) Marginal gloss: Via ooneoräiso.
3) Marginal gloss: Viästur I,utkorus re ixsa oonsontiro, ob saeramontalerQ unionem.

would be broken. He considers a great insanity, *quod pro qualiter*, and compares this to the speech: Christ is invisible in heaven, who suffered visibly.

64. answer. Where we thought, what we acted, one would measure the thing soon. A long time ago he asked, 1) "one should bring whether Christ's body is already food, 2) that we also bring a likeness, in which he would be given for us". And now, if we show the likeness, he would gladly reject it in *qualiter*. But it will not help him, if the bread is a sacrament of the body of Christ, and Luther admits this in the meantime; even if we now argue this, and he does not deny it, as if it were none of his business, if the sacramental agreement should be indicated, namely: wherein the body of Christ is a bread, as it is distributed. And if the union and the essence stands on the likeness, the likeness shall not be restrained. For the very visible body then (while it was broken) it was a food. Now the sacraments are like the *concreta*, and hold in them substantiam and *accidens*, I must say, like a corrupt dialectic. They have a likeness as *accidens* in nature as a substance, and one asks not only who? or what? but also: how?

When I say: A charcoal burner who is black is a Moor, I mean: in that he is like a Moor) that he is black. Blackness is, after all, an accidental thing or *accidens*; as here "to give" and "to be broken" indicate the primary likeness, and "*corpus*" is in the likeness as substantia, and the "to be broken" -as *accidens*; so the *quid* and *qualiter* are found, and must be the likeness of nature and accident in a visible body. What would I be saying if I said: an invisible charcoal burner is a Moor?

(66) If I say of baptism that it is a sacrament of the dead and risen with Christ, may I not draw a quality from it? Luther's list does not rhyme at all: The invisible body of Christ is in heaven, and the visible one has died. For the speech is not heaped against the sacrament, 3) and it is without likeness; nor does it indicate to us the power of the sacrament. So our trope should and must consist of a clear understanding of the words.

The other rule I did not make up from my own head, but followed Augustine in it, and is this: That one speak of sacraments sacramentally. Luther does not like this rule either. Nevertheless, it is and remains certain and firm. But Luther has such an objection here.

68 To the first: "Dear, why are the other words not also taken figuratively, and does the trope alone go over the is, or *body*? Or where is the rule here that teaches us which words must not be taken figuratively? For on such words one would also like to take the words 'eat', 'such things do in remembrance of me'. Tropos watch, and say: 'Take' means: listen! 'Eat' means: believe! Such things do' means: to have in the heart" 2c.

Answer: 4) All speeches are to be accepted according to the occasion of the matter; one sees what is spoken for the sake of meaning or not. But Luther is more concerned with conundrums here than with fathoming the truth. I will answer him with an example: Somebody wanted to make a living lion out of a painted one; and I said: You shall speak of the painting as it is proper to speak of the painting. And another would begin to speak, saying: The painter has painted the color with the brush on the wall and told his disciples to do the same to him; and then he would come who before wanted to make a living lion out of the painted one, and would say: You told me to speak of the painting as of the painting; so I say, The painter is a sign of a painter, the paint is a sign of the paint, painting is a sign of the painting, the disciples are signs of the disciples 2c. Who would not see here that he was muthwilt and vexed the people? But if someone said that he did not know which was the true painter or the painted painter, or what was painted and what was not painted, who could be responsible for such a childish mind? Now every Christian knows well that bread is a sacrament, and is now interpreted that it is the body, that is, a memorial sign of the true body of Christ.

(70) In the same way a man would turn to it, if it were said to him, Believe the articles of faith, and put the mind into the obedience of Christ; in other things thou mayest keep thyself well without danger. Let him not speak such things: I do not know what the articles are, do I? Therefore, if we were not confessed [oovüttznt68 essinn] that bread was a sacrament, then perhaps this counter-

4) Marginal gloss: Initiū ās snoralnsntis loqni "sinnt.

1) d. i. demanded.

2) Marginal gloss: In oonorstis etiam ināieat.

3) "gebept" - asserted, raised; otherwise also "gehebt".

Throw a bill. But who says here: "to take" means: to hear? "Eat" means: believe? "Do such things" is: to have in the heart? "Dächtniß" is a crucifix; that he may draw such an interpretation? Now I have not spoken of all the surrounding words, but of sacramental ones, that is, "the bread"; although the word of the sign leans on the word body, as reported above.

On the other hand, he says: "God Himself should not be able to establish a sacrament in this way. For how can he speak of sacraments if all his words are to be understood differently than they are? If he speaks plainly of the manner of words, it is not a sacrament; for they are not tropi or figurative words. If he speaks figurative words, then one does not know what he says."

72 Answer: This two-horned *dilemma* does not sting or poke, and equally as little as if I were speaking: if one speaks only fragmented letters, then there is no meaning in them; for they are not whole words, but only letters. But if one speaks whole words, 1) one cannot understand them. So here 2) the words, when put together, give an indication of a sacrament. If I speak alone: "bread" or "body"; I do not come into the understanding of the sacrament. But if I link the different things together in speech, the figure soon carries itself. If I speak: I am buried; and say, Christ be my Lord; no one takes no figure from it. But if I join the simple words together, and say, I am buried with Christ, a figure is immediately found in the words. And if I say, Bread is of wheat; the body of Christ, born of Mary, is crucified, I have not yet the sacrament. But put the simple words together, bread is the body, and they bring a sacrament.

(73) Further, the other part of his argument is also of no use, when he says: But if God speaks figurative words, they are not understood. Answer: Yes, if figurative words were unrecognized words; but they are simple intelligible words, which by the addition take on something, by which they are figurative and are recognized; and are therefore simple in themselves, but have become figurative by the addition.

The third: "When Moses instituted the paschal lamb, which is a figure of Christ, he did not need a figurative word, but plain, simple words, as they were in common usage;

and all the figures of the Old Testament are spoken in dry, clear, simple words, and there is not one thing in them all that is spoken figuratively."

75 Answer: It is right, 3) that clear and simple words are taken as well, as composition of a word of good recognizable letters should happen. But in clear words also a figurative speech may arise. As in the word: It is the passover, the overtaking of the Lord. Whether this word contains nothing figurative, I will let Luther judge for himself. He will certainly say that it is a renewed word, and of the other meaning. Also, as stated above, such an interpretation has been taken from all words and invented in them. But that the paschal lamb is a figure of Christ, 4) was then not known to all the ancients, namely, if they were not further taught by the Spirit of God, as also other figures were hidden from them. For the common people, as the children, only the history and the letter was brought forward, from which they may not have learned so much. Just as the children, who already know how to read Latin, do not know what is said in German, so they read like beginners; the Christians who follow [read it] as it has been further interpreted. 5) For John says, "Take the history and the letter alone, from which they cannot read so much. For John says, "Behold, this is the Lamb of God!" Paul says, "Christ is our Passover!" Peter says, "We are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of an innocent and unspotted Lamb." Now if Moses had interpreted this to the ancients to Christ, and said, The lamb is Christ, which is without blemish, that is, without sin; this ye shall eat, that is, ye shall believe in him; there would be vain figure, the lamb a figure of Christ, the blemishes a figure of sin 2c. What then is this contrary to my given rule, as Luther says? Whoever wants to, may well see whether I speak with difference or not.

The fourth concern is that "if Christ is also called a sacrament in Scripture, 1 Tim. 3, it may come to be read that Christ is God, that it may be said that Christ is a signification of God.

Answer: There is no need for concern, because 6) Christ (as he may be called a sacrament or mystery) and the sacraments are so far apart. In addition, the place 1 Tim. 3.

3) Marginal gloss: In elaris vereissient
in eoZnitis litteris

4) Marginal gloss: Laeralnentr nostra antiyuis non plsns oosnita.

5) "the" put by us instead of: "he".

6) Marginal gloss: 6ÜRI8DI18 sao'anre-röAnr.

1) Which namely have a meaning in themselves, but are not yet put together per [ntaxin. (Walch.)

2) Marginal gloss: HnlokaeitooAKosorHMasaoranienta.

has a different meaning, because that is why Christ is called a sacramental sign.

78 Luther says to the fifth: "The sacrament or story should be a sign or likeness of another thing. But the words should not be interpreted in any other way than they are.

79) Answer: This is Luther's legend; and he wants that one believes him, God gives! what he says. Where is it written that the words in the sacraments should not be interpreted differently, neither they run? If I say: I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, does baptizing here mean nothing else, neither dipping in water in the name of the Father? so would baptism be with all physicians, stigners and salmoners, 1) who often dip something in wine or water and changed matter in the holy three names. But baptize here means nothing else, neither: I mark you, who are a member of the church of God Father, Son and Holy Spirit, with the signs of his children and members of his church. If one says to a judge, when he is put to the sword, Take it, and put it to you; this is the authority, that you should punish all the disobedient. Behold! how the sword is so comely a sign of violence, yea, a sign of violence, because the sword is needed in violence. So Luther makes rules where he has no Scripture anywhere, and accordingly he builds and insists on them.

80) But what does Luther mean by allowing it to be a sacrament and saying: It is supposed to model something, namely the unity of the Christians in one spiritual body of Christ through one Spirit? 2c. But why does he not confess here that it is a sign of the body of Christ given for us? If he does not confess it, how does it become a sacramental revelation, on which his praedicatione identica stands? This meaning is to precede, so that it may ground the other; the merit of the suffering of Jesus Christ is commanded to us more highly than that we should bear an abhorrence of it. This suffering, and the likeness of its fruit, are taught by the words and also by the signs; and there is no confusion among us.

Of the saying: "The rock was Christ", and of the circumcision, and of the paschal lamb, Luther must not give me anything. Read what I have written about them in my answers; they will probably remain unpunished for untruth.

The third rule is that no new doctrine should be accepted contrary to the similarity of faith. It

should be enough for peace, that no one should condemn us, because the righteous Christians have never rejected our doctrine as contrary to some article of faith, yet their opinion is introduced alongside these articles of undoubted faith. How earnestly was the Concilio Niceno (which is the oldest and, in terms of doctrine, accepted by all Christians without contradiction) concerned that 3) all the necessary articles of our faith should be brought together, and that henceforth no other should be added to them! Therefore, since Nestorius then began to teach his heresy, and the churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Hierosolymitana became divided in one part, and Antioch and Constantinople in the other, they disputed with great hardening, so that even in the Concilio at Ephesus they parted without an end. 4) For both parties claimed (as will be noted from their epistles) that the other party wanted to impose something further on the Christians to believe than was understood at Nicaea in the Symbolo; and finally the unity of the world in faith was restored by the means alone, 5) by the ten- and hundred-year-old bishop Acacium of Berea, that both parts were content from the interpretation of Athanasii: as he, Athanasius, in his epistle to Epicteto, which still exists, explained what was done at Nicaea. And so Nestorius was found to have made an addition, and was expelled from the Church as a heretic, and became a good peace.

But if in the articles of faith these articles of the sacrament, that the bread is essentially the body of Christ (that is, that the essential should be contrary to the significant essence), are not mentioned in the articles of the old faith, how can we allow a new article to be imposed upon us, against which other articles of faith would have to bow down and resign from the simple mind? since this article of the sacrament does not want to refrain from the other articles 6)? With this, the peace of the church will never be planted. Now, if one were to remain with the rigid words and exclude figurative speech, then one would have to take issue with other articles. So initially, 7) that the Son of God is not

3) Marginal gloss: Ooneiliurn Meenum novog usri srtwulos ^rodikuit.

4) i.e. without deciding anything, went from each other. I,66tio oactvmin 68t(Walch.)

5) Marginal gloss: ^,oaoius Lerosensis ynoinoão xaearit 666168138.

6) 8ubrmitt6r6, make tolerable. (Walch.)

7) marginal gloss: contra urtloululn inoar-nationw.

1) Perhaps: bird catchers and fishermen? "Stigner" perhaps formed by goldfinch?

2) Marginal gloss: yrMrs atrworreat a oixua rations saeramellti. .

He is not only clothed with humanity and receives the [Site] 1:²) "As if we were saying that he is bodily or visibly seed of Abraha, but is also clothed with the bread of in the sacrament". From which words I understand that he wheat; where it is otherwise urged to set the word wants to speak 3) that the Body of Christ is not bodily in "essential" against the word "sacramental," the mind is the Sacrament. Answer: We also say this. So far, not caught up in the servitude of Christ through the faith however, it has not been explained to us in this way, but of the incarnation of the Son of God. And since all other it has been argued as if the body of Christ were also in interpretations are in conflict with some articles of faith, the bread, and it has been badly answered that one and this ours is least opposed to such true incarnation, should not ask how or when. That is why I gladly accept not only is the trope possible, but it must and should be it; I also know that it has been taught in this way in the accepted. The two things are strictly contrary to each schools up to now.

other: the Son of God alone has assumed humanity; and: 88. but this will also go far: for if Christ has a true body, he has not only assumed it, but also the bread.

Now, praise be to God! Luther confesses that it is still natural nor personal agreement, and thus falls from the dry ohnfigürlichen words, and confesses that it is there a true body; and if it is thus in heaven, it is not on earth. For Synecdoche, that is, one may say: "This is the body" is the space, although it is not a body in itself, is a so much: "in which is the body"; or "under which", or "with [which] is the body of Christ. But who has read that the Scripture ever spoke thus? It does not say: The dove is the Holy Spirit, the fire is the angel, so that it, with the way of speaking, might be compared to our present words. 1) And D. M[artinus] also confesses this: That such real or formal unity is not found here in the Sacrament. If it is not found, they will not proclaim the words. Well then, he must produce a single example of his opinion to prove it, since we may have innumerable similar examples. But let it also be taught that the body of Christ is not "in," or "with," or "under the bread," in the sense commonly given.

Here one would like to warn me, however, and say: Drive nicely, and hear Luther's opinion thoroughly! Perhaps you will be of the same opinion if you do not agree with words at once.

First, Luther himself does not want the body of Christ in the sacrament to be *circumscriptive*, or *localiter*, that is, understandably, so that the place and the body therein rhyme with each other. Or circumscriptively, that he takes and gives according to his measure.

87. he also says at the sheet [or bow] s

where it is 4) bodily as one body, it will also have its space; and if one space is not more than one space, neither will the body be more than in one place, if it is otherwise a true body; and if it is thus in heaven, it is not on earth. For the space, although it is not a body in itself, is a remeasurement of the body in the body, or also of the other touching body, as, the wine in the jug may be added the remeasurement from the outside or the jug from the inside. Now this is such a quality that if a body did not have such respect, it would not be a true body. 5) And if God had the quality of a body, it would not be a true body. And if God took this property from a body, it would have to be a different creature than a body. For a body is not without its greatness, a greatness not without measure; and where the body is as a body, it has its greatness, whether in the subtlest or in the quickest way. For God created all things in number, measure and weight; the measure gives the physical things time, place, size.

From this I take: 6) although a body would be as subtle as the most subtle sun glass 7), nevertheless it has its measure, which will not be in many places, or one thing would have to be two. It has also here not one form, but with other qualities, that now and then the body is deadly, afterwards it is not deadly; that now it is not subtle nor flexible to the spirit, and afterwards it becomes so quick and flexible, and thus a spiritual body, which can penetrate all things. The fact that it is not clear now and becomes clear later does not take anything away from the truth of the body; it is still the true body. But to be a body without

2) No. 21, § 288.

3) Marginal gloss: non cioit, oorMS 6886
or>6Arno7rprv6 skin saeramento.

4) Randglosse: Oorpu8 non 6886 8in6 looo.

5) "Respect" probably w much as: Property.

6) Randglosse: Dot68 eorporis xlorlúoatl non tollunt v6ritat "m eorporis, 86â earonia äilQ6N8ionura.

7) d. i. Sun dusts.

1) So put by us instead of: "so that, it would like to be compared with the way of speaking, our present words".

If the body has no weight or measure in it, it will not be a true body. The fact that the body is without weight and conduct does not take anything away from the truth of the body, but that a body is without measure is not, as little as a white man is without whiteness.

Therefore also the bodies as bodies, where they are in a place, so they are not in a place like the angels or devils, have also another way to penetrate. The 1) Angels and devils must not be in a place, because they are not bodies, they may have been beings before the creation of the world as well as to this day. How much more is God not conceived in a place! But the bodies are not created with their quality. So also, where the bodies are as bodies, whether they are already not comprehended by us, thus follows that the lack in us; nevertheless they are there as comprehensible in themselves with their measure, their ubi and place touching.

91) Even if we say that Christ's body passed subtly through the stone or door, and therefore do not want to have it denied or denied, he still did not pass through the door like an angel or a devil, but as a body, which certainly had its measure, however small it may be thought to be. Nothing is pressed so tight and full, it may be firmer; if it is firmer, it still has something thin 3) or gap; if it has something thin, it may give space to subtle penetrating things. If now Luther wants to say that the body is in the bread and not bodily, then it is also not spiritually in it as a spirit; for it is not a spirit, neither 4) which has no flesh and leg; it follows then that it has its space.

Here I must also answer for the fact that Luther reproaches me for having said that there was another way that Christ entered through the closed door, but that he must have two bodies and that they were in one place. He mockingly asks how it happened, and whether the body in the bread might not also have subtlety.

Answer: However, 5) I would like to say: the text in the evangelist would not be able to; because it is badly written: "When the doors were closed because of fear of the Jews"; and it is not written: through the closed door. The little word by is not in the text; the one who gave his glass 6) to the disciples

1) Marginal gloss: [^]nZeHs non opus loous.

2) In the old edition: verjatzget.

3) In the old edition: Thünne.

4) So put by us instead of: "then he is not a spirit, which is the" 2c.

5) Marginal gloss: Huornoão Odristus jnnulk olausis inArssus sit.

6) Glast -gloss.

He would also like to join them through the door and in other ways. But I have gladly praised the glory of the body of Christ, and have spoken like St. Augustine, who writes in the book *de agone Christiano*, Cap. 24, thus: "Let it not grieve us that it is written, how, when the doors were opened, Christ suddenly appeared to the disciples, that we should therefore deny that the body was human, because we see that he entered through the opened doors contrary to the nature of that body. All things are possible to God; for it is evident that he also walked on the water against the nature of the body, and not only did he, the Lord, walk before the suffering, but he also made Peter walk on it. For if before the suffering he might have made the body appear as the sun-glass, why not also after the suffering at a momentary time he might have made it subtle, so that it might have entered by a determined door?"

These are St. Augustine's words, which indicate the subtlety that does not take away the space of the body, and does not make two bodies in one place. Now such subtlety truly lets the body be one body, 7) and shows how it is spiritual, that is, subject to the spirit. But to be without a place, without a space in the world, does not indicate a true body, but rather to be a man without a soul.

95 But if he asks whether Christ did not also know the way into the bread, he must not answer. If he were in the bread, he would have his place and place in it, and not outside; so he would not be in two places. Therefore to speak, if one remains on the speech. If Christ is conceivable or *circumscriptive* in heaven, then he is not in the bread, which some also want to have for the sake of such a given likeness, because the corpse has passed through the stone and through the grave.

Secondly, Luther admits that the body of Christ is *definite*, that is, incomprehensible and without fence in the Sacrament. Answer: The way to be in a bodily thing is measured out to the spirits, 8) not to the bodies. He will also not like to teach it, as much as he always brings parables to it. The angels, if they are not corporeal, are not to be measured to any body, but they show their presence. For if they have not an infinite power, because they are creatures, they are not in all places at all times, nor are they in all places at all times.

7) "his" is used by us instead of: be.

8) Marginal gloss: [^]NMIU8 non in multis loois äsüntlivs.

not in many places, for they are sent out. Unless God commanded and made it in their nature. Therefore, if they are in heaven, that is, in the highest place, they are not also in the lowest. Not seeing that they see the face of the Father in heaven; for two places are not thereby assigned to them.

But that our bodies will penetrate the bodies, as well as the angels, has a much different form; for the bodies will then be obedient to the Spirit, and also all the bodily creatures to man, so that with men, for their benefit, they will be renewed, Rom. 8. Therefore it does not serve, indeed, would freely bring us a Marcionian and fantastic body, which we do not accept. Christian faith holds that we will be resurrected in the body, but in a spiritual one, not that the body will become a spirit. 1) Oh no! for otherwise Christ would have risen in vain; but that the body should obey the Spirit. Now, a body without a bodily dimension, what difference has it from a spirit? Therefore, it is not reason that prevents us from following Luther, but faith that we will be resurrected in a true body.

Here, when I think about the parables 2) that Luther has set, they do not want to coincide with those that teach experience in the natural arts. He says: Of the vision, as it moves through air, light or water and is, and neither takes space nor gives it. But experience 3) teaches us otherwise than that something goes out of our eyes to the visible thing, but the visible image, which manifolds itself until it comes to our face, by convenient means; and the visible image is also no body, because it has no dimension. Similarly, 4) when a sound travels through water, board, and wind, 5) it is much different, because it serves that there is one body in many places. The sound is not called a body, the breath also, and the moving air from the mouth does not reach so far, but diversifies until it touches, receives one air from the other; just as a stone, thrown into a well, makes a whirl, so there is also a diversity; of this I let the physicos speak. So much is said now that all parables are worthless. For if we were to understand the through-

If we were to compare the course of a glorified body with such inconsistent things, we would find no consolation. If we ever fathom the thing, neither in the essence, nor in the manner of the effect, is there found a fair likeness; if we do not see the things that are before us and are earthly, what might we say of the things that are far off and heavenly?

99. Thirdly, Luther says: "If Christ is God and man, and the two natures are one person, so that the same person cannot be separated, it follows that he is and may be *repletive*, that is, in a supernatural way, everywhere, and that everything is fully Christ through and through, also according to humanity; not circumscriptive in the previous way, but according to the supernatural divine way; and if you pointed out a place where God would be and not man, then the person would already be separated; for I with truth could say: Here is God, who is not nor became man: then the person would already be separated; for I with the truth could say: Here is God, who is not man nor became man. 7)

Answer: That two natures are one person, which are inseparable, the Christian faith holds. But this is not separated because human nature does not have the measure of divine nature, or because divine nature takes the measure of human nature, although both are measured out to the single person. So we say: Christ was mortal; and: Christ suffered; the measure of the Godhead is: to be present around and around, and in no place enclosed or encompassed; the measure of the body is: to be and to be comprehended in One place. The measure of the Godhead is: to make all things alive; the measure of the body is: to have its life from God; and although the body is not incomprehensible to us in all places, yet it is God's own body, the incomprehensible and present in all places; this does not divide the unity of the person in any way. The measure of God's attribute is also to be above time and motion, yet from Him is time and all motion; but the measure of the body is to be found under time and motion; and though He is not apart from time, yet He is assumed to be God's own body, the unchangeable, and from eternity; and therefore there is no separation; and because He is God's own body. Where Christ is spoken of, after he is only 9)

1) Marginal gloss: Corpus solum esse Äs/?-rr7rvs in weo, puAnat eum "-rsrÄo ^sstt/vso-ron^s.

2) Marginal gloss: LirniHturio, Äs vrsA, l,ntkori of jnvut.

3) Marginal gloss: quorncxio üat.

4) Marginal gloss:

5) Maybe "wall" ?

6) In the old edition: "wüstest". Luther: show would".

7) No. 21, §143 f.

8) Marginal gloss: Nonsurao äiversao, trilmtas ssorsim, nori äiviäunt.

9) "he now" put by us instead of: "and he".

If the body is taken, it is not said that Christ is without a body. God, who has a body, works in hell, and yet is not included in it, so his body is not in it; for the place of the body is not there, although his divine power is really present. And does it not follow: Here is God, who is not man; for God is no less man, if he does not in such a supernatural way make the body permeate all things; and so the body in its measure has a stately place and is not comprehended. For this the supernatural way has to be in, with effect and presence in all places, 1) and in addition in none may be circumscribed with comprehensible way. But this is not at all in the measure of the body. If therefore I say, Christ is in the assembly of two or three, gathered together in his name, whether in the church, he is truly there; and if therefore he hath not left the body, which hath its place in heaven, he is undivided, and is indeed wholly there.

Luther says of me: I have written before that Christ is placed in heaven according to the Godhead, and on earth according to the body alone; and he adds: If Christ is One Person in the Godhead and humanity, then humanity must be on earth and in heaven at the same time; for to be One Person in God is more than in heaven. And further says: this is also not true that Christ was then in heaven; where was he after the Godhead, since he was in his mother's womb? Was he not personally and essentially also after the Godhead in the womb on earth?

102 Answer: My words might have been more faithfully applied, for I say thus: Then at that time she (the person I understand) alone was in heaven according to the Godhead, but the body was on earth. I did not deny that the Godhead was not also on earth, but that the body of Christ was not in heaven, which I also say, because it was on earth. This therefore takes nothing away from Christ, that he is inseparable in heaven and on earth, completely in heaven and completely on earth. And how did Luther mean that the Godhead was not in heaven? "Is not heaven the chair of GOD, and the earth his footstool?" Is not in heaven his chief activity? Does not Isaiah [Cap. 64, 1.] say, "Oh that thou wouldest break through the heavens"? In the acceptance of mankind, God descended, and yet did not leave His place. For he remained what he was. 2) That he also speaks:

3) Luther himself knows well that the kingdom of heaven is not always taken in one mind in Scripture. Where he does not admit Christ more than others, 4) who teach and live rightly and are in heaven, it is small, for the sake of the matter, that he says: He is in heaven. Why does he not say more than that he is a LORD of hosts and king of angels in heaven, but a good shepherd of Israel on earth? is one person.

In sum: God is called to be in heaven, since his primary work is shown; and that he descended from heaven, if he, regardless of all his divine power, thus deeply humbles himself and becomes man. But what is this consequence: It is much more to be agreed to be God than to be in heaven; therefore shall mankind be equal with God in heaven? Where I said: it is much more to be created in the image of God, than to receive no bodily food; therefore we are not allowed any bodily food: so I would be despised for such a consequence. For (as it is said), if Christ took mankind unto Himself, He did not take from it its measure; that it might be a true mankind, and that we might hold Him for our brother; to which also all faith urges. In whom Christ is given the name above all names, that he is God and man, and true God and man. Take away his omnipotence and supreme wisdom, and he is not true God. If you take away his limbs and his state, he is not a true man.

104) Item, if I have put to cheerful mind a likeness, which he rejects, and must be foolish to him. 5) Now it is not mine, but Augustini de agone christiano o. 25. says: "We should not hear those who deny, 6) that our Lord did not raise his body with him in heaven"; and thereby reports: "No one ascends in heaven, but he who descends from heaven; and say: the body did not descend from heaven, so it could not ascend. For they do not understand that the body could not have ascended into heaven, but the body did not ascend. But he was lifted up into heaven, when he that ascended lifted him up. And that I may give an example, if a man came down from the mountain, and when he came down, he clothed himself, and so clothed he went up again, would we ever say, No man ascends, but he that descended?"

1) marginal gloss: totus udiguo, reads oozx>"s
 ùon kit udigue repletive.

2) Randglosse: veus in eaelo, st dssesndit às saslo.

3) No. 21, § 301. Luther: "on earth".

4) "others" put by us instead of: "others".

5) No. 21, § 301.

6) Marginal gloss: Limüitndo ds vesFr'-tt, rsZs asesndsnts.

and took no account of the garment which he takes up with him; but we took account of him that is clothed, and say that he ascended clothed. These are St. Augustine's words; but if I speak them in his opinion, it must be a fool's land. Although Luther says: God does not depart from heaven like this. But he should talame 1) well know what likeness would be right; but he brings quite inconsistent likenesses, all the way from images to bodily things, or from spiritual to bodily things; and from God's power he falls in, and thus should be unpunishable, and not allowed to answer for anything else?

Among all of these, Luther insists: "One should prove that God has no other way possible for One Body to be in two parts, and that He has a clear saying.

Answer: But if it is not similar to faith, to take away from the body of Christ the measure of a true body, to introduce it into the world without space and place. If, then, it is necessary to prove that it is not possible for God, then every heretic would like to have a misunderstanding of a sentence, so that he should be taught that it is not possible for God. We should look at the simplicity of faith, and judge accordingly, stay with it, follow no path of reason here, but know moderately. 3)

107) It should also be said that 4) St. Stephen saw Christ in one face. The evangelist says [Apost. 7, 55]: "Since he was full of the Holy Spirit", therefore a good indication of how he saw Christ. In the 6th chapter [v. 15] it says how those who were sitting in the council saw him; therefore it can be assumed that he could not have seen the visible heaven in the council house with them; therefore it also says afterwards: "and they rushed at him with one accord" [Apost. 7, 56]. It seems that "where" he had seen the face. This and other things to confirm our case are in the book *de cognitione beatae vitae*, without needing to go into detail here. Here it is said enough that the body of Christ is at once in one place, like a body circumspective. The other two ways do not address the body, therefore also the places of the Scriptures, so attracted by us, as that Christ has left the world, still stand stiff and unchanged.

108) A useless evasion is sought in Luke, since he says: "I said these things while I was still with you," and yet at the same time I was with them. As if Christ were with us, and not with us. And does not the evangelist say that at one time Christ was in two ways. For before he was with them visibly and passibly, but now, when he spoke, he was passively. Nor does it indicate that he was in two places at one time. This would perhaps have more credit, since he says: "Take note! I am with you until the end of the world" [Matth. 28, 20]; but I do not think that Luther would attribute this to bodily attendance. For Christ, who dwells with his church, is therefore separated from his body in heaven. Now let us continue!

109) Since Luther says in the previous letter against the enthusiasts in letter H [leaf] 2: 5) "Christ is there for you when he adds his word, and binds himself with it, and says, Here you shall find me, 2c. which he does in the Lord's Supper, and says, This is my body. Against this I have given the two sayings, that Matt. 24 [v. 23] says, that Christ is yet to be sought here or there; and the other, John 4 [v. 21], that the time is coming that he will be worshipped in this place or in other places. These sayings are presented by me in another form, as they are now already put on by Luther; they penetrate harder than one assumes them; because according to their legend, when the words are spoken, he binds himself with them, yes, so is the body under the bread. This should now be a certainty, as if God had decreed it. And when Luther does this, he now throws it wide open and says: "Who binds Christ in special places? Aren't the enthusiasts themselves the ones who put Christ in heaven in a special place and force us to say, "Here is Christ"? Note Luthern on the bolt. 6) We also confess that Christ is around and about, but that he has taken his body to heaven, and we do not give it a special place outside of Scripture. What then does he impose on us?

110) But 7) when Christ says: "here and there", he points to the places on earth, as the halls and deserts; 8) and against this he emphasizes how Christ will come from heaven, where we also point.

1) d. i. already.

2) Marginal gloss: *ʿgumkntum "öFÄer*
non "ö E-rxoʿe-rʿr"

3) In the old edition "moderately know", which will probably be understood according to Rom. 12, 3: moderately think of oneself.

4) Marginal gloss: *Ktkpüanusviät* in
8piritu.

5) No. 20, § 126.

6) i.e. the arrow he shoots.

7) Marginal gloss: *Ar Ärcre/r-rʿ-roör's 7 Zoos /ʿe 6to. 6xx>onitur.*

8) i.e. "chamber and desert" according to Matt. 24, 26. - "lifts" - holds, compares.

But Luther perhaps thinks that this text should not be understood from the future to the judgment. But now we will interpret according to faith: *venturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos*, "From then on he is to judge the living and the dead. What is wrong there? Certainly nothing. It does not mean "to bind"; we do not need that word either. And even if we instruct the simple and the children, 1) that they should worship God, and say: Our Father, who art in the heavens! even if they do not understand the spiritual heavens, we do not therefore bind God to a place, if we desire the heart of man to be lifted up, and tell them that they should call upon Him, and be joined to Him with their hearts, who created the heavens and the earth, so that they may lift up their minds over the heavens and the earth; this, of course, does not mean binding to a place.

He further challenges us, saying, "How do they themselves direct people to the gospel and to the neighbor? Is not the neighbor and the gospel in separate places on earth? Is not Christ in the believers?"

112) Answer: Yes, we know that the gospel is the power of God, and the believer is a temple of Christ; but we do not bind Christ with it, nor do we point to it as being in the place of his body, as [those] who put Christ's body there essentially. 2) We do not know that the gospel is the power of God, and the believer is a temple of Christ.

It seems that Luther admits us one thing when he says: "just as if we were saying that he is bodily or visibly in the sacrament".

Answer: Praise be to God! We know well that they do not say that he is visible in the sacrament; but they have left me under the delusion that he is bodily present in the sacramental bread, and is taken with the mouth; as he so rightly gives to Pope Nicolao. Now I accept this: If the body is not bodily present, then it is also not present except in a sign; where its body is, there it must also be bodily. Ah! that one would have spoken like this at the beginning and would have persisted in it! So is he; why do we torment one another, and hinder other people?

Luther teaches us how to understand in two ways 3) "here and there", that is, *loco et more loci*, that is, first essentially; that he is to be found essentially, and presently. We must allow them that. Secondly, need-

usualiter]; that is, that he keeps himself of the same place, as one who has citizenship in a place, and one who is otherwise there.

Answer: We know this well, and we also call God to honor "here and there", where He makes Himself known to us; but not "bindingly", that you should return to this or that place, but seek Him in heaven. And [it] does not want the place of Matthew [Cap. 24, 23. 26.] to indicate that the kingdom of God does not come with an outward gesture or visitation, as St. Lucas says in the 17th Cap. [v. 20, 21]; for he writes just at the 21st cap. [v. 8] also writes this saying, so that it may be known that he is speaking of a different future. Well then, if the body is held up in worship and not led up to heaven, then one misses the place and the custom of the place; one not only follows false prophets, but one also thinks that he has gone astray in elements 4).

The saying of John 4 [v. 21, 23] about worship is interpreted in the most inappropriate way by Luther, which I would never have thought. Now this is 5) my understanding, that Christ wants to say, that instead of the old law the law of the spirit should come. And we know that in the old law God chose special places where he wanted to be found. Now, however, he is again to be joined to this word and appointed in the sacrament, and to be sought in a special place here on earth, as you say; is it not *judaized* [*judaizatum*], and acted like the old law in worship? Certainly, if our hearts are now renewed in the truth by the Holy Spirit, we will undoubtedly know how to seek and find Him, yes, even without altars, images, elements, flesh, bread, wine, and without all creatures; nevertheless, has it ever been said of the worshippers even there. If GOD is humbled to find His body in one place: Ei! so [they] also lead to worship Him! Seeing no more than comparing new and old law, the interpretation of the saying becomes clear, and shall become even clearer in what follows, if God wills it!

118) We also have the saying of John 6: "Flesh is of no use," interpreted according to the instruction of faith; namely, that the flesh of Christ was not ordained by God to be eaten carnally, but rather spiritually through faith; so that we believe that God so loved the world that He did not spare His only begotten Son, but gave Him to death, so that if one believed in Him,

4) d. i. conceived.

5) Marginal gloss: *Adorare OHIH in spiritu.*

1) Put by us instead of: know. Cf. § 99 of this writing: "wüsstest". The interpunction of this whole passage was quite wrong and made the sentence meaningless.

2) modest - decree, set.

3) No. 21, § 304.

life, which is enough here. Contradictory is it not, that the flesh of Christ is ordained to be eaten carnally, even with faith; and that it is not ordained to that end. 1) And because it is not ordained, it is not profitable therein. But whereunto it is ordained, the whole chapter sheweth us; and if the Scripture be explained according to all the circumstances of the proceeding and following, it ought to be deemed ohndienstlich to consult the true mind, as we have done?

But Luther splashes in, and 2) brings a rhyming gloss, as if the disciples were scolded for their lack of understanding, since he says: "Flesh is not useful" is spoken in such a way: Ah! coarse heads will not do it. One may well make a side argument, but this is the core and marrow of the whole interpretation. It says of "being of no use" (namely, to make alive), and also of "to make alive". So it may be understood from the word "to make alive" what kind of meaning there is.' The quality of bread is to make alive, which is the quality of God, who gives the true bread of heaven, and that we might eat it, he took the flesh to himself, and thus became our food when it was given to us. The common spirit or spiritual mind does not give life, but the Spirit of Christ gives life. If he would let it be a common rule, it would have a better form, and still nothing would be taken from the flesh of Christ. For though it be like unto the flesh of the first Adam before he sinned, yet is it not profitable to eat. That we have life is not because Christ is God and man, that is, because the living Spirit is in him, as he truly is, but because he is communicated to us. The communication takes place, as and when God wills, through the intercession of Christ and the paternal procession; but ordinarily and commonly through the Word and the means of writing. The reception of these sacraments 3) first of all shows that a person has attained life by faith in Christ, or that he will eat the bread without distinction.

120 Now I have explained the meaning of the words by a pretty simile Augustini, which disclaims

1) The text seems to be corrupted here. The sentence might have read something like this: "It is incontrovertible that it is not contrary to one another that the flesh of Christ is ordained to be eaten spiritually with faith, and that it is not ordained to be eaten carnally. And because," etc.

2) Marginal gloss:

exponitur.

3) Maybe: requires?

Luther to me. I say no more about this, except that I ask that my likeness and his be read against each other with equal judgment; so let it be found as it may. It is not necessary to repeat them: He who has faith knows well that he obtains life from God through the Spirit who gives faith, and not from the carnal (as some say) supper; there is more thanksgiving for the graces obtained than for those not yet obtained, although God also often works miraculously at the same time through His Word.

(121) So then, the *tropus* which we have indicated is also according to Scripture, and is free in the text, and has no deficiency anywhere; it is clearer than others; it is around and around according to Scripture, allows the sacrament to remain sacrament, has for help the articles of faith, the sayings also, "that Christ has gone to heaven", and "the flesh is of no use". These all give us tremendous support, and refute all other interpretations; so now also the saying "this is my body" should and must be interpreted in such a way that we recognize that this bread is a sacrament of the body of Christ, given for us.

The third part. Rejection of several counterstatements.

If these pieces were understood correctly, there should not be much further response to the objection that Luther raises against us in the other part; for he does not want to understand us correctly anywhere, and he shields us from how we can accept their understanding, as if it were according to the words, and we should bring another, better text 2c. Now they themselves will not be able to stay on the words, and must accept a synecdoche; and where it is seen in the light, it is not against us. We also find their words, as "essential," "invisible," "under," "with," and "in the bread," of no account in the word of the Lord. If they once deviate from mere words to figurative speeches, it is not that one should blame God afterwards, if one does not want to measure the matter accurately. But these and others, which are spoken according to the flesh and the course of the world, I leave aside. The cause to doubt, where they themselves want to, shall be put away from them; and so that I do not answer in a way of dispute, I will put it in question one after the other.

The first question: How is it that all evangelists are so unanimous? where some *tropus* would be in this, would have admittedly some with a

4) "their" put by us instead of: their.

What is the meaning of the first letter, that another text might have been, as they do in other things, where one puts what the other omits? Answer: So 1) Lucas and Paul add: "which is given or broken for you"; and so of the cup, and the testament beforehand, so it is said, that they allow the synecdoche in many ways: how is it then that they lay the blame on the evangelists? that shall be found afterwards.

The other. If Christ had drunk the last drink before, as it is written in Marco and Luca, it follows that there will be no more bad bread and wine. Answer. We do not deny this: for sacramental bread is not bad bread, and the worthy partaking is, according to the old law, kept after Easter, even after the body's need, but in gratitude to the highest goodness, feasting on heavenly food. We do not ignore the works, as we are wrongly reproached.

125 Thirdly. Why did the Lord say, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine," and not say, "I will not drink of the wine"? Because it is to be understood that one should look for something higher, and without doubt the drink in the Lord's Supper does not come from the vine. If then it is not the fruit of the vine, it is certainly the blood of Christ. Answer. Christ has given leave with the whole speech 2) of this bodily need, and now calls to another meal; and the wine is nevertheless wine, as Luther himself confesses. But when one does sacrament, one is not with one another for the sake of bodily need. We are not interested in the grapevine, where only the heavenly drink is palatable to us in our hearts; therefore the wine must not be essentially blood, nor the blood bodily present in the bread, as some say.

126 Fourthly. Why else do both Lucas and Paul put before the cup this word: "the same also the cup after supper", or: "after they had eaten at night", because that he would now speak of another drink? Answer. As reported above, it is not against us, it does not help the adversaries.

127 Fifthly. If the evangelists are not against each other, and Lucas says: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood", he does not want to say differently than Matthew and Marcus, that this is his blood; one should not understand it so roughly, as if the cup was in the blood.

Like a peasant in boots. Answer. Certainly the evangelists are one; but because St. Lucas, as Luther himself says, writes more neatly than the others, even more accurately: so one takes the clear understanding from Lucas more cheaply; and is not to be understood as if the cup stood in the wine like a peasant in boots. But neither is it to be understood as if the wine were essentially blood, and the cup were therefore the New Testament, that the blood of Christ was in it. It is too far-fetched to conclude that the cup is the blood of the New Testament and the New Testament is in the blood.

128 To the sixth. Lucas speaks of the blood of which Matthew and Marcus speak; and according to Oecolampad, body and blood are signs in the Lord's Supper, and are called body-signs and blood-signs; so in Lucas, blood must also be called blood-signs, and Lucas' text must therefore be held according to Oecolampad's opinion: This cup is a new testament in my blood-sign, namely in the bad wine. Thus the new testament becomes no more than a drink of wine; or a drink of wine is so strong that it makes this cup a new testament. Response. It is true that Lucas and other evangelists speak of the same blood, namely the true blood of Christ; but I do not say that body and blood are signs: but bread and wine, although, because it is a figurative speech, the tropus and the interpretation falls on the word "blood" in Matthew and Mark, as is said above. And Luther does not want to notice the logic. Whether one says that Christ is a son of Mary; one does not want to say that Mary is a son, but Christ. Also when I say: The wine is a sign of the blood, I do not want to say: The blood is a sign; but this is added to the wine, that it is a sign. Therefore, my interpretation will remain the same with Luke: The cup is a sign of the new testament in the true blood of Christ, and the other consequences and misfortunes are all of no concern to me.

129 To the seventh. If Oecolampad does not want to put the tropus on the blood, but on the new testament, why does he not make it all a sign and a vain *tropos* and thus says: This sign of the cup is a sign of the new testament, in the sign of my blood? Who gives cause why one word, and not the other also, takes the tropus? Answer. If one speaks of signs, one should not make a sign out of the signs, and thus speak of the sign, so that it is recognized as a sign. So

3) Marginal gloss: HAando Msnäuin tropo.

1) Marginal gloss: LvanZelistas variantss inäwaiw tropuni.

2) Marginal gloss: Huovaoão inwlllMnäum: Lr

Nor shall I say here, a sign of the cup; for then the cup would not be the sign, but the sign. And if I say, The cup is a sign of the new testament; then the cup is the sign, and not the testament nor the blood, and they are not the less in their natural nature.

130 To the eighth. Why does Oecolampad not do the same in Matthew and Mark? Turn where you will; if blood is a *tropus* in Matthew and Mark, it is also in Luke; and if it is not in Luke, it is also not in Matthew and Mark. Response. Yes, it is so. I ever confess that in all the evangelists the blood is the true blood of Christ, and also the body; but in one place the *tropus* reaches the word "blood," in the other it does not. I could give many such examples. I say, "Christ is a Son of Mary." There the little word "son" stands on "Mary", and is otherwise attached to Christ. In another speech: "Christ is a son of the heavenly Father, who chose Mariam, Christo to be a mother." See, there the word "Son" does not reach "Mariam". Item, one says: "the seed rst a figure of the Word of God," or: "the seed is a figure of the preaching of the Word of God." There it is well to see that neither the word of God nor the preaching are the figure, but the seed. And the little word "figure" 1) refers to the "word" in one place, and not in the other.

131. to the ninth. So Oecolampad says: "This cup is a sign of the new testament in my blood; confesses [that] Christ's right blood is in the cup, and creates no more, than that this cup is a sign of the new testament: so it would be no more, because: the cup is with Christ's blood a figure of the new testament; and therefore Christ's blood must not give a right new testament, and be no better than the paschal lamb." Response. I do not therefore confess that the blood is in the cup; but that by the blood the new testament is sealed, and is signified in this. Therefore the consequences and consequent are useless; for I do not pass 2) the *antecedens* or first speech. But if the blood were so, and the Scriptures were able, without doubt this and other things might follow. But Paul to the Hebrews clearly indicates what the blood sealed the testament.

132. to the tenth. Where is any example that the New Testament should be a *tropus*? Answer. It does not need to be; for I

but do not say that it is a *tropus*, although the word "sign" falls on it. 3) The wine is accepted as a sign, therefore we call it a sacrament. But testament stands here in its value; it is signified by the sign. Therefore, one may still speak of the new testament, and it still remains the gospel; it does not need the care of all, and neither blood nor testament will here be figurative for itself; although the word testament serves another, and carries the *tropum* on it.

133 Eleventh. One may point to the cup and say, "this is the New Testament," that is, Christ's blood; just as the bodily flame of fire is a spiritual thing, that is, the angel, and the dove is called the Holy Spirit. Therefore, whoever drinks of this cup truly drinks the true blood of Christ and the forgiveness of sins, or the Spirit of Christ, which are received in and with the cup; and will not receive here a living figure or sign of the New Testament, for that was due to the Jews in the Old Law. Response. That 4) I have confessed in my first writing out, that I like to understand, "this is my body," as the dove is said to be the Holy Ghost. For it was not essentially the Spirit, but a creature created, that it should mean that the Holy Spirit dwelt in Christ; for thus also this bread signifies to us the true body of Christ. Now he who saw the dove did not see the Holy Spirit, but by a figurative speech, because it signifies the Holy Spirit, because the sign and the signified are understood together. Such speech is called *synecdoche*, I call it sacramental in the place, and I would not like to have it cut off. It is also not the first chip in it. Therefore, it does not follow that the blood of Christ, the forgiveness of sins, is drunk from it, only as far as it signifies; and therefore it does not have to be bodily present or bodily received, as will follow from the interpretation of the blood.

134. to the twelfth. "Where already Oecolampad gladly sought a remedy and placed the text thus: This cup is a sign of the new testament in my blood; that not the blood should belong to the cup, but to the testament, on this opinion: The new testament is in the blood of Christ, and exists through it; and not thus, that the cup is a sign and figure through the blood of Christ, thus: This cup is a sign of the new testament;

1) i.e. directs.

2) exist - concede.

3) Perhaps: "shall" - may serve.

4) Marginal gloss: stwutsisrūuoat itap"?rrs

but the New Testament is in the blood of Christ. Where he thus says, he well knows that such a text cannot be here; for a Greek article should be here, but it is not there, but the text hangs together as if it were one inseparable word." Response. So Luther knows well that I put it thus, as he says; what has he frightened us so long? 1) Yes, it is not to be called a makeshift, but the quite full interpretation, and is therefore not needh of a new Greek article. 2) There is a word that goes with it, namely the little word "new"; for if it is a testament, and that is renewed, not with the blood of oxen, but with the blood of Christ. Erasmus interprets it in this way, although he otherwise does not agree with me on this and several other points. Namely, he says in annotationibus super Lucam: "As the Old Testament is confirmed and consecrated, since the people were sprinkled with the blood of oxen; so Christ by his blood has sanctified the New Testament for us, which the epistle gives to the Hebrews. Now he has enough understanding of the Greek language, and has seen that this article is not needed. Such speech, who would search there, he would find much; as, Marci at the 9th chapter: "until they see the kingdom of God come to be in power", *εως αν ιδωσι την βασιλειαν του &εοϋ &ληλυ&υϊαν ιν δυνάμει*. It also says *not την &ληλυ&υϊαν or την έν δυνάμει*. Around here If it is completely a forgiven counterproposal, and if there is nevertheless the arrest, then he wants to direct it with omission of an article, and misses there as well as in other pieces.

135. to the thirteenth. Lucas with One Word beats the gushers all to heaps. Response. Yes, with 3) one word he certainly gives to understand that a tropus is to be assumed in the speech. For one may not deny that the testament is confirmed by death only in the death of the testator, and the highest priest goes with the blood into the sanctuary. Therefore here is not the confirmation of the testament; but at the cross, there is the forgiveness of sin. Here is the proclamation, in faith is the acceptance, the bestowal of the merit is of the Spirit of Christ. Now here is the preaching of the testament, this cup and the supper, and the covenant is not set in it; so it follows that the cup is a sign of the covenant or testament, and is not the testament itself. Yes, whoever wants to go worthily to the sacrament, shall

have already the faith that his sins are forgiven, and thus give thanks to the congregation with the sacrament. And so then, as it stands here with the testament, why does one object in the other similar places? and now also say like Luther: "As the cup is a sign of the testament, so also is the bread a sign of the body, and the wine a sign of the blood." For the evangelists must read the same.

136 To the fourteenth. What good would it do if their text could stand? With the sign and interpretation, they may not indicate a title of sameness. Answer. The parable of breaking and pouring is sufficiently indicated above, and if not, Luther gives it to us now.

137 To the fifteenth. May the pouring out in the evangelists and the breaking in Paul not give the same meaning, serving the body of Christ; but rather they find said about the administration of the sacrament. Answer: If one may see clearly 4) how Luther writhes, and how he would like to, where he only wants to; so one sees it there. Above he rejects the likeness where the blood is poured out; and here it is so clear that he cannot deny it; and if the shedding of the blood goes to him, the breaking goes to the body, although he wants the breaking of the body and the shedding of the blood over the table, which is much clearer on the cross. But here he can freely admit the synecdoche in public, and yet it is an eternal cry that the words are to be acted without all figure. Well then! Praise be to God! Here he confesses that because of sacramental unity (which is also of two things, if not bodily with each other) that may be said of one which is done in the other. Why then did he mock my rule above, that one should and may speak of sacraments sacramentally? So he says: "Because cup and blood and new testament are one sacramental being, for the sake of such unity the cup is poured out, but only the blood is poured out per *synecdoche*; and this is right and enough answered." But why should this not also apply to us when the bread is broken and distributed, the wine poured out and presented? Why not also, for the sake of sacramental unity, may their signs be added, whether they are not yet poured out and broken, but by the signs it be known that they are once broken and poured out for our benefit? And I do not see that we have any disadvantage, whether already the breaking of the bread and the giving of the wine in the supper; because their likeness will be attained at the cross of Christ.

4) Marginal gloss: aämnittit

1) "frattened" perhaps: vexirt.

2) marginal gloss: omissio axuä
of inäieat, sa-AM-renr "886 in xoeulo.

3) Marginal gloss: in ernee xerteotuin.

The words here are meant to serve this purpose. It is clearly stated, for the great comfort of the faithful, "who was given for you," that is, for your salvation, for your life. And it is a wonder that Luther 1) desires to put such a comforting saying there, as if it were much more than for your eyes, when Marcus and Matthew also say: "for you and for much"; admittedly before their eyes such did not happen. How then will such things turn out? Against Carlstadt, it might well be that Christ sat there with the body that was given for us; and it is still fitting that Christ in heaven, who died for us. Now he would like "to be given for us, and to be poured out to atone for our sins" to belong only to the supper; would to God that he would consider the sacraments properly for once!

138. to the sixteenth. But how, if the word "my" is placed after the word "that" in St. Paul, and not after the word "body"; for he says from word to word: 2) "This is my body"?

Response. This changes nothing at all in the mind. It does as much; 3) nor do I find any reason why it should serve to strengthen their opinion, since the word "my" would follow it, as in other evangelists. But this is the difference of the obliquus ἐμοῦ, retaining its accent, which is reckoned against another, which in other evangelists is not thus clearly held forth; so the opinion is that this bread is the sign of my body, and of no other. It is I who truly redeem you, and no other, therefore I also die for you, and even with my body itself. For at one time [i.e. in ancient times] there was a night feast, where it was signified and proclaimed by the paschal lamb, how the blood of the paschal lamb had protected the children of Israel from death, and it might also be said sacramentally in truth: This is the lamb that redeemed the children of Israel. But if Christ now gives this leave, he wills that one now wait for higher good from him. For notice, if the eaten paschal lamb did not have power in him to redeem those who follow; for they would be redeemed: so also our sins are already forgiven us through the suffering of Christ. But in order that no one should take offense at the great letter "my, mine", he should take another example against it. If God pointed to the seed of the field, as he did here to the bread, and said, "This is the seed of the field.

is just my word; therefore the word would not be present among the seed or in the seed. But we would like to make a distinction between the word of Moses and the law, or the Pharisees, which may also be signified by a seed. But this seed is my word, means my word, and no other. And yet this is not detrimental to sacramental unity.

139) The seventeenth. Scripture does not suffer Christ's death to be signified by the breaking of bread; 4) therefore it is not a likeness; and though the bread has a likeness to that on the cross, yet it has no likeness to the body as in the supper.

Answer. The body is not so present in the evening meal that it must be distributed with the bread. It is enough for the sacramental distribution that the heavenly Father assigns to his elect the merit of Christ's suffering; and that the faithful recognize through the sacrament that such merit has been set before them and has already been imparted to them, for which reason they also give thanks. Luther and every orthodox believer should take pleasure in this.

140 To the eighteenth. St. Paul puts the word "is" after "blood," and says: "This cup, the new testament, is in my blood." This, then, is to be understood: This cup, being a new testament, is the same in Christ's blood.

Answer. We have been asked in what the likeness is, that the cup of blood and a testament is sacramental. We have indicated that the blood on the cross is hoped for us. This sufficient indication is also here, if the cup is called a new testament, precisely in that Christ's blood is poured out. For thus in his blood, and in no other, was it established, and the "is" truly serves on the little word "new," as said above in St. Lucas; wherefore also in Matthew and Marco it is called the blood of the testament; not the testament, which would be established there in the first place, but it is ordained that we might be redeemed by it on the cross.

141. on the nineteenth. It has never been read that "will" should mean "a sign of the will".

Answer. This is sufficiently answered before that we let "testament" remain testament. But bread and wine are signs.

142 To the twentieth. Because one calls the cup, the wine is understood by it, and one makes a new unity, if they are nevertheless two different natures; so one would also let cheaply be called the wine.

4) In the old edition "death".

1) Marginal gloss: puAnat 86 "urn.

2) Invis //ov 7-61 Cor. 11, 24.

3) Marginal gloss: Huld Vtztlit 86rvatU8 U666ntu8 in e'ov.

The cup is called a testament because it is not only a cup, but also a sacramental being with the testament and blood of Christ.

Answer. Sacramental unity 1) we have never punished; but if we want to remain in it, we must be the most fearful the world has ever borne. But that we should take the signs for what they signify would be a pitiful servitude to our souls. By the grace of God, we are well aware of how we should keep our minds free in this. We see and perceive outward things, but remember ourselves that we recognize 2) the inward and invisible things, that is, the things that are signified, as sacramental unity requires; and no one has ever heard of us otherwise.

143. to the twenty-first. How might bad wine interpret such great things, as it could hardly denote all the figures of the Old Testament?

Answer. But this is still more wonderful, that a word of two, three, or four letters, as, On [xx], God, or *Adonai*, should signify and signify to us him whom all men's and angels' tongues cannot utter; and in him the likeness has none, but such alone is ordained for it. Now the wine is ordained for this, and a very good likeness, by which divine grace is commanded us, of which above said sufficiently.

144. twenty-second. It is a miraculous sign that Christ's body and blood are in the sacrament, and it is not visibly there; but it is enough for us that we feel it by word and faith.

Answer. 3) Our opponents say that there are many great miraculous signs. But St. Augustine, who has read and considered the evangelists and the words "this is my body" no less than they, contradicts them. For he makes a clear distinction: "For there is a great difference between the deeds of angels and those of men. The deeds of angels we are to wonder at and understand; but the deeds of men we alone are to understand"; and he speaks there of the sacraments; read him, whoever will, on the third *de Trinitate*, oap. 10 Some years ago he gave me cause to ponder this further. How then do they say that it should be felt with faith alone? But with what faith they feel such things, true believers know well how to distinguish. On such faith Christ has

did not build his church. But this is the useful faith that Christ died, as such is signified and proclaimed in the Sacrament.

145 The twenty-third. Even though your sign is not visible, even though you see the cup, you do not see that it is a sign of the blood of Christ, but you must speak it with words and believe it in your hearts, because it is not painted on the cup. Why is it also not believed that the miraculous signs take place with the body of Christ? So, I think, they want to talk to us.

Answer. The cup and the bread are painted by the Word of Good, first of all, if they have the quality of the Word in themselves. But now that his body is without place [sine mansions local], or in many places, and especially 4) visible and invisible: how can it be believed without God's word? But the words "this is my body" do not bring such things with them, and yet the sacrament, as far as it concerns outward admonition, is no less powerful if it does not have the concept as if it had it. The dove, meaning the Holy Spirit, the flame of fire in which the angel appeared, were without doubt outwardly miraculous works, even visible; Christ was also born miraculously. Now these things are signs of some invisible natures. But here it is not necessary to be something outwardly miraculous, for bread is natural through the Word; when it becomes significant, it has already become a sacrament. It is very different from the signs prepared by angels. "Angelic deeds have wonder, because they are unknown to us; but here," says St. Augustine, "things are known to us, and therefore without wonder; but the things which some pretend to us were less known than angelic things."

146. Twenty-fourth. Who can deny that in the Lord's Supper there is forgiveness of sin, since the New Testament is there, and not the sign of the New Testament, as Lucas and Paul say?

Answer: 5) The New Testament is accomplished on the cross. We have this covenant where we believe; it is not denied that there is forgiveness of sin outside the sacraments. Therefore it is not denied badly there. But that the cup is a sign of the testament, and not the testament itself, I take from the fact that it was once assured and fulfilled on the cross. But that it is given through the word, that is,

4) d. i. at the same time. .

5) Randglosse: klör rornissio poooatoruva.

1) Marginal gloss: servile est, srF-ra pro rsöns aeeipere.

2) In the old edition: "like".

3) Marginal gloss: Hn" Me saeraiEntn eapienän.

I take care that no sane person contradicts it. And likewise, if one accepts with faith the proclamation of how Christ has done enough for us on the cross, who would deny that there is forgiveness of sin? But this we could not and may not ascribe to any element as working or bestowing. Oh no! for it belongs to God alone. But it is attributed to them as proclaiming. Otherwise the sacraments would be more powerful than the saints of God themselves, to whom such is not bestowed.

147 The twenty-fifth. Whosoever shall confess that he hath the signs of the new testament, confesseth that he hath not the new testament; he also hath denied Christ: for Christians shall have the new testament in them without figure or sign.

Answer. The Christian signs and ceremonies differ from the ceremonies of the old: the ceremonies of the old law meant that salvation was to come; but ours mean that it has already come. Therefore we may say with truth: Which Christian receives worthily the signs of the new testament, who testifies that he has the new testament, and that Christ has forgiven him his sin. But if in the reception of the sacraments we would receive the forgiveness of sins more than we would give thanks that they are forgiven us, it would be evident that we do not have the new testament, nor the forgiveness of sins.

148. To the twenty-sixth. Without the words, the cup would be nothing; without the bread and cup, the body of Christ would not be there; without the body and blood of Christ, the New Testament would not be there; without the New Testament, forgiveness of sin would not be there. Behold, all these things are 1) sufficient for us in the words of the Lord's Supper, and we grasp it with faith.

Answer. We understand well the heaped *sylogismum* 2); if we break it down, we find good sense. It is true that words make the bread and the cup signs of the body and blood of Christ; but words alone have in their power that they proclaim and signify; this they now give to the sacraments also, and no more than they have. But further, that they have given the presence of the body and blood to them, is not proved. Then *sylogism* goes off the track, and becomes brittle; for the blood of Christ truly gives the new testament, and for ever pardon of sins and life; but the outward words do not give it, but they proclaim it. Therefore conclude

1) In the original: reichet.

2) Marginal gloss: Vis veokorum.

They have it in them no other way than that they show such great grace. The sacraments also do this; the faith that grasps such a gift, even as in the outward admonition the inward master instructs. And therefore, when we consider what is in the power of the words, we find how much is given to the sacraments, and will be more for us than against us.

149. twenty-seventh. May not the body in the bread be understood as Paul says: "As often as you eat the bread", as one understands by the cup the wine in the cup, as Paul says: "As often as you drink the cup"?

Answer. It was said before about the content; I gladly allow that this bread introduces us to the contemplation of that which is signified by it, and according to sacramental unity, which is there in meaning. But one looks for a reverse way. One does not drink cups, but wine from cups. Again, it is in sacraments: Bread is eaten; but this, if the bread contains sacramental meaning, is not eaten bodily at all, but is grasped with faith. Therefore they are quite different *synecdochae*, *continens pro contento*, and *contentum pro continente*. Rather, as Paul says so beautifully, we should consider how we are to know that which is sacramentally apprehended in the bread, namely, when he says, "proclaim the death of the Lord!" which proclamation flows from faith and gratitude; and this is the content of the sacraments, that through them one proclaims how grace is communicated to us. Paul put the sign and the signified together so that the interpretation would be clearer; but here Luther may well jump, however verbose he otherwise is.

150. to the twenty-eighth St. Paul does not say: if you drink of the sign of the body and blood. Response. He says it, because the bread and the cup are the signs, although he does not express it in words. And that he would have them for this, he adds, "Proclaim the death of the Lord."

151. twenty-ninth. If it should not apply to us, if we say: St. Paul does not say: As often as you eat of the sign of the body; because *ex puris negativis nihil sequitur*: then you also have no reason, if you say: Paul calls this bread, and not the body of Christ, therefore it is bread alone. 3) Answer. We want to have from the words that it is true bread; and for what it is to be used, we show from the following and preceding words, which naturally explain the matter. And is nothing from negativis; although Luther knows well, if a thing is not in the

3) Marginal gloss: I'uous a neMti vis.

Scripture says that one may well argue a negaUvig. We are not to know more than God has given us to understand through His Word.

152. to the thirtieth. The words "this" and "this" are certain pointers that one should go back to the previous words, so it will be just as much: He that eateth of this body, and drinketh of this blood. Answer. Yes, the words are certain pointers that it is no longer a common bread, but the bread of the Lord, yes, the sacramental bread, which means the body for us; this is what the little words mean. Yes, where Luther had his mind, it would certainly have his opinion. But we have also seen the text, and our interpretation is in accordance with faith. Therefore he does not judge anything by the large letters; and indeed, since the natural interpretation is given here, we are right to consider how he understands each one, and now our interpretation is not ours, but Paul's own, where it is considered otherwise.

153 Thirty-first. Why does not St. Paul say: He is guilty of the bread or of the sign of the body of Christ who eats this bread unworthily? The text forces that this sin is the unworthy eating; and yet they pretend that it is vain bread which they eat; so he must be guilty of that which he eats. Answer. If the bread is a sign of the body of Christ, then he is guilty of the body who does not eat the sign. One would not sin against bread if it were not a sacrament of the body of Christ, because they have been drawn into one sacramental union; not that they are therefore with one another, but that here is the image of the body in the bread; although Luther denied this, it is nevertheless well established. Therefore Paul knows well how to distinguish between bread and body, he also knows how to reconcile them and put them together. He does not say "eat the body. For no one may eat the body unworthily, but unfortunately many eat the sacrament and sign of the body unworthily. But if the bread is not a sign of the true body of Christ, but of the spiritual body, then one is not guilty of the true body of Christ, but of that of which this bread is a sacrament. Now it is proved that the bread and the wine are signs of the body of Christ, and that with certain proofs; and not only is this proved, but also the counteropinion is rejected, and that mightily.

154. to the thirty-second. So Oecolampad hie in this place lets body be called the true right body, so they must also in the text of the Lord's Supper not be a *tropus*. Response. As here the

True body is meant to us, therefore also in the text of the supper, although the tropus of the word "bread" falls on the word "body", but this takes nothing away from the true body. Therefore one cannot make me his such conclusion]; He who dishonors the bread dishonors the sign of the body, that is, the bread; but both such^: He who dishonors the sign of the body, that is, the bread, dishonors the body. Much less will follow the contradictoria and other inconvenientia that Luther heaps.

155. thirty-third. St. Paul does not say, "Whoever eats this bread unworthily is guilty of Christ, as he is guilty of the king who mocks the king's image;" but St. Paul says, "That the guilt may be done in the pieces of Christ, to which the bread and wine should be like or a sign. Thus Oecolampad's similitude will be thus: He who dishonors the nose of the king's image dishonors the king's nose. Answer: 1) If those who crucified Christ in the flesh, as guilty of his body and blood, have sinned against the whole of Christ, it is not wrong to say that those who eat the bread unworthily sin in Christ. For those who reject the supreme goodness of the body and blood of Christ, and hold themselves against the bread as if it were common bread, and do not pass from the visible to the invisible things, must ever despise Christ. What honor has the king's nose against the image? It is more apparent that it is an image of a king than that it has such and such a nose. In the sacrament, however, the body and blood have also earned much against us, hence the interpretation.

156 To the thirty-fourth. Who will believe that to distinguish Christ's body is nothing, but to distinguish Christ Himself in His signs? Answer. I do not say that the body of Christ here is anything different from the true body; and I say in answer to the opinion: 2) He does not distinguish Christ's body who does not think more of Christ, who suffered for him, than of another man. And we say that if an unrecognized Heinz or Kunz dies, it is not the less or the more; but the death of the body of Christ should be so highly esteemed, that we should also hold in the highest esteem everything that belongs to Christ.

1) Marginal gloss: Hnnrs Saulus äioit:

oo/Pon"

sa-rsttr-rs, et non:

2) Randglosse:

oorlms ^onrr'-rr, yndld?

and fed his poor, performed his ceremonies with due fear of God. But if we do not love our neighbor, who is redeemed by the blood of Christ, the ceremonies are not in true thanksgiving. If we do not need faith and love toward our neighbor, there is certainly no distinction of the body of Christ, and without doubt one eats and drinks the judgment, because one may show that Christ has suffered for him, and one also wants to be grateful for the suffering of Christ; but one receives the sacraments not the less in contempt of the neighbor. Thus the Corinthians did not distinguish the sacrament, not in whether blood and flesh were essentially present, for St. Paul did not punish them for this. But if this had been their sin, Paul would not have left it undisclosed, in which they did not examine themselves and distinguish the body. The true test is that we believe that Christ has taken away our sin by the shedding of his blood, and so redeems us. But we invent in ourselves a thankful spirit, so that we not only are not ashamed to confess it, but are also ready to serve our neighbor and consider him a brother. But to believe that the body of Christ is bodily present in the bread is contrary to the likeness of faith. Christ did not put anything on the same faith, but on the faith that he has redeemed us and is the Son of God.

157 To the thirty-fifth. St. Paul alternates finely, one thing after another; now he calls it bread and a cup, and then body and blood; and then again bread and a cup, and then again body and blood; so that he may make us certain that this sacrament is not just bread and wine. Answer: Of course, there is a nice variation here, and it is easy to see how Paul speaks with such great modesty, so that he does not lead anyone astray. He gives the outward things to bread and wine, as eating and drinking, and leads us on with them, so that we do not forget the good deeds of Christ, which they mean, as: proclaiming death, not debasing it, appearing with ingratitude; examining ourselves beforehand, what confidence we have in Christ and our neighbor, and what higher things we think of the true body of Christ. And do not serve a little bit for the consecration, as one pretends; but around and around the worthiness of the sacrament is diligently commanded to us.

158. to the thirty-sixth. Where in the words, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" there would be figurative speech, according to Oecolampad's opinion.

the] text: The bread that we break is a communion of bread, which is a sign of the body of Christ; and would be so much: bread is a communion of bread. Answer: 1) Not so! O Luther! nowhere do you want to understand me rightly; for I leave the true body of Christ in the four sayings; although the little word "figure" falls on it in the interpretation, therefore this does not follow it. Likewise, as you show me, I also do not say that there is a figurative fellowship; but the breaking of bread bears 2) a figure on it, as the cup bears a figure of the testament; and would not have to speak thus, if the trope were to exist. Enough has been said about this to the intelligent. And this is the opinion: the very breaking of bread signifies to us how we have a true fellowship in the one common true body of Christ, who was given to us in common and shared with us all by divine grace, if he died for our sake. Therefore we are also an hereditary people of Christ; and none of the things that Luther pretends follow.

159 To the thirty-seventh. So the breaking of bread is a fellowship in which the wicked also have a part, and not only the good; for Judas also was in the supper (now the wicked may not have a spiritual fellowship, but they must have a bodily one): 4) then they must have a part in the body, which is distributed to them in the breaking of bread; for if it is distributed to them, it is also there. Answer: Yes, the breaking of bread is a sign of communion, not communion itself. How? if poor people bear a sign of the cross, that alms should be given to them as the needy, it is said: bearing the sign of the cross is not a fellowship of alms? and is the bearing not the fellowship for itself, but means that those who bear it 5) have a society and fellowship of alms. The sign should be accepted only by the needy, and not by the unworthy. Now at times among the multitude of not the least unworthy run, they also bear the sign, and when they come to the beggar, he tells them: Is not the sign of the cross a fellowship of almsgiving? and then punishes those who so insolently may bear the sign of the fellowship to which they do not belong. So Paul punishes

1) Marginal gloss: kanis, huein krunZimus, yuomoão sit eoimmunwatio eorporis Lüristi.

2) In the old edition: "trage ick". We have deleted "ich" because it seems too much for us.

3) "but one" - again.

4) The brackets are set by us.

5) In the old edition: soß.

even then the false ones who received the sacraments, as if they also had fellowship in the true body of Christ; that through faith they had obtained forgiveness of sin and grace in his death, and thus had Christ as their own.

160 This fellowship is truly for the good alone. John describes such fellowship in the first epistle, saying, "Let our fellowship be with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ;" and then, "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship among us, and his blood purifies us from all sin. There he indicates how we have fellowship. But of others he says: "They went out from us, but they were not of us"; they walk among us, and bear the signs, and also want to be believers, but they are true Judas. They received the sacraments, but the body in no way, neither spiritually, nor bodily; although they sin in [the] true body of Christ, whose sacrament they act with such unbelief and ingratitude in such unmercifulness. In this also the Corinthians might well be punished for their discord, and yet still have fellowship with the Gentiles. Dear, could not the societies have a sign among themselves, so that in one or the other they have true fellowship? unless their true bodily [being (?)] is in the sign of fellowship. Therefore it is a bodily fellowship, which has Christ and Christ's body as its own, beforehand, as he gave it in the cross. But do not therefore need the presence of the body of Christ bodily in the bread; for to speak of it sacramentally would not be against me. For the sake of signs and names the wicked are also called for a time, [that they] are in the kingdom of heaven, as also many evangelical parables and examples indicate.

Now the following words of Paul explain our matter sufficiently. He, Paul, says: "Look at Israel according to the flesh! Are not all those who eat the sacrifices a fellowship of the altar?" [1 Cor. 10, 18.] That is, a sign that they commonly have righteousness with one another to the altar in sacrifices and serve the altar, belong to priests and God's people. Neither should anyone mingle with them, for as they carried righteousness to the altar. 1) But if a hidden Gentile had eaten with the Jews, he would have been respected, he would have had fellowship, but he had none. So also the false Christians are respected, they have well fellowship in the blood, in the testament, in pardon.

1) i.e. had a right to the altar.

of sin outwardly; but they are nothing but pure glorifiers. 2) If then Luther would have it that the ungodly may also receive the true body, because it says, "This is my body," let us prove by the same consequence that they also have the new testament, and thus the unworthy and ungodly would have their sins forgiven if they received the sacraments. Yes, if you say, They are unbelievers, therefore it is not a new testament to them; let it also be said, They are unbelievers, therefore the bread is not the body to them; so it would be found that the consequence in the word is nothing at all.

162. thirty-eighth. If one wanted to speak of spiritual communion, it would not be necessary to call the two pieces the body and blood of Christ, but it would be enough to call them Christ. Why should he speak so differently of the body and the blood, and put two communions together, as two different communions, since neither is the other? And if the spiritual communion is not more than one, then the communion of the body of Christ is not the communion of the blood of Christ; again.

Answer: We, who are bodily, are a bodily company, having spiritual fellowship in spiritual goods. We are assured of this through the body and blood of Christ in his passion; and therefore, if we have received spiritual goods through the body and blood, the signs of the body and blood are convenient signs of such fellowship; and though Christ has instituted more signs than baptism, yet it would be no more than one fellowship. For in baptism it is also signified that we are purchased by the blood of Christ; and those who are baptized are already with us in fellowship, and alone is the fellowship thereafter accepted in other signs anew. Luther could well see that the devil's fellowship and the fellowship of the devil's table are one thing: he should also be able to recognize that one fellowship is the fellowship with Christ and the fellowship of the Lord's table, which holds in it both bread and wine, that is, signs of the body and blood, and proclaims that both good deeds are bestowed upon us. And is not the devil therefore *definitely* appointed to be at the table. What do you want to enforce here?

Now, praise be to God, we have seen Luther's reasons, and the longer we look at them, the more flawed they are; but he has not caught us untruthfully in one piece. But how he

2) Marginal gloss: Impii "on rnLnänenut earnem 6dri8th 8wut Q66 V6r6 in tsstnnreuto kunt.

A healthy heart can see well for itself. He does not want to allow a trope, and yet he allows it, because he does not like the synecdoche, but how he presents it does not want to be in accordance with the faith. If, however, he wants to speak of sacramental unity in a Christian way and has a desire for peace, there is no need at all for this quibbling; for thus we would soon become one in truth. The mere words are by no means worth the struggle, if one has attained the truth; may God, the gracious Father, from day to day, in this and all other things, abundantly impart and increase them to us, so that we may have full knowledge of Christ! Amen, Anno MDXXVIII.

The second part of Zwingli's answer.

387 Now that you, pious princes, have considered Oecolampadi's answer, which would truly be sufficient for every quiet, chaste, true Christian, who should not look at the many, but at the power of the words, I again humbly ask you to hear the remaining two parts with the same seriousness.

388. As in our first part Luther's contested comments, of which he would have done well to omit the major part, have been answered (indeed also with more words and action, neither of which we would like to have done- but have ever had to run the colored reasons over the face with a wet sponge, so that the ruddy beauty would be accepted, and the rather weak color would be seen, so that no one would take the sick opinion to marriage under the appearance of the healthy one), 1) so it is now up to us to present our opinion and understanding of the words of the Lord's Supper.

389. We thus point out, as often before, that the one faith and trust in God first forces us to notice that we should not understand the words of the supper bodily. For faith, which is trust in the only God, is the only rest of the soul, the certainty and firmness by which we see that there is no good, no truth, no righteousness, neither the only highest good, God; that there is nothing at all certain in which one can exist unconfidently, neither He; that the soul finds rest in no creature, but only in the Creator. If then the substance and essence of faith is such light, certainty and rest, and if faith does not come from any creature but from the one Holy Spirit, the Creator and Life of all things, then it is certain that our faith (I mean the right, essential, true, living faith, since man is the Creator of all things) is the only faith that is true.

1) These brackets are set by us.

knows that he is a child of God) does not come from any creature, does not consist in any mere creature, is in none undoubtedly calm and sure, is strengthened with no creature if he is weak; for even the miraculous signs may not make the right spiritual faith, but the spiritual faith makes one recognize the miraculous signs to be God's work; or else the children of Israel would have been supremely faithful in the desert and at the daily miraculous signs of Christ.

390 All of which is clearly learned from Paul Rom. 8, 24. and Hebr. 11, 1. where he says in one place: "With hope we are healed, but the hope that is seen is not a hope." By "see" he means to have everything bodily, and wants to say that the only hope and trust is the salvation of the soul; for if a man had the Lord Christ as his own, he would not be healed or calm in conscience, for faith alone must make him calm. Simon the special sieche 2) did not have Christ in the flesh, neither Magdalene, because he was his guest and ate his food; he was in his house 2c. But Magdalene had him for salvation, because she recognized him to be the living Son of God and the animator of the soul. Now if the presence of the body created or made faith, Simon would have been more faithful neither the sinner. But the sinner has him alive in her heart through the light and certainty of faith; therefore he was salvific to her, and not because she understood him bodily, watered and dried him. Simon had it so much as his own, as a guest of the host or moderator 3) is, bodily in his food 2c., but has it not in faith; therefore he had it not at all wholesome. Therefore the good of faith may not come from any bodily having or possession.

In another place [Hebr. 11, 1.] he says: Faith is a substance (here the word xxx<r-7-as-ec, which is interpreted in "person", of which enough was said above) of the things which one hopes for, and a certainty of the things which one does not see. A substance he calls faith, that is, the essential, certain, certain and constant confidence that man has in the things that we hope for but are invisible. These words are also misused by our opponents, who drag the description of faith as if we should believe things that are not visible, and want to make do with it in this matter. We

2) i.e. lepers.

3) Maßherrn ----- Tischherrn. Cf. Mitmaßen ----- Tischgenossen, Col. 1250, § 46.

Let us therefore believe that flesh and blood are here, if they be invisible; for faith is of invisible things. From what argument or reason we would be compelled to believe that neither rose nor flew, 1) as it is said, because the same will not happen.

392 But the error comes from the fact that they do not decide between faith, which is a slacking (listening), obeying and admitting or slacking, and faith, which is undoubted trust. For if they saw the difference clearly, they would know that here Paul does not say that the delusion, obeying or forbearing 2) is a substance of things hoped for. For so faith is taken for an indulgence of the things which we hear. As if we believe that the great Caliph of Waldach is more powerful than the Pope. Here faith is nothing else at all, neither with lightening nor slackening, so be it; but that in this something comforting, peace, or security of salvation is born for us in our sea, that is not. But faith 3) is taken here in the description for the essence, security and power of the soul, since it leaves itself undoubted in the invisible things, as in the things to which it is united, and which may give it united (unios) salvation. Thus the body of Christ is to be eaten bodily in the bread, not the opposite (obssotum) or goal to which faith looks; for it looks only to that which is the origin of all creatures, which cannot be seen with any bodily eye; therefore it must be attained only with the sure eye of conscience, and this is faith, the essential consolation, the substance of trust in God.

393 When they say, "Faith is the thing to be hoped for, and therefore it is necessary to hope and believe that the body of Christ is there, so it is there," you see, pious princes, that they go back and forth in the word faith; and since faith is described as confidence, they make out the faith that is abated or healed. For in our souls there is no comfort in believing that we shall be eaten bodily in the bread of Christ's body; for if that had been the case, Abraham could not have been saved, for he never believed that, but all his confidence was in the one Lord and Creator of all things; so also is the substance of our faith.

394 Secondly, they do not see what is called "invisible things" in Hebr. 11:1. Namely, the

1) Probably as much as: "went & dust excited still flew". 2) Marginal gloss: faith for lightening or slackening. 3) Marginal gloss: faith the essential confidence of the soul.

and visible things are taken in common for all created; 4) as Rom. 1: "His invisible things are learned by the creature of the world"; Baruch 3, 38: "He is therefore seen on earth", "to see" is taken for being sensitive, bodily. And "to feel" 5) is not taken for feeling of the flesh alone, but for "to become aware of all the sensations of the body", of seeing, hearing, grasping, tasting, smelling 2c. So now faith is united in him who has not been perceived nor recognized with any bodily sensation, but the unified mind, the unified spirit, the unified soul perceives him with understanding and trust. Therefore, faith cannot stand in any creature, but in the one invisible God. Thus it is contrary to faith to be pointed to a visible thing, that is, to one creature as one creature. For that we are pointed to Christ signifies that he is God and man; but to his mere humanity no one is to be pointed, as he himself says, "He that trusteth in me, trusteth not in me," that is, he is not to trust in me as long as I am a man 2c. So also is an open error which every believer feels in his essential substantial faith, in that they say, The bodily food of Christ put away sin, put away the soul 2c.

This is now the first vein from which the well-grown faith speaks: 6) Well then! I find that my one food and comfort is the one God; and the God has taken my nature and weakness to Himself, that He might kill those in Himself; 7) so all my confidence is ever in Him alone. Now what would it be for me to eat the corpse in the flesh? The soul does not eat flesh, so the body does not like human flesh. If I now know God and the good deed that he has shown me, by which he made me his child, I have enough of it 2c. In this you see, pious princes, that faith does not suffer to be directed to a creature, much less to be directed to eat something for the indulgence of sin. Of this the pious Silesians wrote more abundantly, whose writing I have read in the midst of 8), and found it more Christian and more thorough neither everything that Luther has ever written in this matter. Must also, whether God wills! come to the day, so that one can see,

4) i.e. creatures. - followed by: creation.

5) Marginal gloss: Ssnsus, sensibilities, not sense.

6) Marginal gloss: So the flesh of Christ is taken in faith.

7) In the old edition: todte.

8) d. i. meanwhile.

whether they speak as he said on them. In short, the faith that can go unhealed 1) (and is not otherwise not a faith), seeks in Christ Jesus after his death and resurrection nothing more in his flesh than is sufficiently indicated above from Paul and Augustine; or, if it were bodily in bread, we would also seek bodily health nothing less in bodily touching, neither even the sick woman [Matt. 9]. We would also like to argue in Luther's way: To make the soul healthy is greater than to make the body healthy. So then Christ cleanses the soul with the bodily food of his body; much more would he make the bodies healthy with it. But Summa Summarum: all the oath of Christ's humanity is gone, and [we] know nothing more of it; but our [nostratium, ours] substantial faith stands in the one bodily crucified, not bodily eaten, God.

The other vein that brings us to realize that the words of the supper may not be understood bodily is the resistance of God's Word. For we must never be of the same mind as those who use to cry out: God has said: "This is my corpse", so it must be so for him. Yes, indeed, it is so', but not so, as our erroneous mind means, but so, as Christ means. Accordingly, they cry out as if all the words that are against them are not God's word. And if I cry out as loud: "The flesh is not useful at all", they are also God's word, and must be true as those: "This is my corpse," they do the same as that painter, who in all his works said most of all about Saint Christoffel; he could not paint anyone else so well. So they don't give notice of the words and senses that are against them, but say: "It says, 'This is my body: This is my body. Keep ye simple words, and if ye be deceived at once, [it is] wyer, 2) ye are deceived of GOD neither of men." Nice thing! If they do not like to keep the understanding, they teach that one should keep the misunderstood words; and if one is deceived by them with their misunderstanding, then one should put it on God. But we should be of such a mind that if untruth, even the devil himself, presents God's word to us in a false understanding, we should not accept it in this way, but should set the counter-scriptures against it, just as Christ himself did, and thus weigh out the right understanding.

- 1) Heblinge--Gängelbänder; hence "unheblingen"-- without gears.
2) "wyer" probably stands for "weger" i.e. better.

397. If then faith and Scripture, that is, the spirit and the letter, may not suffer the words to be understood bodily, of which Luther so cruelly cries: "We shall prove that the words may not be understood in this way; although we have done this before and now superfluously: Let us take the words of Luke, and with the words of the other evangelists, so that all believers may see that we spare Luther a great deal, that we are not as seriously responsible for the vain, inept chatter that he is carrying on as another Egg, Struß, 3) or Faber Wohl would be. For if his calumnias, alenfences and intercourse were to be honored, it would be bad for his name. May God give him back his face! Amen.

398 Lucas 32: "He took the bread, praising God, broke it and gave it to them, saying." With the words Lucā lighten Matthew, Marcus and Paul. It is said enough above of ευλογησας and εύχαριστήσας, that they speak for "GOtt.

praise" and "give thanks", not for "bless" hie stand.

This is my body, which is given for you. Before these words Matthew, Mark, Paul, "Take, eat!" Of which Luther also has much trouble; but we do not deny it, but know that one truly takes and eats what he gives. But what does he give? "His body" (says Luther); for he says on it, "This is my body." So we ask: whether they ate the body that sat there, or the body that was declared." If they ate the one that was sitting there, then the natural body was sitting there, which truly has flesh, blood and bones; so they had to eat it only spiritually: or if they ate it bodily, then they had to eat it naturally; but this is inhuman to hear, and even Luther does not indulge in it. But if they have eaten him only spiritually, that is, if they have been thankful that he has given up the body in death, then there must be no more quarreling; for we have now often enough shown that we have the body of Christ most precious in the supper, namely, that we consider his death and therefore give thanks; that is the noble thing to do here. If, then, he is also in our supper, then all the cleavage is gone; but if they have eaten the body that was declared, then Christ's body was declared at one time, and not declared, which is quite contrary to God's word. Joh. 7: "Jesus was not yet declared. This is also publicly Marcionic. Or else he has been declared at one time.

once had two bodies. All of which is contested before.

In previous writings, we have also sufficiently indicated how the word "this" is properly used to refer to the bread or to the entire feast of thanksgiving. 1) For if it points to the bread, then the bread is taken as a part of the sign or sacrament of the evening meal for the whole thanksgiving, as Acts 3, 42. 46. the breaking of bread is taken for bread, cup and thanksgiving. And this does not prevent the drink from being called the blood; for since it is a part of the sacrament, the sacrament is called something of both parts, but something of the one alone, as is proved above.

401 And so it is understood from the two points that nothing else is shown here, neither that this feast is his body, that is, a sign, a signification, a thanksgiving, a memorial, a renewal of the body of Christ; that is, that he has taken true body and soul to himself, suffered death, and thus redeemed us. For as it is certain that the apostles did not eat the natural body; neither did they eat the body declared, as has been heard enough; neither did they eat anything else, neither the true body in the spirit, that is, first of all, believing that the true Son of God became true man and flesh, or body, for our sake, and therefore would suffer death for us; and [thirdly] that with it he willed to institute the thanksgiving of good works. And so the bread and the wine are called the body and the blood, because the two measures 2) are carried around in thanksgiving for His whole incarnation and all that He suffered in it.

402. also the flesh of Christ is not taken only in one place 3) for his incarnation and deeds therein carried. John 1: "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us." Behold! "Becoming flesh" for becoming man; and "walking among us in the flesh" for having been truly human among us and having been killed, as also Isaiah 53. said before. Item, Hebr. 5: "Which in the time of his flesh offered up supplication and grace 2c." But here flesh is taken for the change of his humanity.

403 Therefore thanksgiving 4) is called his body and blood, that we have eaten his flesh spiritually in our hearts.

If we have learned the divine mercy in his incarnation and death, and have surrendered ourselves to it with faith, and therefore, out of joy and delight in the rest we receive from faith, run to, praise and give thanks for the unrequited goodness and friendship. It is also not a matter of saying: The bread or supper means the body of Christ, it renews, it remembers; or it is said: It is a meaning, a renewal, a remembrance 2c. as is indicated above enough.

404. "Who is given for you." Here Luther comes forth not only with foolish coarseness, but also with sacrilegious traffic and blasphemy, and says first that "for you" is as much as "before you"; which error is explained above. Then he says that "to give" is taken to mean to present, to present, to present. And when St. Paul presses him with the word "broken," when he says, "This is my body that is broken for you," Luther strikes it hard with a mallet, and says, "to break" means to break before, yes, also to break before. I worried for a while that he would also say to the full how great a mock 5) Christ had made. What does it seem to us, pious princes, that Luther takes the precious payment that the Son of God has set forth for us and makes bread out of it. He takes the precious crime and death of his humanity, and makes of it presenting bread, crumbs, morsels and clods; with what Scripture? With none; with what teachers, if there were any of the old ones, yes, even of the Papists? With áúróç Burkart it was called.

405 What does sacrilege mean, if it is not a lavish sacrilege? must I ever say. Should one also deal with the holy words of God in this way? The high humility and mercy of God lies in the fact that He gave Himself in death for us, so Luther (regardless of God, His holy word, violation of all believers' consciences) may, without Scripture and predecessor, make "given for you" into "offered before you," regardless of the fact that Gal. 1 says, "He gave Himself for our sin." Must withholding 6) also mean: has offered himself for our sins; and Titum 2: "Who gave himself for us," Rom. 4: "He is given for our sin," Rom. 8: "He gave him for us all," Eph. 5: "He gave himself for us a sacrifice and a host before God," now means "to give" to offer and to prepare; and

5) i.e. chunks, morsels.

6) i.e..

1) Marginal gloss: kata synecdochen.

2) About "measure" - meal compare § 390.

3) Marginal gloss: pro mvstorio in6Lrnationi8.

4) Marginal gloss: So we eat the body of Christ.

is "to offer" oneself: so it follows that Luther's Vorbrocken or night meal was also a sacrifice.

406 But I must ask one thing here: If Luther says, "dargeben" is taken for darbierten and brocken, what do we think of in our supper? If he says, "The death of the Lord, mortem DOMINI adnunciabit," then we say no; for according to his interpretation of the words, one must think of the preliminary bread, for there is nothing at all about death in Matthew and Mark, yes, also in Luke and Paul, before the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," if giving and breaking are to be taken for offering and preliminary bread, not for dying and paying. Such a beautiful thing follows from Luther's taapen, 1) where he finds a hole through which he can escape.

But someone might say that Luther only indicates it as a court right; 2) and says, "someone might interpret and preserve it in this way, even though he does not want to lie mightily about it. To this we say, [first:] that he [consider] what this word is, since one allows it to be well kept and preserved. [Secondly, that he should consider what Luther indicates with many useless words, that the breaking of bread or crumbs is one thing with the breaking of the cross; all of which we gladly, to spare, skip. But surely, if the breaking of the bread is one thing with the dying on the cross, and if the dying is a sacrifice, then the breaking of the bread is also a sacrifice. The bread must also be crucified, juxta vanitatem, quae Marcionem deceret apud Tertullianum, lib. 4. adversus Marcion..., and all the teaching of Luther falls back, so the supper becomes a sacrifice. Now I have reported this to him in the hope that he would consider it, but it has not helped.

408 Third, let us hear Luther himself, whether he relies on this explanation or not. Luther in the large B in the third panel: 3) "Who is broken for you. "We have said much about this above, that the Scriptures cannot suffer, that breaking should be called Christ's suffering. The enthusiasts may say it, as they say other things, but never prove it" 2c.

Behold, pious princes, this is the fine court law that Luther has made above! If it belonged to the market of Zurzach, there it is valid: "Shit on whoever you like! Here he leaves it free, and does not want to think that "to give" should be interpreted as presenting bread. Here he says: "Let not the Scripture suffer that 'breaking' Christ's body should be interpreted as 'giving'.

den hot". But the book is nothing at all different, because so pretty look and found.

But we know that this supper is a thanksgiving and praise of the body of Christ, who was given to us by the Father, who was given "for us" by the Father, who alone became for us in death the sacrifice that took away our sin. And this is: to be given for us, to be broken for us. It is also indicated above that "to break" is taken to mean to kill and to slay.

411, "Do these things in remembrance of me. What one should do in memory of Christ is indicated many times above.

412 "The like also the drink" 2c. With these words, Luther acts as if matter were about to melt away from him, but he does not need it.

413. "This is the drink of a new testament in my blood, which is poured out for you. Here we first want to show what miserable fog Luther has raised, 4) so that he might bring darkness into the light, and then [we want to] chase away the error and bring the truth in again.

414 First, he teaches that the cup or chalice is often used for drinking; we admit this to him.

415. secondly, that the potion is the new testament; and if it is the new testament, it is the remission of sin; and makes this shake 5) arguimentum de primo ad ultimum:

416 Luther in capital C on the first tablet. 6) "Without bread and cup, the body and blood of Christ would not be there; without the body and blood of Christ, the New Testament would not be there; without the New Testament, forgiveness of sins would not be there; without forgiveness of sins, life and blessedness would not be there. Thus the words first of all comprehend the bread and the cup of the sacrament; the bread and the cup comprehend the body and blood of Christ; the body and blood of Christ comprehend the new testament; the new testament comprehends forgiveness of sins; forgiveness of sins comprehends eternal life and blessedness" 2c.

417) Thirdly, he brings us a beautiful trick, an old priest taught him, 7) when he says that the word "which" does not refer to the blood, but to the drink, thus: "Which drink is poured out for you, that is, poured out before you; for *fundere* also means to pour out," he says.

418 These are the mists with which it billows.

1) "Taapen" probably stands for: Tapping.

2) i.e., of good opinion; he hopes that it is right. Cf. No. 21, § 427.

3) No. 21, § 436.

4) d. i. sets on the way.

5) "Züttel" of the same stem as verzotteln", a derivative term for "final chain". Cf. § 428.

6) No. 21, H 451 mutilated.

7) Cf. No. 21, § 422 ff.

Now we want to go behind them with the wind that blows wherever it wants, and disperse the mists with the fair wind suäiüos borea over the Lombard 1) [Ge]birge, so that the bright beautiful truth may be seen again.

419: That the drink is not the will, but only a drink of the will, we want to prove 2).

First, we ask Luther how many New Testaments are. If I think well, he cannot say more than one thing. So I ask: What is the testament? But he must say, Jeremiah on the 31st and Hebrews on the 8th is determined, namely, the forgiven 3) remission of sin. How can the potion be the testament? Potion and remission of sin are two different things. Yes, the body and blood of Christ and the remission of sin are two different things. Luther may say that the drink is the remission of sin, but he cannot; or else he would have to let the drink be a sacrifice; for where there is remission of sin, there must be sacrifice, Heb. 5 and 8 and Ephes. 5. Now if the drink is the remission of sin and the testament, it must also be a sacrifice.

421 Secondly: If in the drink there is remission of sin, and in death also remission of sin; so in two unequal things there is remission of sin, in death and in drink; the one is altogether bitter, the other altogether light.

422 Thirdly, the remission of sin will be in a mere creature, and will not pardon the one divine grace.

423. probation. The drink is a louder creature than Luther himself recognizes, it is wine in substance; he wanted to say that wine and bread would also be united in the person of the Son of God: then he would have assumed people, seeds 4) and wine, and not only the lineage of Abraham. Now if it is a righteous creature, it is not the remission of sin; nor is it the testament; for even the natural body of Christ is not the remission of sin; or else God might have redeemed us with a creature, and might not have sent his Son. So then Christ himself, if he were only a pure man, would not be the remission of sin; much less might the drink, which is a pure creature, be the remission of sin. But where

someone wanted to say: The bread and drink is Christ himself, therefore it is remission of sin; he knows not what he saith. For Christ's being may not include anything in it, neither God nor man; and not God, man, wine and bread. But if anyone should say that the drink is called a testament because the blood of Christ is in it, he recognizes that it is only "called" a testament, and not "is. Otherwise the bodily blood cannot be there either.

424. Now we want to indicate with scripture that [the] sign of the will is called testament.

425 First, in the Old Testament, in the first book of Moses at the 17th, the circumcision is called the covenant, and soon after that the covenant sign. Now the sign and the signified cannot be one thing, though they come to have one name. Thus it is also evident that circumcision alone was a sign of the covenant, since God bound Himself to be their God, and that they, His people, would possess the land of Canaan. So also the drink of the supper alone is a sign of the covenant that God has made anew with us, the remission of sin.

426 In the New Testament Matthew and Marcus have the words of the drink thus: "This is my blood, which is the blood of the new testament. Behold, pious princes, how the two also call the bodily blood of Christ, which they themselves shed, not the testament, but the blood of the testament; that is, the blood, that the testament, that is, the forgiven remission of sins, might be conquered, as Rom. 3. says: "We are forgiven [i.e., made free], being made righteous by His grace, through the redemption that was perfected in Christ JEsu, whom God ordained to be a propitiation, through faith, with His blood." And Col. 1: "GOD by the blood of His cross, 5) through Him hath perfected all things that are in heaven and on earth. "2c. Heb. 9.: "Christ entered once into the holy place with His own blood, and thereby obtained eternal redemption."

Watch, pious princes! Is not also in Luther's shake the redemption the testament? Yes. And if the blood is not the testament nor the redemption, but the value and cost, so that the redemption has come over: so also the drink is not the redemption or testament; for it is so far behind the blood, that by the drink redemption and remission of sin is not conquered, as has been heard enough, but has come about by the blood. Now the blood is not the testament, but

5) Marginal gloss: Hskraismos täte sxponimus.

1) In the original: Lampardian.

2) Marginal gloss: rationikus.

3) i.e. Zratis, free of charge.

4) "Kernels" here will probably stand for "grains" from which the bread is baked.

That, so that the will is purchased; just as the twenty florins are not the horse, but that, so that the horse is purchased and made single-handed. Now nothing at all came over with the drink, or else the redemption would have been accomplished in the evening, and would have been accomplished with the drinking of the disciples, and not with the suffering of Christ, which has not yet happened, and therefore has not yet worked. Therefore, the longer it is, the more distant it is that the drink is the testament.

Thus Luther's chain or shackle falls to the ground. For the words do not grasp the bread and wine in such a way that they become anything other than a sacrament, that is, sign. Bread and wine do not contain the body and blood of Christ in any other way than as any sign contains the signified; this can be meant by the sign, since the sign is not present. Body and blood do not grasp the testament differently, neither every purchased thing is grasped by the money, so that it is purchased; that is: that with it the redemption is conquered, and that they are not the testament or indulgence of sin. For that which is conquered, and that which is conquered, are never the same thing. Now the indulgence of sin and redemption is that which is conquered, and the blood that which is conquered; the redemption is the testament; the blood [is that] that the testament may be conquered: so they may never be One 2c.

But Luther would have to bring a new word "grasp", that he would show to the simple with "grasp", as if the words thus "grasped" would bring with them the body and blood of Christ, and speaks well: 2) "grasp the words to the sacrament", but the simple do not know that "grasp to the sacrament" alone is so much: to fast or make to a sign.

But that Luther would not want to say: we are even throwing him away, so we also want to hear his words, but since he, forgetting himself, publicly renounces, 3) that in the blood the testament consists; so it can never be the testament itself. Luther in the great B 4) at [the] 7th tablet: "For Christ's blood is not the figurative testament or the old testament blood, but the new, which consists in his blood" 2c.

These are Luther's words. Now the existing and that in which a thing consists are not one, therefore the drink cannot be the testament, even if the drink would be the blood of Christ,

for the testament consists in the blood; and if the blood is [that] in which the testament consists, the testament and the blood may not be One Thing; much less the drink, which is not shed for us; or else it would be included in the Unity of the Person of the Son of God, which is not at all as heard.

432 Now it is on the "which". The good pastor who taught Luther has not forgotten much of the tropes when he applies "which" to the cup or drink: "Which drink is poured out for you. For it is sufficiently shown that Luther's opinion, together with his crowd, is erroneous, since they suppose that pouring into cups or drinking takes away sin. For if this were so, then either the wine would be in the unity of the person, or else a more pure creature would take away the sin; of which there may be neither [i.e. neither of the two].

433 But the good old priest should learn that τὸ ὑπερ ὁμῶν ἐχχυνόμενον exallage [enallage] est, nominativi pro dativo, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπερ ὁμῶν ἐχχυνομένου. Id quod nullo negotio apud Matthaeum et Marcum videtur, qui ambo sic habent : τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα μου, τὸ τῆς χαύνης δια- Ἀ-ήλης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐχχυνόμενον. Hic videmus τοῦτο, hoc, demonstrare poculum,; sequentem vero articulum „τό" insignem reddere sanguinem; et sequentes omnes articulos eundem sanguinem demonstrare, non poculum. Atque hujusmodi exallagae celeberrimae sunt cum apud Paulum, tum apud LXX. 2 Cor. 6.; συνιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάχονοι - ἀντὶ: διοτ χάνους. Ezechielis 23. caput apud LXX ne expedies quidem citra exallages beneficium ; hujus tropi ita omnia sunt referta, ut nusquam non inveniantur.

434 But I must again refer to Luther, who droned on about the words: "The flesh is not useful" as long as one might leave the articles out and say: "Flesh is not useful", since he nevertheless misleads. But now he speaks:

Luther in the capital C on [the] 4th panel: 5) "If they now followed such two pointers" 2c.

Here, behold, pious princes! he instructs us that we should look at the articles, that is, pointers (we called them pointers before). Well then, let's bring out all of Matthes' and Marcus' pointers, so that he can see where the "which" goes. So they speak:

"This is the blood of mine, which is the 6) blood of the

5) No. 21, § 457. .

6) Randglosse: Rae, virn unius artieuli graset in nostrats linzna dsmonstrativnm eb artieulum rsHulrsrs!

1) i.e. nowhere.

2) No. 21, § 451.

3) d. i. confesses.

4) In the old edition erroneous; G. The passage is found in No. 21, § 446.

new testament is, which blood (sn! vim po "trerui rü, of enirn potest intenäem in öeafür the crowd is shed."

436 Here Luther would like to learn by the power of the little pointers in Matthew and Marcus where the little word "which", or "that", or "so" pointed to in Lucas; namely, to the blood, not to the drink. "Which blood is shed for you."

437 We want to overturn all this with a few words against the erroneous calculation that Luther makes last and teaches how we should meet, and bring forth the unanimity of the evangelists. So Matthew and Marcus (ob- mittam enim yáp apud Matth.) speak thus, "This is the blood of mine"; but so Lucas speaks, "In the blood of mine." Now no one is so unintelligent as not to perceive the difference 1) between "being himself" and "being in another." Soinan says: "The gentlemen of the council have given four jugs of wine to our dear citizens of Costenz, you can see that the jugs are called "the wine", but they are not, but they are what the wine is presented in. And even though it is called that, it is not understood by anyone that the jars are the wine. Now when Matthew and Marcus say, "This is the blood of me," they do not mean to say that the cup or the drink is the blood; but that it is the friendly brotherly cup, which is offered round about in the supper to commemorate the blood of Christ; as that to whom the pitcher is called. Therefore Lucas, who wrote after both of them, does the same to him as one who says, "They give you only the wine with the jugs, and do not give you the jugs;" and says, "The drink is a true sign of the new testament, which new testament is established and conquered in the blood of Christ;" as if he said, "The drink is not the blood, but a sign of the blood, in which the new testament is conquered. So it can be announced that Lucas with the word "in the blood of mine" wanted to make it obvious that this drink is not the blood, but a festive sign of the blood, in which the testament is won and conquered.

438) But here, Luther protectively 2) opposes the previous "which" and says: "Oh! what they would give to have the article there! But it is not there." So it seems that Lucas has from word to word: This 3) potion there, the New Testament, with the blood of me: and 4) the words might well be interpreted in this way:

1) Marginal gloss: blood and in blood has difference.

2) Pupil. Sagittarius - ABC student.

3) Marginal gloss: ^ovT-o 76.

4) In the original: "mögind".

Luther at [bow] 2 on the 6th panel. 5) "And so that we may avoid all confusion, I interpret the text of Luca in the clearest and shortest way: 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood.'"

439 Behold! how Luther makes himself clear. Just like everywhere else. Why does he not bring out what the "in my blood" serves? If he wants to say that the cup is in the blood of Christ, he is not speaking correctly; for according to his meaning, the blood must be in the cup, and not the cup in the blood. So he comes to the aid of the matter nicely, and rages once and for all and says:

Luther fnn sheet 2 on the 5th panel: 6) "From this it follows that coarse Hempel are, who want to conclude from the words Lucä: it must be the cup in the blood 2c., as a farmer in boots, or meat in the pots is."

440 Behold, pious princes! what an unfaithful interpreter we have! how licht he presents us, 7) because we know little. If we reproach them with the "in the blood of me," we do it only so that they may understand correctly that "in the blood of me" is as much possible as "through the blood of me," for the New Testament has been conquered. Thus Luther makes a long Perlament, 8) and finally arrives at the point that he speaks:

Luther there: 9) "This cup is the New Testament in the blood of Christ, that is, through the blood, or, for the sake of the blood" 2c.

441 Thus Luther goes on, and yet rings the matter now and then, that he, ex instrumen- talibus locutionibus causales, makes "through the blood" as much as "for the sake of the blood. Thus, "The cup is the new testament because the blood is in it." Is not this an impotent babble, when one sounds for a long time and does not answer, but only at the last falls again into that which is thrown at him? We say, then, "The new testament is in my blood," by which we see that he **means to say, K1V6 xa?' Errt'He^<"v, 81V6 xa?' ex^er^i'-**

[That the new testament is in his blood, that is, is conquered with and through his blood; and that the testament exists in the blood, and not the blood in the testament. Thus Luther says: the drink is the new testament, therefore the blood is in it. And it does not say that the blood is in the testament, that is, in the cup, as Luther speaks; but the testament is in the blood. Is it not a pity to speak with such frankness?

5) No. 21, § 406.

6) No. 21, § 403.

7) Maybe: how is he lying to us?

8) i. e. talk.

9) No. 21, § 405.

Verkehrniß and Alenfanz act? He would like to say, it would be ἀλλογενή, *Testamentum in sanguine*, pro, *sanguis in testamento*, hoc est, in poculo. Poculum enim apud eum et *testamentum* eadem res sunt....

But to them [i.e. away] with the mists! we have publicly learned that the drink is not the testament, and that the blood is not the testament, but that in and with which the testament is conquered. And is such a speech: "The new testament in my blood", as, so Paul speaks, Rom. 4: "And he took the sign of circumcision, a seal 1) of the piety of faith" 2c. Here Paul does not have the adjective "one", but simply: "He took the sign of circumcision, a seal of the piety of faith" 2c. Still we see that this little word "one" is added in our language, yes, it requires it; and if we add it immediately, we may then explain it further, thus: Which circumcision is a seal 2c. Ea enim vis est epitheti. And is of the speeches innumerable. Right there it says from word to word: "Where the law is not, nor transgression." Here, ΜΜπει-, "there is," is lacking, and if one interprets it into German, one must speak thus: "Where the law is not, there is also no transgression."

443) So Luther butchers himself here for the sake of Homer's lice, because the words "the New Testament in my blood" may not come right in our language to be clear, because thus: The New Testament, which is in my blood. We have also indicated above in the matter: "The flesh is not useful", that in the saying: "How can he give us his flesh to eat?" the word "his" is added, even though it is not written in John 2c. But all this becomes even clearer when we reconcile the other words of the evangelists.

Matthew and Mark say, "This is the blood of mine, which is the blood of the new testament. But Lucas says, "This drink is the new testament." Now the evangelists are one, although one speaks in *recto*, the other in *genitivo*. And whoever wants to complain would like to say: The Holy Spirit is not the same, or forgetful. For as Matthew and Marcus speak that the blood is a blood of the New Testament, so Lucas is contrary to them at the first appearance, for he calls the drink the testa-

1) Marginal gloss: Hie non cleiturked
per eelipsiin feUipsin artwuli, quas vis est epiüeti, enm tarnen m ss-
rsta artionlms ornino aclsiit.

2) i.e. suitable.

3) i. e. toils.

ment itself, cum articulo x. Now, as before "blood itself" and "in blood" are contrary to each other, if one did not want to let up the *tropos*, so here also "the testament itself to be" and "only the blood of the testament to be" contrary to each other, as far as the king himself and the captain of the king, through whom he overcomes the enemy and wins the victory. The testament itself, and that, so that the testament is overcome, are also against each other. But as we have seen enough before, by all the Scriptures, that the blood is that which gives the victory over sin, death and the devil: it is evident that it is not the testament, victory or fruit of suffering; but it is the captain who gives the victory to the heavenly Father; it is the tree from which we have gathered the fruit of the remission of sin. And in short! with his death and blood is born to us life and purity.

445. 4) It will now have to be argued that, as in the words: "This is my blood" (when Matthaüs and Marcus speak) Lucas has performed the *tropum*, 5) that this potion is the new testament, that is, a sacrament of the new testament, which new testament is conquered with the blood of Christ: thus also again Matthaüs and Marcus perform the *tropum*, which Lucas does, since he calls the potion the testament in the blood of Christ. i. *exponant*, in *conjunctivo*, thus; That this potion, which here barks Christ, is a sacrament of the blood of Christ; which blood of Christ is the blood, so that the testament is conquered.

446 And this comes from the causes: Since Lucas saw that Matthesen and Marxen's word "this is my blood" might be understood enthusiastically, he detached the *tropum*, and reversed blood itself into "being in the blood", that is, being won and conquered with the blood. 6) And again, since he saw that they both also called the blood not the testament, but the blood so that the testament is conquered. And again, since he saw that they both also did not call the blood itself the testament, but the blood, so that the testament is conquered, he was not afraid to also call the cup of the supper the testament tropical, since the clarity was well found in the previous two, since the blood itself was also not called the testament, but only the blood of the testament.

447. therefore also Oecolampadius ring has to answer, since Luther alenfanzet him with the words "in my blood" thus: 7) "it must be

4) d. i. light.

5) d. i. explained.

6) In the old edition: "him".

7) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession] in [the arc 2 on the 8th panel; and on the (arc on (the) 4th panel. sNo. 21, A 411 and 419').

The drink is the new testament in the sign of my blood. And therefore he 1) sputters out at him, who may hear that the new testament is a drink of wine. And the angry man does not see that "in my blood" in Luke is not tropus, but open, a simple clear speech; but in Mattyesen and Marxen "this is my blood" is tropus; just as again "of the new testament" in Matthew and Marcus is not tropus, but "the new testament" in Lucas is tropus.

But here he speaks against it; Luther in the great D in the first tablet: 2) "For it will not suffer itself in any way that Paul should use one word over one thing or matter, and in one speech, differently and otherwise, as a two-faced and cunning deceiver" 2c.

449. And after that he speaks thus: Luther in the large F at [the] second tablet: 3) "The words are to be understood as they read: 'This is my body, this is my blood', that I know for certain. For if they were tropus, they would have to be tropus in all places where the Lord's Supper is spoken of."

Behold, here, pious princes! but we have once: Burkart has called it. He prescribes a rule: "Where the same words are used in one thing, they are definitely tropus: and concludes from this that the words: "This is my body" 2c. are to be understood as they are; and proves it strongly, and says: "This I know for certain. Is not this a thing to which the pious Saxons ought to be justified? how, if we also would know it? shall he alone know it? I will say it: He cannot protect the rule with any word of God, for the contradiction is found publicly; therefore he knows it the same as the violinist, who does one stroke above himself, the other with himself, and does not remain on one at all. So what Luther says in the book is thus, or not.

But we want to hear another. Joh. 3. is taken in One Matter, in One Speech and Teaching πνεῦμα, Spirit, for wind and the Holy Spirit. Joh. 4. Christ says to the Samaritan woman: "Give me to drink!" and afterwards need drink for believe. Joh. 6: "You seek me, because you have eaten of the bread", and after that he calls himself by the name "bread"; and by the word "eat" he understands to believe. John 8: "The servant does not always remain in the house, but the Son always 4) remains in the house." Here he speaks de conditione

ΜΜΠΕΙ, from own people and servants, also from the free children. From that time he speaks, on top of it: "If then the Son shall redeem you, ye shall be free indeed." Here he speaks of the only free Son of God, of himself. In Romans 3, Paul takes circumcision for the whole Jewish people; soon after in chapter 4, in One Matter and One Speech, he takes it for the sign that is done to the body. Rom. 6: "We all that are baptized into Christ are baptized into his death." Here the first baptism is "visible sacramental baptism," but the other is "spiritual baptism," that is, dying to the world and living to God.

What shall I draw out many examples? The Scriptures are so full of such changes of words that, as often as one goes from a physical to a spiritual, or from a high 5) to a low, or from a low 6) to a high, or from used speech to simple, or from simple to tropical 7) and used, or from otherwise understood 8) to lightly understood, or from lightly understood to otherwise understood; and, in short! from figurative 9) speech to plain, or from plain to figurative: thus one needs all the same words, which, however, have different and different understanding. But Luther "knows it for certain.

453. So we have now, pious princes, that the bread, 10) which signifies Christ, is the sacramental body of Christ, that is, the sign of his body, the true essential one, which he gave in death for us; just as one speaks: This is the Cocles who held up the bridge of the Tiber to the enemies; but showing his image, this is only a carved or hewn Cocles; and but the true Cocles held up the bridge of the Tiber, not the carved one; and that the drink, the cup, is the sacramental blood of Christ, that is, a sign and signification of the true blood of Christ, with which blood the testament of the forgiven remission of sin is conquered; wherefore also this cup is called the testament, yet also only sacramental, that is, signifies and signifies the testament. I want to force this sense from Luther.

Luther at the capital C on the 2nd tablet: 11) "Since all these things are one sacramental being, one can well and truly speak of each and every one of them as a sacramental being.

1) d. i. speiet.

2) No. 21, § 466.

3) No. 21, § 507 is cited in a mutilated way, therefore what Zwingli concludes from it is completely useless.

4) In the old edition: allewe.

5) Marginal gloss:

6) Marginal gloss:

7) Marginal gloss: Iroxū.

8) Marginal gloss: 'AlkZoria".

9) Marginal gloss: k'i^nae.

10) Marginal gloss: A summary explanation.

11) No. 21, § 453.

piece than from the cup: "This is my blood." 2c.

455 A sacramental being is not the right being, but nothing else, neither a sign nor meaning of the other right being; enough has been said about this, and Luther does not like it either. Thus it follows that whoever calls a thing a sacrament wants to say that it is only a sign, and not the real thing that it signifies; for no one calls the real thing an image or sign. No one says: The right itself king is a sign of the king. But as soon as one says, This is a sign or image of the king, one understands that it is not the right king. So whoever says, This is a sacrament of the blood of Christ, says, This is only a sign of the true blood, and not the true blood. Now Luther calls it a sacrament, so he calls it differently only a sign of the true and not the true. Do you say, "Why does Luther act so cruelly? Do you call yourselves Tutists, Tuteleians, sign lyres 2c.? [I answer: It is the hand of God; and it is to be feared that he has transgressed, that God will thus let him fall; for such an iniquitous figuring 1) and fiddling that he does is known even to the wicked; nor does he think that it is not seen, and therefore is not ashamed. God better it!

456 Now it is in the saying of Paul, 1 Cor. 10: "The cup of thanksgiving." Luther, however, makes blessing of it; and may not, however, offer it with One Word; but all Christians from the apostles have called it Eucharistian [*εὐχαριστία*, that is, thanksgiving, instead of Eulogias [*εὐλογία*]. But Burkart must have his own way. In which saying Luther lets himself in so darkly that those who read it at once see very soon that it does not consist with himself. Therefore, let us make our meaning firm, and thus conclude the other part.

457 In the eighth chapter, Paul spoke much against those who ate things sacrificed to idols with the idolaters, and fought against them in love, that, though it was proper for them to eat things sacrificed to idols, yet they should refrain from doing so, if they saw that many brethren were angry because of it; for love also refrains from things that are proper. But Paul does not here refrain from saying that it is proper to eat things sacrificed to idols, as some have written, but he only says that even though it is proper, they should spare the weak brethren out of love. And therefore here again he comes to the same matter and wants to show that it is not proper to eat things sacrificed to idols, and he does this very strongly. All those who are in one sacrifice, in one

If the body appeared at a feast or ceremony, it would be one body, company, and congregation with all the members of the same feast, sacrifice, or ceremony.

When the brethren of Corinth appeared in the supper of thanksgiving, they undoubtedly became One Church, One Society, One Church, and One Body with the brethren of the Christian faith; therefore it should not befit them to eat with the idolaters in their sacrifices, for they would also become members of their Body, that is, of the Church and Society of devils. This should never be, that those who want to be seen [members] of the church of God with the company of His table, also become company of the devils. This is the summare argu- ment. We have already sufficiently fixed this place in other writings. Luther also did not like anything against it, 2) but he is fumbling around behind the bridge; therefore, we will now point out the reasons.

459. "The cup of thanksgiving, that we may give thanks, or, if we give thanks, is it not the company or congregation of the blood of Christ?" Here Luther makes fellowship and sharing out of the word, but without Scripture. But Andreas Althainer indicated at Bern at the disputation a xxxxxxxx, that is, community, in the second [Epistel to the] Corinthians, in the 8th chapter: "The Macedonians have exhorted us excellently that we take this gift and fellowship of serving the pious Christians" 2c. Here the good man defied, the whole world would not want to contradict, because that *κοινωνία* must mean fellowship and sharing: so it must also be taken here, 2 Cor. at the 10th chapter. Here we see that the good man did not know that this word stands in many other places even on our sense; and therefore 3) he fell silent, since Oecolampadius took *κοινωνία* from 1 John 1 for the fourth time, taken for fellowship, as also the Latin interpres has interpreted, and saw there that he could not stand with the account: fellowship is taken for sharing in one place, so it is also taken for sharing in 1 Cor. 10. And therefore we will first show some places in Scripture where it is taken publicly for community and society, and then show that 2 Corinthians 8 is also taken in this way.

460. 1 Cor. 1 thus says: "Faithful and true is God, by whom you were called into society (*hic habet antiquus interpres societatem*;

1) i.e. rub back and forth.

2) i.e. capable.

3) "verstumt" put by us instead of: "erhummet", which is probably a misprint, instead of: "erstummet".

Erasmus *consortium*) of his Son JEsu Christ our Lord." To Galatians on the other: "They offered me and Barnaban the right hands, to a sign of society", χοινωνία? Here the old interpreter and Erasmus: *societatis*, of society. Phil. 1: "I give thanks to GOD" 2c., and that you have come into the church or society of the Gospel. Here Erasmus has *communione*m, not *communicationem*. And 1 John 1. says *χοινωνία* for the fourth time for company. Acts 2. is also taken xocrEca thus: "They always clung to the apostles' teaching, to the church, and to the breaking of bread" 2c. Accordingly, if one considers the saying 2 Cor. 8 [v. 4], it also has its meaning from the church, because the Macedonians recognized the Christians at Jerusalem as their fellow churches and fellows; therefore they shared with them what they had as common property. So Heb. 13 and Phil. 4.

But putting all this aside, Paul sets himself forth to speak of the church, that we are the church of the blood of Christ, and not the church of idols, saying, "For we the multitude find one bread and one body." Here you see, pious princes! abersmals] the causalem "for," which little word is a sign *ἰπεξηγη- σεως*, id est, expositionis, of interpreting and explaining what he understood before by the words church or company, and body and blood, and says, For we the multitude *οἰπολλοί*. 1) Behold! that which before he called the church or company, he now calls the multitude or the company, that it may be understood that he did not speak of dividing the blood of Christ, but of the church, that we, the Christian multitude, are church and company, the church of the blood and corpse of Christ; therefore it is not fitting for us, by the corpse, to be company and church of idols.

462 He also says that we are one bread and one body. Now who will not see that he does not say here of the dividing of the body of Christ, when he makes the bread of which he said "us", "we are the same bread"? If then we are the same bread, how can we be divided? or, do we also eat one another? Therefore the meaning is this: that the drink of thanksgiving is the congregation of the blood of Christ, that is, whoever shares in thanksgiving 2) with the cup is [a member of] the company of the blood of Christ. And if we break the bread, we are the church or congregation of the body of Christ. For we,

we, the multitude, that is, the whole church are One Bread and One Body.

Behold! how he goes from the true corpse, also from the sacramental corpse, to the allegorical, that is, differently understood corpse, namely, to "us". And not only shows how we are the church of the blood and body of Christ, but also why we are: namely, "because we all 3) (Behold! now he calls the church and the multitude "all", who are companions or brethren in the supper) partake of one bread with one another." Now we have publicly that all the quackery about the sharing of the body of Christ is fog; for Paul says "that we" then, that we share of One Bread with one another, "are one church of the body of Christ," not that we share the body of Christ with one another, which he should have said in *προσπαυδοῦσαι*, that is, in indicating the cause.

464 And this he makes clear only when he subsequently teaches by example how Jews and Gentiles recognize that those who eat of a sacrifice are companions of the altar, of which they eat; *χοινωνοί*, companions, co-adherents, co-participants. 4) Now if anyone eats of the sacrifice of the altar of the idols, that is, of the devils, as the 5) is also a companion and joint-liability of the devils. Therefore he tells them out, "they may not drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of the devils." Luther and the Old Testament should have learned from Paul's words: "I do not want you to be devils' fellows", that here are taken for fellows, companions and brothers, not for those who have eaten the devil. And if they had seen this peel⁶, they would also have seen that *xm'ia*, congregation or company, does not mean to divide out in the place; for the devil is not divided out to eat; so also *χοινωνία* here is not called the dividing out of the body of Christ in the eating of the bread and drink, but those who here are fellow-measurers 6) in the sacrament and sign of the body and blood of Christ, are not to become fellow-measurers, fellows, fellows, nor fellow-servants of the heathen and idolaters in their obligatory and communal sacrifices or ceremonies.

465 But as Luther would say here: One knows well that one does not eat the devil, but the devil is taken here for the sacrifice of the devils. So learn also that here one does not eat the body of Christ, but the sacrament or zei-

1) Marginal gloss: ot nuno 8unt, Hui xrius Evnvia aäpellabantur.

2) In the old edition: "mittheilet." - "theilet" - Theil hat.

3) Marginal gloss: Onrmes multituão er eonmr"?r'o.

4) i.e. participants.

5) We have deleted "not" here because it did not seem to fit the context.

6) i.e. table companions.

of the body of Christ. And thereby the eater becomes a fellow member of the church of Christ, if he eats it with right faith; otherwise he appears only as a fellow member, but is not, but becomes guilty of the true body and blood of Christ, and of the mystical, that is, of the spiritual body and blood, 2c. of which enough has been said above. So much for the other part.

The third part.

If I, pious princes, also speak something into Luther's faith, I will undoubtedly be scolded. For one may say: Why is Luther's freedom judged by your conscience? 1 Cor. 10, you attack Luther for the sake of something external. Now freedom is where the spirit of God is. 1) If Luther undoubtedly has God's Spirit, as you yourself confess, then you should leave him unjudged. Let him know that this and other sayings, which may thus be drawn out against us, are for us. For our freedom is judged by Luther, and not only that, but all our faith, mind, understanding, doctrine and life; yes, we are the most evil heretics in his book, therefore we are not at all willing to judge him with this, but to punish that which is not conformed to the truth, and to confront him where he teaches wrong while we live. To this end, no one can boast of the freedom of the spirit who wants to do or teach contrary to God's word. We also owe it to our conscience to warn where error wants to grow. Now Luther did not have enough to pour out the clumsy error with even clumsier writing: he first had to introduce more error and suspicion in his confession. And the greatest thing of all is to make a desperate protestation or testimony. Therefore, we should go out to meet him, and open the pus that lies at the bottom of the flesh. Nevertheless, we will keep Christian discipline, since he does not keep pagan or Turkish discipline against us.

467 When he indicates the unity of the divine essence and the unity of the persons, he should not have taken the Roman church as a witness, because as far as he has often exclaimed about it 2) it does not believe that there is neither one nor more gods, but is even godless [dei expers]. And I believe, whoever has a right true faith, sees that the Roman church never had true Christian faith, since the splendor of the papal

primacy is to arise. I know well what the Roman Church, which has faith, holds; but it must not be attracted here. If he now presents the Milesians 3) as witnesses in such a glorious matter, it tastes like 4) something that I want to give you, pious princes, and all believers to consider.

468] On the other hand. Since he says: "He believes that Mary, the holy virgin, is a true mother, not only of the man Christ, but also of the Son of God," 2c., 5) I also believe this; however, Luther should have explained himself greatly in the words, as he then also rightly recognizes against his will, as we indicated at the end of the first part, namely: "that Mary is called the mother of God because she gave birth to him who is God and man; but his divine nature cannot be born except from the one Father. I indicate, pious princes, for this reason alone, that in our kind 6) there are also some priests who say at the pulpits in the Papal churches: "Who would be God if Mary had not given birth? Therefore she is mighty over God Himself", thus inverting the honor of the Creator into the honor of the created. But Luther should still leave the little nail behind him, so that the simple ones would learn to recognize the difference of the two natures in Christ the less.

469 Thirdly. Since he speaks "as Christ ascended to heaven," 2c., we also believe that under the name of Christ he lets the human nature remain in its characteristic; for it is fitting for Christ to be on earth, in heaven and under the earth, but only according to the One nature; as has been heard enough.

The fourth. We do not disagree about original sin, but Luther and his crowd do not want the words that we say, because Burkart did not speak them. And this is recently the summa, which we prove in the booklet *de peccato originali*: "that original sin is not a sin of its own nor a guilt, but a prest, 7) which attaches to us from Adam's sin." Are not against that someone calls the prest sin 2c.

471 The fifth. Since he speaks of the orders *ordinibus*, the Christian stands, he needs words, which, if not properly judged, may mislead the simple-minded. Luther: "But what is in God's

3) Hilesü occurs in the meaning: Muthwillige, unzuchtige people.

4) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession, in the arc] F on [the] 4th plate. [No. 21, § 511, at the end]. - We put "after" instead of "yet".

5) No. 21, § 514.

6) Maybe: in our places?

7) d. i. infirmity.

1) Marginal gloss: 2 Cor. 3:17.

2) written out (?).

Word is fasted, that must be holy thing; for God's Word is is eaten "in bread"; so the sign is ever eaten with the holy, and sanctifies all that is in Him and in Him" 1) 2c. drawn: Lift up, pope and popes! it is now no longer a

472 Here I ask Luthern what he understands by this sacrament. To the fourth: Eat the godless clergy, and speech: "What is contained in God's word"? If he means receive the bodily body of Christ; why then do they not that everything of which God's bodily or written word become holy, when he first said: "What God's word fasts, speaks is holy, then Judas, Pilate, Caiphaz and Lucifer that is all holy" ? Now I ask him: Does the Word fast the are also holy; but if he understands what his eternal word, body of Christ here? Without doubt he will soon say yes. that is, his eternal, inexpressible wisdom, will and power, Why does it not make the harrowers and workers holy? preserves, then it is not true; for even the devil is 474. to the seventh, he thus says, 4) Luther: "In the preserved in it and lives together with all the godless, but church is the gospel, baptism, the sacrament of the altar, they are not holy. He then wants to take "holy" pro 5) in which forgiveness of sins is offered, fetched and sacrosancto, for unchangeable; so the word "fast" is not received" 2c. Of the gospel we are one, that in the same allowed, but one is used to speak thus in the case: forgiveness of sins is promised, and given to him who Everything that God calls, recognizes, speaks or wills, believes and trusts in it. But if Luther believes that that must be; or what God orders, that must proceed. forgiveness of sins is given in baptism or in the sacrament of the altar, I ask him: whether forgiveness of sins is also What God ordains, no one shall break. God orders the magistrate, therefore he may not depart; therefore he is given in the sacrament of the altar to him who does not believe? Says he, Yea, then the word of Christ, "He that holy, although the persons of the magistrate are ungodly. trusteth in me hath everlasting life," and, "He that But Luther comes up with the word "fast" for and for, so believeth shall be preserved; and he that believeth not that one may become obsessed with it 2) and learn that God's bodily or outwardly spoken word is able to sanctify something, God gives whoever speaks it; and then the pabstry is helped along with him. For the words "this is my body" bring the body of Christ from heaven, even if his drunken sheriff with the red pants spoke them at the beer soup 2c. Should one also look for sinister words, since one wants to explain the faith clearly?

473. to the sixth. He now believes what he never believed before, nor in this book, namely: 3) "That those who pass and receive the Sacrament eat and drink the body of Christ in bread and wine orally, even though they do not have faith." For he has previously taught publicly, even within the four years, that only the faithful eat the body of Christ. But the insecurity of the rich oppresses him, so now he preaches another way. On the other hand, he also denied in this book that he had never taught that the body of Christ was in the bread. And here he says, "The body and blood of Christ in the bread." Thirdly, he recognized above "that oral eating must be understood sacramentally," that is, that the sign is eaten which for its meaning is called the body of Christ. But here he also says that the body

Here someone would like to say, pious princes: I think you want to keep Luthern friendly, so you show him the brush 8) so that the bacon will trust you. Response. No; this is the truth sought and brought forth; if Luther has violated it, then he knows this, then he has no shame, otherwise he may not be ashamed of himself.

4) No. 21, § 531.

5) Marginal gloss: Pucker up, altar! [Zwingli expresses his displeasure at the use of "altars" and not "tables.]"

6) "verschnellet" probably as much as: verscherzt.

7) In the old edition: gerstin.

8) d. i. Bristles.

1) No. 21, § 523.

2) Perhaps: to adhere to, to look at bullishly, to stare at. Compare § 240 of this writing.

3) Marginal gloss: Is [in Luther's Confession] in the great G on the first and second panels. [No. 21, § 531.]

save. For this sacrament alone brings the believer show (I say with reluctance); if I have now taught rightly in remission of sin, so forgiveness is with the believer alone; it, why does he say: "I have never taught a piece rightly" for faith alone knows it, and [does] this sacrament nothing ?

476 Luther speaks of purgatory in the eighth place: "I know that there is a purgatory, but there is nothing to be taught about it in the church, nor is there anything to be done about it with writings or vigils. Haec ille. Here I would like to hear from Luther: why his purgatory is not to be taught in the church? If he knows anything, then do as the most unfaithful shipmen do, who, when they come ashore, warn those traveling from land that they should palate themselves 2) as Tullius says: Ah! Dear, show us the "Scyllam!" If he does not, I will not only say that he is doing like the wicked boys who tell their companions about birds' nests, but since they do not know any, only that they bring their conscious nests from the companions, but I will say: May God's spirit not suffer that one sees the harm of his neighbor and does not warn; and if the prophet knows that the sword is coming and does not warn, then the blood of the bystanders is sought from his hands.

477 But all disgrace put aside, so we want to extinguish Luther's purgatory with one word, whether it would go Nobis house 3) whether the ridge together. Joh. am 5.: "I tell you amen, amen, that whoever hears my word, and trusts in him who sent me, has eternal life, and comes into no judgment, punishment, nor court (judicium Dstfo hebraico idiotismo), but has already passed from death into life." If Luther does not believe the word, then luge what kind of faith he has. For I know that we who ^believe, Christ will keep us 4) in the last hour in life, that is fresh, whole, and healthy, Jn. 6, [v. 47.]. See the words feet baß.

478] The ninth. He rightly recognizes the intercession of the Holy Spirit, but has not done so before; only once he indicates a person, with injury, in the "Magnificat". But since he says: others have attacked the article, I ask him: who was the first to attack it at this time? If 5) he affirms the truth, he must attack Zwingli.

479 To the tenth. Luther says: 6) "I keep images, bells, chasuble, church decorations, altars, lights and the like free. Whoever wants to, may leave it" 2c. Behold, pious princes, how our adversary, the devil, deals with us! Images are forbidden and rejected in so many ways in the New and Old Testaments that no believer can despise God's word in such a way that he can count it free; and Luther puts them under bells and lights. What does he take God's word for? Yes, he says:

Luther there: "Although I consider images from Scripture and from good histories to be almost useful, they are free and arbitrary" 2c. I ask Luther here, from which Scripture the images may be proven useful? From holy? so he says to God and all His servants in heaven and earth, which is not; for neither God nor they have never let up nor tolerated the images with a single word; but have always forbidden them to the highest and also stormed them. One knows well that we speak of the venerated images. Or from pagan history? He has not read them very much. I was very sorry. He can boast little from them. From Christian histories? that is, from the histories where the learned fantasists have expanded good and evil (Luther understands me well, which I mean), false and invented things into a harbor cheese 7)? So God forgive Luther! Does he have no other judgment in reading, than that he also does not see in the same, which of revered images reads, which does not; which would come from the mad head of the fantasist, which from an understanding loving mind of truth? For I will say it freely: Where have we a history writer since the apostles' times, whom we now present to a wise pagan?

Keeping the vestments and the altar is the same as if the children of Israel had left the altars of their idols standing, since they no longer sacrificed to them. He who teaches to keep the chasubles 8) and the gilded tables, teaches the pope to wait until his kingdom may arise again. I understand church adornment to be the delicious ornamentation of the sanctuary. Is of one value with the images, but so much more evil that they look more public on the Gutzel 9).

1) No. 21, § 537.

2) i.e. to take care of.

3) Nobis house perhaps the hell. Nodis perhaps the "Gottseibeuns".

4) Marginal gloss: Lgo rssuseitado eum in novissimo äis.

5) d. i. confesses.

6) No. 21, § 543.

7) "welded" probably as much as: "welded", i.e. forged together.

8) Hudeln - rags, rags.

9) i.e. the unjust acquisition, fraud. In No. 26 of this volume tz109: the widows their houses "abgutzeln".

Whoever lets the stork nests stay, they will truly come back.

482 It is wicked to be rapacious and warlike: but it would be better, pious princes! you would do them all harm, 1) neither that they should provoke the enemy to rise up again. He that taketh his wife in whoredom with strange keys, garments, and jewels, and leaveth them unto her, teacheth her to go on whoring. Thus idolatry is made by the holy prophets an adulterous wife; and if one keeps the idols that have been set up for worship, one does likewise, as if we might not otherwise be drawn enough from God by the impotent power of the flesh, but we must also have a suit that draws us from God.

But that is all. Luther leaves a pretty sign, by which one sees that he does not speak out of spirit or faith, but out of quarrel, and says: "For I do not hold with the iconoclasts. Here we say that we truly do not keep it with them either. But since one may do so with order and with peace of mind, one should not regard Luther's word as chiding us iconoclasts. What does not give his deed is ghosts, enthusiasts, iconoclasts. We should put new wine into new wineskins, not into old ones, and we should guard ourselves against all evil. If we do not defend the venerated images, the vestments and altars, why do we want to keep them, if we, born again through the gospel, want to be a new people? Some churches have a hundred altars; if they no longer want to have mass, what are the sacrilegious piles of stones for? Yes, bells and lights, if they come in hope of a good work, as especially the lights are dangerous, should also be left alone 2c.

484 To the eleventh. Enough has been said above about the danger he puts all his writings in, if he refers or testifies only to those that have gone out from him [for] four or five years. However, I would also like to turn back from these same Lutherans, if I were as distressed about him as he is about us, and not only that, but also indicate from this that he is against the greenhorns, who stand out so freshly, and yet know nothing at all, except that they, put off on Luther's teaching, insist and heresy. They also deal with practicalities, which I know well to write now and then through their town clerks. One understands well what Sprengler 2) Works them

1) i.e. from then on.

2) "Sprengler" probably as much as "Aussprenger". This seems to us to be a reference to Lazarus Spengler/who was city clerk in Nuremberg. Compare Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. X, 2256 ff.

drive. The pious cities like to incite against their preachers, and they against each other. Ask the honorable councilors at V. [Ulm], A. [Augsburg] and M. [Memmingen], what and who writes to them, without which I do not know. Now asking 3) [them] God almost, that he gives them right understanding, or else they become desolate to shame! For even Luther must be overcome, and that [i.e. if] he were equal to a hundred thousand; quia omnium potentissima veritas, for truth is above all power.

In the twelfth place, Luther testifies: 4) "if he would say something else out of the necessity of death, then he wants to have it known that it is wrong and inspired by the devil.

486 I will prove that this is an open despair. First, it is a despair of the thing. For if he trusted to maintain the matter with Scripture, he would defy the same, and [not] 5) take the matter upon himself so dear. Nevertheless, I must also draw us out. Where, then, has our one ever stood up, or thought so much of himself, as to defy? But this is the cause, that we stand on the firm living ground, which no one can take away from us, nor with any tempest can we win. But it also serves ad invidiam et odium to make us hateful, that we bring the stern, dear man to what we have truly thought him to be all along. But I hear well that we should spare his untruthfulness, and let our God with His Word be the hindrance 6) so that we do not make Luther restless in his sweet sleep. Let no one be sorry for us!

Accordingly, it is a despairing of himself. For, without one seeing from the words that he is afraid of him [i.e. himself] behind the matter, I will prove that it is a desperate presumption, thus: Paul writes 1 Cor. 13: X parte⁷) cognoscimus, et ex parte prophetamus, we increase in knowledge and prophecy. So Luther thinks that he may neither become more learned nor more enlightened, but that where he would otherwise have learned, the devil would have given it to him: so he does not see his way to God to teach him further; and that is despair. For

3) Asking is in the optative, orsnt! (Walch.)

4) Marginal gloss: He fears to give him [i.e. for himself; tinast kidil-

5) The context seems to us to require a "not" here.

6) "Hinderling" probably as much as: the rearmost, last place.

7) Marginal gloss: 'Lx ^/xn>c, sueesssivs; paullatina maZis 6t maßis.

1) Love alone is never lacking; but prophecy, that is, the revelation of truth, tongues and knowledge are lacking, that is, they never become so perfect that he who has them neither lacks nor lacks anything. So if there has never been a prophet who has not increased for and for, a man who understands tongues, a scholar: why did Luther dare to say that 2) he would not become more learned and knowledgeable in this matter? Is it because of God that he does not take care of him, that he does not greatly enlighten him, which I do not hope he would ever have despaired of. If it is because of him that he thinks himself to be nothing at all that he does not know most perfectly, it is an ungodly presumption, and therefore despair.

But if anyone should say: Now you also hold yourselves in such a way that you think you are sure of the matter, we say yes; but that we are going to be reported, that is not. But Luther now recognizes that it is the sacramental body of Christ, and has never been so close to it before. If he has now increased in knowledge, why does he reject it again? Because that is out. He recognizes, like Berengarius, that the body of Christ is sacramental. Now so wind and turn as he will, so it will go with him, like the jay in the glue, 3) the more he cries out, is weighed [i.e. moves] and wriggles, the more he sticks. So we have promised Luther that we will drive him more and more to the angle, so that he must deny himself God's right and sound knowledge; or else he must deny this error. I also reckon that he will forgive himself for writing more, so that he will see that we are victorious over him, however much he writes. But not we; he who makes himself victorious in us.

489 And this is the most blessed thing, that he confesses his faith, like that priest, who, after he had reproached the sheep, ends thus: "Behold! if you do not change, and I also, then we will become of the devil together; God help you and me Father, Son and Holy Spirit! So Luther also ends here, and says: 4) "Where I would say otherwise, I will herewith publicly confess. that it is wrong and that the devil has introduced it.

be given to me. For this help me my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ! That book he began with the devil, this one he ends with him. So God decrees that if we want to be wise without His word, we will become fools.

490 Thus we who have enough of the twelve pieces of the Christian faith 5) and who also believe without doubt, have found twelve pieces in Luther's faith, some of which are incompetent, some of which are not faithfully presented from the essay, some of which are wrong, and some of which are even contrary to God's Word and the true Christian faith.

491 Still thus we recognize that commonly the very highest *ingenia* have fallen into something like quarrelsome correctness 6). How did *Cicero* attack *Sallustium* beyond measure? Hieronymus Augustinum enough rough angeschnerzt, 7) and, which we should never forget, Paul Barnabam, Acts 15, 37-39, by John Marcus? Since truly the noblest harness and weapons. For why should John Marcus not have gone with them again in the business of the gospel? for he never denied himself of it, even though he had gone from Pamphylia to Jerusalem, Acts 13:13. 13, 13. Here Barnabas (even an uncontested, serious, but also mild, chaste Christian and apostle, that I often regret that we no longer have his writings and stories) was right about it, and Paul was wrong. Although God ordered it for more growth of the Gospel. Still, even though they were so quarrelsome that they departed from one another, they became one again; for Paul answered him quite honorably, 1 Corinthians 9, that it was laid to their charge that they led their wives with them, which Paul wrote long after the quarrel.

492 So then, our humble request to Luther, by the spirit in which we all live, in which he preached the gospel when we believed; by the same spirit in which we too will be found on the last day, have preached: let him remember that he is not above error, just as Paul in the heat was too much of a ruler 8) who nevertheless either compares or surpasses all the apostles in doctrine and holiness. We know the manly and chivalrous standing out that Luther did against the papacy, since no one was allowed to dare to do so. We know, however, that he, too, although

5) "The Twelve Pieces of the Christian Faith," i.e., the Apostles' Creed. Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XIX, 797.

6) i. e. bossiness.

7) d. i. snubbed, ! 8) d. i. hard, brittle.

1) Marginal gloss: lioeus 1. oorintli. 13.

2) i.e., boldly; also: given away.

3) i.e. on the glue line.

4) For this malicious citation by Zwingli, compare No. 21, Z545; Zwingli has omitted the prefix: "This is my faith".... "I beg of all pious hearts who would bear me witness and plead for me that I may stand firm in such faith and resolve my end; for (since God is for) whether I would say otherwise out of temptation and mortal need, it shall be nothing and I want to have it publicly confessed herewith" 2c.

God will! recognize that his doctrine and knowledge exist to a fair degree; and will perceive that the devil does not seduce him with arrogance. God has given him spirit of power enough; only he does not turn the power to his glory; so we will surely become one in all things. May the true God grant us this! Amen.

493. Therefore, pious princes, let our writings be read in God's name by people whom your wisdom knows well how to humble, whose minds and aspirations are captive to the obedience of God; for all those who want to preserve flesh and blood here with their own sincerity are captives of the flesh and the letter, even though it alienates them; And want to put on us as if we were of natural account and nature of the flesh against the bodily-fleshly presence, which is truly not; for if so, we would not have come to hold the opposites before those who have had much higher reason before us, neither we; for the opinion against which we fight has always been contrary to human reason. But is this not only carnal, but something more wicked, to hold the misunderstood letter so ludicrously that one does not want to hear clearer Scripture? We do not mean to reject the letter, but to hold it in high esteem; but for the sake of right understanding, otherwise the letter is not only useless, but also harmful.

494 But on our side is the faith, the Scriptures, the custom of the first Christians, the custom of the earliest Christians, the mind of the

Elders teachers. Although in this the chattering parakeets 1) are so blind that they do not see that the ancients, in calling this sacrament the body of Christ and a sacrifice, always lead such a form with words and senses that one can see that they have talked and understood after Christ in the same way as we teach. Now, in a few days, an impatient job has defiled the booklet *Päscasii*, which is entirely with us, with his annotations. The good man does not understand what the old custom is, but where he sees that the pious Pascasius speaks of the bodily meal, that he only understands the visible supper and sacrament, and then speaks of the right spiritual meal again in such a way that one can see that he only lived for a sign 2); so this polite chancellor is here, and adds: *Caute legas*, one should read it carefully. For this they do not look at the time; for among the ancients it was often said: We eat the true body of Christ, for: We eat the sacrament of the true body; therefore the Marcionites attributed to him a spiritual, not a true body. Then Porphyrius also mocked them, saying that Christians eat their God, which was not the opinion of the ancients. We have all the similarities of the Easter lamb in type and words. Therefore, for God's sake, do not take anything for evil. May He preserve you together with your territories! Amen. Given in Zurich at the end of August, in the year 1528.

1) d. i. Parrots.

2) d. i. held.

25 D. Jakob Streichen's writing Against Zwingli's Error Concerning the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament. *)

June 1526.

1) Whereas Solomon, to whom God had given the highest knowledge before all 3) men before his time of divine wisdom, did not fall into the doctrine and worship of idols afterwards; also Judas fell to the worst traitor, who also before-

3) So set by us instead of: for all.

sent by Christ together with the other disciples to proclaim his future and to confirm it with miraculous signs performed in the name of Christ: so a devout Christian might be driven into error and despondency in many ways, as now some famous and highly learned preachers of the holy gospel have so greatly offended error.

*This writing appeared in 1526 in a single edition under the title: "Wider den unmilden Irrthum Meister Ulrich Zwinglens, so er verneinet die wahrhaftige Gegenwärtigkeit des allerheiligsten Leibes und Blutes Christi im Sacrament". It was completed, as Walch indicates, in June 1526. We give the text according to Walch's old edition.

The fact that many heartfelt, faithful disciples and lovers of God's Word are also grieved by the fact that they doubt not a little who should be believed, if each part uses evangelical doctrine and Word.

But let every devout Christian heart be comforted and rejoice in God, for in this sharp and most dangerous challenge to our true faith, we sense the truth in its own way, bright and clear; our thoughts and attention must be focused on it alone, and we must by no means cling to the ministers as if they would no longer want to fall away from the truth they have recognized and often preached, as is evident not only from the examples of Solomon and Judas that have just been given. But the light of the whole Gospel takes the heart of the faithful from all creatures, even from the ministers of the Word, and teaches to adhere to the Word in faith alone. That is why Christ warns us so highly and faithfully in the Gospel of Matthew 7 and 24 that we should pay constant attention to the false teachers with the utmost diligence, because they would also break out with their teachings so subtly and quickly that even the elect (where possible) would finally be deceived.

3) There is truly no more swift, healing 1) and harmful seduction to be expected, than that which, alas! Now, through those whom we have considered to be the most knowledgeable in evangelical preaching, many thousands of simple Christians are being led astray by these unholy seducers, who are giving us the pure body and blood of Christ in his delightful and joyful presence in the sacrament, 2) and are giving us only dry bread and sour wine; For if they would prosper in such a way that we would let fall the mighty words of Christ, opened in his supper, then it would soon be over for the whole of Christ and the outward word of God. How unfortunate! Some apparently now also deny Christ's innocent humanity, and ascribe sin to our faithful Redeemer according to his human nature 3); only that they do not have to confess the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament; that will also soon come to pass. Therefore, we are assured in the Word, as the true evangelical teaching is now being attacked by us everywhere (as Christ said), that our preaching flows from God and not from human speech 4).

1) In the old edition: "heler" i.e. more complete.

2) i.e. to snatch.

3) In the old edition: "feinde", which, however, Walch has already explained with "sin".

4) In the original: Derme Rätte.

4) It has not happened differently since the first proclamation of the true gospel; so the false prophets, besides the tyrannical persecution of the world, have always intruded with false doctrine and pretense of holiness, that 5) Paul complains the most almost in all epistles, especially to the Romans at the end, in both epistles to the Corinthians, also to the Galatians, to Timothy and everywhere. Also Lucas writes of him Apost, at 20. For this John [in] his first epistle at the other [Cap., v. 18. 19.] says: "There are now many unbelievers who have gone out from us, because they were not of us; for since they would have been of us, they should have remained with us." O! how is it already 6) in the day, in what spirit those have preached and written, who a year 7) ago recently so clearly preached and described the presence of the most holy body and blood of our Savior Christ in the Sacrament, also the abuses in this wonderful Sacrament so even as damnable blasphemy, therefore denounced, that the holy body and precious blood of Christ should be present, [not] 8) tract and used differently, than Christ himself has taught, acted, and prescribed. Also, the same preachers have understood themselves in writing and orally 9) before everyone, that they have used nothing in this true doctrine except what the pure unfailing eternal Word of God is able to do.

Now that the believers, by God's grace, have partly beaten back the old errors, and with great joy and devotion receive the body and blood of the Lord under both forms from such delicious preachers, oh! how unashamedly they now fall, the preachers, from such Christian doctrine, which in particular doubt has never been attractive to them from the heart! Therefore, without faith and God, their ministry must be recognized; for they boast that some years ago, even while they were preaching the gospel, they knew well that there was nothing in the sacrament but bread and wine.

Alas! the harmful preachers! Woe, woe to the perilous times! they must ever confess that they have deceived so many thousands of souls with doctrine which they themselves did not believe nor believe to be righteous.

5) Set by us instead of: that.

6) Maybe: beautiful.

7) This probably refers to the Swabian preachers and the *Sungramma Suevicum*, No. 14 in this volume.

8) The context seems to us to require a "not".

9) Perhaps: "versähen" d. i. known.

10) i.e. harmful. Zwingli makes fun of this expression "harmful" in his answer § 6.

have. Oh God! How do you find such thoughtless Christians, who listen to or believe in such windpipes! Indeed, if it were a matter of a little temporal good, such a two-year-old would be rejected after his divided speech. But such preachers are high, seeming, and sweet words; misuse for this purpose the precious languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, which, as the noble gifts of God, should be used only to honor and praise God, and serve truth, not error. Read of such prudence the prophet Isaiah 33 and St. Paul 1 Cor. 1, also Christ in Evangelio Matthäi 11. Thus 1) they open the mouths of the simple, and especially of the forward, and turn white into black; and what was yes with them today is no tomorrow.

(7) Because their words, which tickle the ears, seem so adorned, and because they are respected as spiritual people, and because the gospel of Jesus and the cross sound in their mouths for and for, they have a special holy spirit, which must also confirm quite repugnant things to them. They also create new, unknown names for themselves, as if they were not of common German birth; they also give one another the high titles that belong to Christ alone according to his divine nature. From this it is easy to determine whether they truly preach or write from the faith of the simple, humble Lord Christ; for he says to the like of them on the 5th of John: "How can you believe, who receive praise from one another, and do not seek the true praise, which is from God alone? Namely, they have set themselves apart from the number of those who, unwavering, according to the calling of God to evangelical preaching, persevere in God's word, and with the eternal truth, the Son of God; [to whom] in their preaching Yes is Yes, and not Yes is No, therefore they cheerfully agree with St. Paulo, 2 Cor. 1, may give thanks to the faithful GOD, that their preaching, [God's] word, has been Yes, and not No, with all the hearers; for Paul also says from GOD to Galatians on 1: "If we also, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you otherwise than we have preached unto you; let it be accursed."

(8) Therefore, the pious, steadfast Christians should not be frightened, for we easily find that with such strange preachers the angel Satan has disguised himself as if he were an angel of light; and let us all praise God that we now know that we have attained the right word of God, true understanding, even without ceasing.

1) In the old edition: spreissen.

Ask God to protect and keep His little new army from such sharp-witted preachers, according to His divine promise Luc. 12.

For the devout, simple Christians who are eager to learn and do the will of the Father in evangelical doctrine alone are assured that they can know which doctrine is from God or from men, John 7.

The living Word of God must therefore be attacked on both sides in the most severe way, according to its inevitable nature: by tyrants with the sword; by false preachers with a wrong interpretation of the Scriptures and fraudulent pretenses of fabricated holiness.

(11) And if the much-thought-of apostate brethren want to say that they have so long behaved the truth concerning the sacrament to the weak for good, they may not at all embellish it. For God does not want His children to be brought up with lies, but with unconfessed truth. The holy apostles also by no means falsified the truth for the sake of the weak, but only allowed some of the old holy ceremonies, and 2) taught that they were not necessary for salvation. For in such a hurry at the beginning of Christianity, it could not be understood by everyone that the ceremonies were all only figures of the future Savior; therefore, the weak should be allowed for a time, out of love, to make use of such old divine ordinances.

(12) It does not follow, however, that one merely gives bread and wine to the faithful for the blood and body of Christ, and teaches and preaches the same out of a false heart and a deceived mouth, as if Christ's body and blood were truly present; and then runs back with a thousandfold indignation, and opens the false deceptive mind, and excuses themselves with it, that they have lied for the sake of the weak, and deceived so many thousands of people.

(13) Indeed, more wicked preachers have never come into the world; but hereafter, in a short time, their foolishness shall come to light more clearly, through me and many others, with the help of God.

14. half a year ago I took up the pen to warn the pious believers against this miserable error; thus have

2) Here we have deleted the word "not" because it does not fit into the context. However, this word was undoubtedly in the original edition, which Zwingli makes good use of in his answer (No. 26, § 35 s.). It is obviously either a typographical error or a printing error.

Some pious Christian brothers turned me away, thinking (as I fully respect) whether perhaps these unstable teachers would quickly recognize their error themselves and come to the truth.

(15) I also thought myself that they would easily reintroduce the antagonism with flowery words. For some of the same new prophets, with their own handwriting, have eagerly urged me not to write anything against them, as the spirit of such people is unsecured and not comforted in themselves. But, alas, while we have been silent, they have spread their poison with Latin and German books everywhere.

16 For this reason, I, nor any pious servant of the Word, have the right to remain silent any longer; we want, then, along with the ingratitude of God's grace, also to make ourselves suspect of error. Now that [1] the Serene Principality, the Margraviate of Baden, out of God's great mercy, is still preserved from such damned error; [2] and I in Baden, a poor and industrious drener, am required to teach God's word in a Christian and peaceful manner (as I also trust God) according to God's action; [3] I also oppose and resist the said error without ceasing. I am also eager and happy to oppose and resist the said error without ceasing, and to fight it with the holy Gospel, as long as the Spirit of God sustains my life, and to revenge the wolf (1) (before he wounds and destroys the beloved sheep, bought with the body and blood that Christ has given us); (4) and to prevent, with all possible diligence, the authorities in our country from selling the books of error, but to keep them out of the margraviate: Three days ago I saw a new booklet at the market in Baden, in which at the end there is a final speech, which reads: The true Corpus Christi of Christ and his blood is present in the sacrament of the altar.

But who he is, or from what spirit he has prescribed this final speech, or what he subsequently introduces, I will leave that alone, for I have no regard for man in divine teaching; so God's truth is just, even if the stones stop to speak. There is also no doubt that God's word is unchanging in Himself, even if the devil himself were forced to speak it; for the denial of God in the speech of Balaam, Numbers 23, is just as unfailingly true as in the mouth of Samuel. Also Caiaphas has just from God's

Sent 3) truly pronounced by Christ, John 11, ohn faith, as Paul with faith.

(18) Forasmuch then as we teach and preach without ceasing here at Baden, out of an ohu-contradictory understanding of the words of Christ, that the true body and the precious blood of Christ are present in the Lord's supper, I cannot deny this truth, whether it be spoken by a believer or an unbeliever. Since the presentation of divine truth in the above-mentioned booklet, thus poisoned and seductive, has been read by many people, and nothing against it is contained in the booklet for a true reason, I have not been able to avoid stimulating the wrong mind with short words, thus:

(19) Zwingli of Zurich unashamedly points out the truth that the true body and blood of Christ are present in the sacrament in the much-thought-of booklet, and says: "This article is unchristian, for it openly disputes God's word and the articles of our true old Christian faith. Also, he dares to prove his impudent pretence with the Scriptures, and says, first of all:

The flesh of Christ is not at all useful to eat, John 6. The flesh is not useful, so Christ did not give it to us to eat. Mark well, thou devout Christian, in the first word thou shalt hear how freely this man wants to force the eternal Word of God upon a dead, false, and seductive mind. It is also revealed here that there is no understanding of the doctrine of the true faith among the wretched people, and so on:

Zwingli wants to force us to hear the word of God in the sacramental eating of the body of Christ, as if one eats beef and veal. And so he denies that we cannot eat Christ's flesh. Every devout Christian knows this well, and there is no one of such a coarse mind who would make of Christ's supper a fleshly filling of the belly and eating; for only these subtle masters, who introduce such coarse fleshly, even beastly doctrine with beautifully polished words. Therefore, Christian reader, "take to heart" that Christ teaches and pronounces differently about the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood, in two places of the holy Gospel, truly and clearly. For there are two kinds of eating here, and no such gross eating of flesh (as the new prophets arrogantly impose their own urge 4) on the word of God) is made or understood of any of them.

3) d. i. Fitting.

4) d. i. Compulsion.

The first way to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ is entirely spiritual and inward, for which the eater and drinker have no need of any outward sign or being, whether of heavenly or earthly creatures. For it is accomplished only according to the eternal Word of God in faith inwardly without sense or voice, and thus the flesh of Christ is eaten.

23. Whoever firmly and without doubt believes that the Father has given His only beloved Son to us, that He in His innocent humanity (taken for our sake) suffered torture and death in His pure most holy body, also shed His precious blood, and thus paid for the sin and guilt of all men born of Adam, and put an end to God's wrath and vengeance, and after such faith thus recognizes God's unfathomable gentleness that he places all his trust in this sufficient redemption with the highest pleasure: he eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ without ceasing. For such eating and drinking inwardly is nothing else than believing in Christ, which is necessary at all times. Thus the believer eats and drinks the body and blood of Christ every hour at the true supper of the Lord, which is followed by eternal rest; thus he abides in Christ, and Christ in him, as the text openly expresses, John 6, that Christ says: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him." Of eating and drinking, then, Christ says and teaches throughout the whole chapter; and nothing carnal or bodily is to be understood there, as Christ himself explains; for the parables, here indicated, of the flesh, blood, and bread, are thus understood from the words of Christ alone; as the bodily food inwardly 2) keeps a man alive according to his bodily powers and healthy for a time; so through faith Christ, inwardly in the mind, becomes present to the believer with blessed fruit and effect of his innocent suffering and death, even the shedding of his blood.

(24) But since Christ our Saviour indicated such a way of eating His body and drinking His blood, it was all heard by the Jews as if the Lord had spoken of eating flesh in the flesh; therefore they said, "This is a hard saying, and who can hear it? And Zwingli wants to charge us with this coarse understanding, as if there were no one who could understand this chapter on spiritual and inward eating without his teaching.

(25) But consider, every one, how formally he censures the Scripture here, when he says in his first probation, The flesh of Christ is no use at all to eat; and forces the Scripture, without all Christian understanding, that Christ said, John 6: "The flesh is no use. Dear reader! Hear here a subtle artificial master of the Gospel; for Zwingli would have it that this is the understanding that Christ said: "His flesh is not useful"; although Christ speaks of no particular flesh here, but alone points to the gross carnal understanding of the Jews; therefore Christ sets "spirit" and "flesh" against each other in the Gospel manner. And as Paul commonly calls the whole man "flesh," because he, according to his mind and desires, does not hear and love otherwise than according to his own use, lust, and pleasure. In the same way, all Scripture is heard by the carnal man and is not accepted otherwise.

26. The Spirit, however, draws the whole man in faith from himself, and leads penetratingly all knowledge and desires into God with the highest delight and confidence, from which then is raised the godly life that abides eternally in the believer. Thus Christ says here to the Jews: "The Spirit makes life"; that is, he brings the mind of living faith with my words; "but the flesh is not useful"; that is, the carnal mind, comprehended by senses and human reason, without the Spirit in faith, is of no use at all, nor can it produce fruit in the Word. Thus it is found how masterfully the new prophets interpret the Scriptures.

27 Furthermore, if Zwingli wants to force the word of Christ upon his most holy flesh, how can it be that, according to such a mind, God's supreme mercy in the sweetest work of redemption is not condemned? For if the flesh of Christ is not useful, wherewith are we then redeemed from eternal death? If the body of Christ is not useful, then the suffering and death in the body is not useful either. Thus the simple are forced, under high spiritual words, into the highest contempt of God; and nothing else is to be expected, but that such holy prophets will preach a whole spiritual Christ. For Christ's body and flesh are of no use to them.

(28) But it is evident from these miracle-workers how he produces such precious arguments from his rhetoric; for the text of Christ's much-reported words is thus, "The flesh is not useful," and is drawn from no circumstance to no particular flesh. Thus penetrates my good

1) "Also" here stands for "and".

2) Instead of "internal," it should probably read "external" or "bodily."

Zwingli based the words on Christ's most holy flesh. With God's help, however, it shall be further revealed what such people have taught, so that I will subsequently, with better leisure, discover Ber subtle Meister Fundament. Enough is said herewith in haste about the inward way of eating Christ's body and drinking His blood, and how skillfully and Christianly Zwingli brings out the Scriptures in the first word.

The other way of eating the body and blood of Christ is not included in the sixth chapter of John. But the holy evangelists, Matthew on the 26th, Marcus on the 14th, Lucas on the 22nd, and Paul on 1 Cor. 11, describe the supper of our Lord with whole public and bare words: "that Christ took the bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said: Take and eat; this is my body, which is given for you. Likewise also he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave unto them, saying, Drink ye all of it: this is my blood of the new testament, which is poured out for you for remission of sins: as often as ye do it, ye shall do it in remembrance of me."

(30) So Christ gives his body and blood, above inward eating, in outward, visible, and sensible signs, which are also bodily eaten and drunk; and yet his most holy body, even his precious blood, remain invisible, and incomprehensible to all the senses and reason of man, but truly present by the power and almighty effect of his eternal word.

(31) Neither can the eating of flesh and the drinking of blood be heard here, as the crude prophets attribute to us: for the true body [and] blood of Christ has no bodily effect or sensibility here in the sacrament, but only for the consolation and spreading of faith among the pious children of God, who without doubt believe the simple revealed words of Christ. Therefore it is a sign only for fruitfulness to the believers and not to the unbelievers. So that the first inward partaking in faith (as indicated above) must also precede this outward eating; for without faith there is no profit even in this joyful supper of Christ.

(32) From this it is recently evident how impure, carnal, and animalistic the wretched people teach, to inestimable annoyance, about the pure and wonderful supper of Christ.

(33) Nothing here is changed in the body of the believer, or bodily sensibility exercised in partaking of the body and blood of Christ;

But the unwavering faith of the words of Christ is confirmed in the certain presence of the body and blood of our Lord. Therefore, man does not eat the flesh of Christ in a carnal way, but according to the nature and content of the almighty and mighty words of Christ: "This is my body", "This is my blood".

34 Now we want to continue in the shortest possible way the prescribed foundations of Zwinglin in the much reported seductive booklet.

In the beginning, there is no need at all for the true discerners of God's Word to seem to hear of the first appearance, as no reason at all is found behind the new prophets in the interpretation of the Scriptures, in all that they pretend against the presence of the holy body and blood of Christ. For they have taken away the key of true understanding, and thus have accepted the kingdom of God, that is, the right inherent understanding of the true holy Scriptures, and thus have barred the pious Christians from the unified meaning of God's word: that as they no longer recognize Christ in his word because of great art, they also no longer want to let anyone come to the truth, and thus understand this:

It is impossible that a letter, even the smallest detail of it, in the holy scriptures can be understood thoroughly and for salvation without the true faith, before which all human reason and wisdom perish and must disappear. Now these masters of the new heresy take away everything that is taught in faith about the wonderful presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, according to the nature of God's eternal word, and insist on this according to human (deceived and seduced reason) knowledge; and teach that one should not accept or admit anything further than what human reason can well comprehend. Therefore, according to such human doctrine, one must not have faith at the supper of Christ; the sensible masters can do it all well without faith and God with their pagan cleverness and art; and though they speak sweetly of faith with their mouths, they mean nothing else than that one should believe their fictitious understanding; And whoever does not surrender to the mighty gods in a hurry, they will exploit him and call him a priest, a preacher of the flesh, and other disgraceful speeches (as such people's new spirit is able to do).

(37) Therefore, if all Christian doctrine is consistent only in the faith that God gives, 1) and here in the

1) d. i. consists.

Night meal the reasoners from the faith of the words of God lead the simple-minded into the deceived human reason.

(38) Whoever wants to be a Christian and true believer should beware of this new perverse preaching, as of the most pernicious teaching of men, never heard on earth.

But lest anyone think I am doing too much for him, I refer to the wretched book of the supreme master of this new art, which he sent to the pious preachers in Swabia some months ago, where his resolution is: One should not accept anything more at Christ's supper than what reason can comprehend.

40 Therefore, where we have a spark of true faith, we are not easily frightened by Zwinglin's compulsion here.

41. [This is in the other ground of his probation, how he compels the innocent Scripture, John on the third, when Christ said to Nicodemo, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." If now (says Zwingli) the bodily flesh of Christ is eaten; nothing but flesh comes of it. Fie 1) and shame on him who says this! I have never read nor heard such an explanation of the pure Word of God, only from Zwingli, who himself also fritters from his artificial glosses; yes, without doubt fie, shame and vice above all vices, to drag the living Word of God to such a carnal and animalistic 2) mind!

(42) There may be nothing in the innocent words of Christ that Zwingli puts forward, for no one has ever taught that the body of Christ is eaten sensibly like other food, since he is invisible and present in the sign, incomprehensible to all the senses; likewise his holy blood. Therefore, as said before, nothing corporeal belongs to the eater, nor is it changed in him by the body of Christ.

But, dear reader, see how Zwingli actually forces the holy words of Christ to prove that the true body of Christ is not present in the sacrament. Christ says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Therefore, says this Master, the Body of Christ cannot be present. That is to say, wisely to fiddle around in the Scriptures, if perhaps no one could notice on what blessed ground Christ pronounced the words; for here it is not thought of what flesh-eating gives birth to in man. 3)

44. the lord says here about the fleshly spirit.

birth of all the children of Adam, who are all conceived and born in sins. Therefore, they all come from the tribe and remain according to their nature nothing but flesh, that is, nothing of the Spirit of God is in them; for all their mind, desire and inclination flee from God and penetrate into themselves to love and esteem themselves great above all things. Therefore, this birth is prevented from everything that requires GOD's glory in us. Therefore Christ says, "If ye be not born again, neither shall ye enter into the kingdom of heaven." Which birth is not of flesh and blood, but of the Spirit in faith. Now this scripture points Zwingli to the sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ; therefore one may well notice that he has hit it very well. Yes, if he were a Zwingli and not a Zwingli of the Scriptures, that God's word would have to agree with his teaching!

45 Thus it may be easily obtained that this scripture, "that which is born of flesh is flesh," may not be understood to imply that the true body of Christ is not present in the sacrament.

Thirdly, Zwingli presses on to confirm his error with the innocent two sayings of Matthew 26: "You will not have me forever"; Matthew 28: "I will remain with you until the end of the world. Zwingli says: "The first word must be understood in terms of human nature alone, for according to divine nature and grace he is with us all the way, as the following word indicates. And Zwingli insinuates that all those who preach the flesh also falsify God's word, if they say that Christ will be with us in the flesh, but he has said that we will not have him with us in every way. Truly, anyone who does not know what it is to write poetry and to recite the Scriptures contrary to their nature would be frightened by such an artificial person. But, dear reader, it is Zwingli who writes such delicious things here.

We know well that Christ says to his disciples just before his suffering: "You will not have me forever," and that this can by no means deny the presence of his body in the sacrament, invisible and without all sensibility. For Christ says of his presence in this text, in a mortal and visible way, that afterwards he would often be shown the honor and devotion that the damsel did when she poured the precious ointment on his head at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as Matthew puts it, and also Marcus in the 14th verse. Therefore, we confess that Christ is such

1) Original: Pfuch.

2) In the old edition: fischeschen.

3) "gives birth" put by us instead of: gebühret.

He died once and rose again, and can no longer be mortal; all this remains unharmed if we do not preach the presence of the body and blood of Christ in a carnal way (as Zwingli did), as the almighty word of Christ expresses it, since the Lord says: "This is my body", "this is my blood". So also this marvelous presence of the body is nothing contrary to the common presence of a divine kind; for GOD, who is present, works mightily at the Lord's supper in the Word, as the text reads.

48] Fourthly, one of Zwingli's innocent scriptures is used to protect his dry bread and sour wine. John 16: "I came forth from the Father and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go to the Father." This must be understood (Zwingli speaks) only of the leaving of human nature; for according to divine he may not depart from us; so he is ever not in the Sacrament.

So, dear Zwingli, take the whole Bible and say 1) about the visible and sensible presence of Christ: so we say without constraint and with sure faith, in virtue of the words of Christ, about a bodily, real, but nevertheless invisible and insensible presence of Christ's body and blood.

But the pious Christian people must suffer the misery of the new prophets, who want to confirm the bright and obvious error (under the appearance of the eternal word of God, presented with many writings according to their invented mind) against the true spirit of God.

Fifthly, Zwingli cites the evangelical word Marci 13: "If any man shall say unto you: Behold! here is Christ; behold! there; believe it not." Therefore one should not believe those (says Zwingli) who preach that the body and blood of Christ is present.

(52) It is truly disconcerting to answer such puerile diligence. For who has ever taught that Christ is to be believed here or there according to sensual sight? Nor does Christ himself say this to warn us against such teaching, but about special places and sects, about false clergymen, as if a special and certain Christ of his good pleasure were invented in religions and places of his own devising. Therefore, no faith should be placed in such things, for Christ, our Savior, has his certain pleasure and our following in faith alone.

1) In the original: vsag.

The Lord, who decided under the cross to keep his commandments, cannot be found in monasticism or hunnery, nor can he be blessedly heard in prayer in one church or city more than another, even though miraculous signs may be seen. But it does not follow from all this that the true body of Christ and the most holy blood are not visibly present in the Lord's supper.

The sixth is the scripture Apost. 1: "Two angelic men say, Why stand ye looking into heaven? This same Jesus, which is received from you into heaven, shall so come again, even as ye have seen him go into heaven." "Here must break all those (says Zwingli) who say, Christ took from us only the face 2) of his body, not the body."

Dear Master, have a little mercy on us, so that we do not have to break away from your art right away. For we will not be turned away from Christ with grief. We know and confess that Christ has ascended bodily, truly and visibly into heaven, and has taken not only the bodily face but also the whole human substance from the disciples and ascended into heaven. But it does not at all imply that the same body is not invisibly present in the power of the almighty words when the supper is held, as Christ instituted it.

55 Therefore, if Zwingli thinks that he even forced it, I think that it is 3) yet undone. There is a great difference between the Ascension, as Lucas writes in the place of the preconceived, Apost. 1, and the true presence hidden in the bread, as Lucas described in the Gospel on 22. We have also never taught that Christ visibly enters the bread when he ascended to heaven; for if he were to be seen entering the bread in this way, there would also have to be an almost large bread, even if we were to see all of it, we could not believe it, but we could see it; for Zwingli teaches here that nothing is to be believed except what is evidently understood. How thoroughly this is spoken of faith, any simple-minded Christian can well judge; for Scripture, indeed, the nature of faith, requires invisible things in the exercise of faith. And this we have not learned from the pope, but from the divine eternal word, that we know, beyond all our reason and sensibility, to adhere to the eternal word without all doubt.

For the seventh, Zwingli, after having read the Scriptures many times without all understanding, now takes

2) i.e. seeing.

3) In the old edition: seyn.

He now wants to frighten them out of their natural 1) and of God by Christ, the prophets and the apostles. And so swift writing to the simple, 2) whom he misled before with the word that is preached is called the eternal living word many writings, so that they also now have to let of God by Christ, the prophets and the apostles, often and themselves be referred to a foreign understanding, in many places in the Scriptures, and it is also honored invented by Zwingli and his followers, in the revealed and had for eyes. words of Christ "this is my body, this is my blood". (61) Therefore, according to the content of the word, it Therefore he, Zwingli, speaks on the word of Christ: "This is to be believed here without all error that Christ truly is my body, which is given for you": "If then the bread is presented bread and wine to His own in the sacrament. the body, which was given for us, then the bread is But the true invisible body, hidden under the bread, and crucified for us; therefore it is invented that it is a different the true blood of Christ under the natural wine, is that of which the eternal word says: "this is my body, this is my speech. blood."

Here, dear Christian reader, open your Christian eyes, and consider how sophistically the delicious masters introduce the unpleasant error under the evangelical name. For it is evident that the body of Christ is not bread, God and Savior Christ says, St. John 7: "My doctrine is or the bread the body of Christ; but bread remains bread, not my doctrine, but the doctrine of him that sent me." and the body of Christ also remains unchanged. Here you hear that Christ shows an excellent difference in

(58) Therefore the Lord Christ said of that which was his teaching, when he says: My teaching is mine and not hidden under the bread, that the bread is an outward sign. mine. So that it must be understood how he speaks And so the body of Christ is truly present with the bread differently according to human nature and divine nature. through the almighty word of God. Zwingli, however, uses The most holy gospel of Christ, after his holy human a simile of St. John's blessing; 3) where he read it in the manner, proclaimed with uttered words, is the doctrine of Gospel, I do not know; but I do know that the faithful are Christ, as delivered by him in an intelligible voice; and this all blessed in faith. However, Zwingli leaves the Scriptures is the word of Christ after human character. and proceeds with histories, as is the way of the spirit, 64. but that which is signified by this Word, and hidden turning from one to the other, so that the listeners are well from the voice, is the true eternal Word of the Father, heard. Himself, the Son of God, according to the divine nature

(59) But if we are to teach in the same way here, we and person; as He then says to the Jews in the eighth of do not have to model fairy tales, but proven Gospel John, "I am the very thing that I speak to you." Scripture, because it shows and compares quite artfully And so the teaching and the word of Christ did not and well the composition of the visible bread and the come from the humanity of Christ, but from the heavenly Father. In this way Christ says: "My teaching is not mine. insensible invisible body of Christ, as we say and believe Father. In this way Christ says: "My teaching is not mine. of the outward Word of God, in which something sensual In this way, the true eternal Word of God is proclaimed and quite sensible is present, and not at least something through human and sensible words, and is united with them in such a way that where the Word is spoken, the that cannot be seen. Word of God is present without expression; and yet the

60 For the word of God spoken, as much as it can be Word of God is present without expression; and yet the understood outwardly, is only a human voice, formed by difference is that the Word of God is not the word of man, men. But that which is signified by the utterance is the nor is the voice of man the word of God; nevertheless, the eternal word of God, which also [in the] in the Word that is preached is called and described as the Word of God.

So, devout Christian, take here a strong and irrefutable likeness in the doctrine of the Sacrament, where certainly is true bread and wine, and the true essential body of Christ.

4) "samiglich" - sämmtlich.

1) "artlich" - which they have according to their nature.

2) "einbilde" put by us instead of: einbilden.

3) Under the papacy, people tried to prevent thunderstorms from striking by reading St. John's Gospel; this was called St. John's Blessing.

and his most holy blood. The bread thou seest; the body thou canst not see, or the blood; for, as often said, by virtue of the almighty operation of the word of Christ, his body and blood are invisible, and present beyond the comprehension of all sense and reason. So you perceive the bread sensibly, also the wine, and the body and the blood of Christ under the bread and wine, or with the bread and wine, invisibly and [un]sensibly.

68 You can also read more about the comparison of the word "good" in the Gospel; for Paul also speaks to the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. 2: "When you receive from us the word of divine preaching, you receive it, not as the word of men, but (as it truly is) as the word of God."

69) Clearly, the difference mentioned above can be heard in the living Word of God, for Paul had to preach to the brethren with his own voice and speech; but that which was proclaimed in the words of Paul is the eternal, fatherly Word of God, hidden among human words and voices.

(70) And though the voice goes away with the sound, yet the word remains in the concept and imagination of those who have apprehended it, or described it, and are presently speaking of it, or contemplating it.

71 Furthermore, the examples thoroughly hold thus: that as the word of God, in the outward word, does not become fruitful, so long it remains in sound and voice, or also in sensual or rational retention; but only then, when it becomes inward, and is accepted with faith, does it bring life.

(72) So also with the sacrament, he who without a living faith receives the body of Christ and his blood with the bread and wine has no grace or fruit, but rather eats and drinks the judgment of God himself, as Paul says in the first Corinthians on the 11th verse.

Therefore, the sacrament, like the word of God, is only for the faithful an increase and confirmation of their faith; but for the unbelievers [the] revenge of God on their ingratitude is also an unpleasant increase.

I think that these comparisons of the Word and the Sacrament are much more sufficient to confirm the truth, because Zwingli with his St. John's blessing may penetrate the true Christian mind in the doctrine of the Sacrament. Although some who fall into the trap of denying the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament through Zwingli's art may find such a likeness of Scripture incomprehensible, I am well aware of it,

Whoever accepts the simple knowledge of God's word with due faith, that he may easily meet the manifold seduction of this new prophet.

VIII] For the eighth, Zwingli brings the Article of faith. He ascended into heaven, seated with the righteous of God the Father Almighty; there he sits, there Stephen, the first knight of Christ, saw him. Apost. 7.

(76) Yes, dear Master, it is just as much done with this as with many writings martyred above by you; but, praise God! we have not allowed you that, because of the visible and essential ascension, the body of Christ may not be invisibly present in the bread; as insurmountably indicated by the word of Christ, to which word also no scripture or article of the true Christian faith is opposed.

(77) I see also in thy swiftness how rough thou soundest here from sitting to the righteous hand of the Father, when he must sit with thee all the way. How? if he might also stand up before you? Stephen saw (says Lucas, Acts 7) Jesus standing before the righteousness of God.

Dear reader, one feels an Aristotelian Christian quite well and obviously in this subtle master; because he does not admit the omnipotence of God more than his reason can grasp with the pagans.

79) But it should be reasonably thought, 1) that it is just as impossible of nature that two bodies be in and in one circumscribing place, as that a body be visible in one place, and otherwise supernaturally (without all sensitive effect and quality from God's almighty power) also truly present in other places.

Now St. John speaks twice on the 20th that with his true body Christ entered through closed doors to disciples and opened his joyful resurrection. But nothing of the Scriptures is valid for the wise Aristotelian preachers; they do not express their patron saint by name, but they push all their foundations of faith into the sinful, afflicted reason. Christ nor Paul did not teach them this, but their high intellect in Aristotle and other pagan fables, since they have drawn their high Latin from. I hope, however, with the grace of God, to soon bring the new prophets to a fuller understanding of their spirit and their Christianity, and to bring them to the knowledge of all pious Germans. But, dear reader, listen, for God's sake, how this master rummages around in the Scriptures.

81. to the ninth he says: Therefore Chri-

1) i.e. consider.

stus is from the right hand of his father in the future to judge the living and the dead; therefore he cannot be invisibly present in the sacrament. And he confirms this with the word of Christ, Matth. 26: "From now on you will see the Son of Man in the righteousness of the power of God. There he sits (says Zwingli) from that 1) he has ascended. You see here! He (Zwingli) does not grant Christ that he rises, and unwaveringly from the side of his Father works something further (according to the content of his eternal word), which the sense and understanding of all creatures cannot comprehend without faith.

He further says: Christ does not sit in a little stone house. Now there is no need to answer this further. It is evident in what sense we have taught of the Lord's supper, recorded above. But that he refers to it in this ninth article, saying: "There he showed himself and nowhere else bodily, that he did not further visibly show his bodily presence after the session to the righteous of the Father", we know well.

But Zwingli cannot escape from the true bodily invisible presence, with which he kindly shows himself to the believers in the bread, when he says: "This is my body", even if he would bring forth the whole Bible of his invented mind.

For of all the sayings of the Divine Word, there is not a single one in the whole Bible that is fundamentally repugnant to and contrary to the blessed, invisible presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament.

In the tenth rotten foundation, Zwingli warns us not to fall into the Marcionite heresy. Oh God! If he had left himself and his listeners, yes, all of Christendom, unconvinced and unburdened by this most harmful error, against the eternal Word of God, we would have easily protected ourselves from the old heretics.

But he continues to torment the Christians with false reasoning (invented from the innocent Scriptures), and says: "because Christ did not show Himself to the disciples on the day of resurrection at one time, the body of Christ may not be present in the sacrament by any means": which is printed in many ways here above.

(87) Then everyone can see how finely Zwingli's Scriptures are compelled for this is his delicious argument: "If Christ could have been in many different places at one time, he would have been (when he vanished from

to the two disciples at Emmaus, and was no longer 2) with them) no less with them and with the disciples at Jerusalem."

88. Now hear this, Christian reader! Is not this a strong reason against the most holy sacrament, first invented by Zwingli, and previously unproven to all Christians?

(89) It has been said as much as this: Christ did not walk on the water all the time with dry and sinking treads, therefore he may not do it all the time. Is this not a masterly argument? Christ did not let himself be seen in many places on Easter Day for one hour, therefore his body cannot be visible to the righteous of the Father and invisible in the sacrament. Ah, wretched master! bring forth an expressed text that will do your poetry justice, and say that Christ's words "this is my body, this is my blood!" are not to be heard according to their light and bright understanding of the true presence of the body and blood of Christ. But you would not produce the same text in eternity; for God has once said, "This is my body," 2c., and will never revoke it in eternity. What you further attack in the Scriptures in testimonies and other fictitious teachings, is all pervasive and pulled by the hair against God's word.

90 He says even more in this tenth article, since Thomas did not want to believe that he had risen, John 20. Let us see that the disciples did not understand Christ's words, "This is my body!" that he had given them his body to eat; for Thomas (says Zwingli) could have believed otherwise very soon.

Oh God, of the deceived teaching and introducing of the Scriptures! If Thomas had believed the word of God unwaveringly, he would not have doubted the resurrection.

Now Thomas and all his disciples had fallen away, for Christ had so often and so clearly said that he would rise again on the third day, but they did not believe. This proves beyond all doubt that Thomas did not want to accept anything, because he saw it and grasped it with his hands. Therefore, it is far wrong that he would have been content with the hidden and invisible presence in the sacrament.

It is also undoubted that the disciples did not keep Christ's supper at that time.

2) "no more" put by us instead of "always". - After "was with them" we have deleted "there he would be" because it is too much'.

1) So put by us instead of: "and he is gone out".

But Zwingli must thus force and penetrate much Scripture together with Christ, the eternal Word of God, against Scripture and Christ, so that he alone may be the light of the whole world. But our light Christ stands with us with the true lanterns of his word and shines for us, so that we know with good faith and an eager heart (regardless of Zwingli's chatter and his kinsmen) that his body and blood, in virtue of his almighty word, are in the sacrament; and therefore we do not say that Christ is everywhere after the manner of men, but in such a way as is often indicated above, where after his word and institution the supper of Christ is held.

In the eleventh, Zwingli takes the pope as a witness to his doctrine and says: as it is written, de consecratione, distinct. 2. prima: the body of Christ, in which he is resurrected, he must be in One place. "Ah God! (says Zwinglius) what can all the popes do against it? Does it apply, their pope's book, why do they not surrender then?" I let Zwinglin force with the pope, maybe they will become one without me.

But I have sufficiently indicated that we do not believe or teach Christ's body to be present outwardly according to sight or sense, nor according to your concept of reason, for we know, according to the infallible word of God, that the words of Christ, "this is my body, this is my blood," according to the omnipotent effect of the word, irrefutably bring the innocent body and the most holy blood of Christ to be present; yet (as has been said all along) invisible and insensible.

97 And herewith I want to have jumped over all his bars, which he has shot in front of the truth; for they are only his fictitious straw-halves, which a sick flea can jump over; I say this of his false interpretations and not of the truth.

He is the only one who, without any reason, miserably and shamefully insists on and forces his unfortunate error.

But let it not be so: for though he dreams that no creature may leap over his bars, yet I, the most grievous creature of God, know that I have leaped over them with all true believers, with joy and true faith, and on the ground of the Scriptures. So, even if he were to put down the greatest bars, growing in all forests and stubborn minds, still we remain at the table, eating the true body and drinking the blood of Christ, and are well preserved; for God, our Lord Christ, has spoken it, and will no longer speak otherwise of this sacrament.

99. With this I will also conclude for this time, and have served my dear Christian brothers (out of necessity and insurmountable need of love, through which faith works and is able to do all things) with haste; so that the impolite plea and seductive declaration against the true presence of the innocent body and most holy Christ in the Sacrament may be found to be impotent and contrary to Scripture. That the impious plea and seductive declaration against the true presence of the innocent Body and Most Holy Blood of Christ in the Sacrament may be found to be impotent and contrary to Scripture, and that Christians may be taught how to remain steadfast to the revealed and expressed words of Christ.

Afterwards (whether God wills it!) this new error will probably be further disclosed, discovered, and found to be true with the word of God among all true Christians.

God have praise!

Eilends zu Markgrafen-Baden. [In the year 1526, mense Junii.

JEsu Christ's servant,

Jacobus Strauß,
preacher at Baden.

26 Ulrich Zwingli's answer about D. Stranssen's book, written against him, concerning the Supper of Christ.*)

1526.

To all believers in Christ, Huldreich Zwingli begs grace and peace from God through Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, our Lord!

1. hath God, dearest brethren, the number of our little hairs in actual knowledge, which after all is our no...

ner has: so he has much more hummed the letters, 1) which are written now and then for and against his holy word.

1) i.e. summed, added up.

*) This writing appeared, as from von der Hardts uutoMupli. Imitier, Dom. III, p. 141, first appeared in 1526 in a single edition in quarto; then again in 1527 in Zurich by Hristoffel Froschauer in octavo. It was translated into Latin by Rudolph Gualther and is included in Zwingli's complete Latin writings, Dom. II, x. We give the text according to Walch's old edition.

(2) Therefore, let no slothfulness overtake us, neither 6) I have judged what kind of a customer he is, which to write nor to read, which distorts us, until we are so well others can judge even less: I was well advised not to assured of the truth that we may look upon it with cheerful answer for these useless sayings; for God is the right eyes, without all blinking. Nor shall we be sorry for any judge and discerner of hearts; he knows well whether we work, as were the pious Moses and Aaron, whom neither have faith in him and his holy word, whether we speak out Pharaoh's oppression nor his terror wearied, because of high courage, or love of truth and neighbor, or not. For they did not accomplish God's work according to His how would this not bring much annoyance to the Christian promise and commandment. reader, should I once again answer for it: 7) that I am not

(3) We too should not regard the worthlessness, (1) repugnant to myself; that I did not invent a new name for the high and low, the learned and the wicked, (2) of the myself, and if I did, I would not have done wrong, for the Lord's supper, but without ceasing honestly bring forth the Savior of our souls is called Jehoshua in his, that is, truth, and not fear error, no matter how high it rears its Hebrew language, and by us JEsus; Peter Cephas; Paul head, until assurance comes to us all from Him who is our Saul; and that he, the ostrich, undoubtedly thinks that rock and foundation. For that a man has hitherto allowed Zwingli is a Greek name, and yet plays on the German by himself to be regarded as believing that he eats the flesh all means, and thus now quite merrily and happily; 8) that and blood of Christ, even bodily, as the popes have said, he excoriates us for the most harmful (he calls us the most or bodily-spiritual, as is now being said, has been either harmful, can't get his mouth full enough to utter cruel an ignorant delusion, or a fictitious gilding, and not a faith; words) preachers that have ever been, but we rely on the therefore, in the bodily eating of the flesh and blood of most salvific preacher, Christ Jesus, and on his and his Christ, all the same are not yet sure. apostles' word.

(4) For this reason we should all ask God, first of all, 7. That he makes himself so proud in the midst of it, to bring forth to them the truth that he has shut up for them, as if he wanted to bring our error to light in a short time, in that place, for he is the prosperous householder who is and sees that such learned men, to whom he may not pleased to do so. On the other hand, that He may give us, offer the clogs, confess to it, and some of them confess who must suffer many blows in the battle, patience; that their error, praise be to God; also makes it so difficult how the resistance may not leave us alone, but make us brave; hard it has been that he has undertaken writing, since it not angry and blasphemous, as unfortunately some of the would be good if he had never written a letter in the adversaries are too polite, but serious and moderate, so church; and he will worry about it himself in time, if God that an honorable request for truth may not turn into a shows him his arrogance. That he resents so much that wicked female quarrel and mischievousness. God grant some, who undoubtedly judge his inability 9) to write, have it! admonished him not to write; just as 10) they feared him

So now this trade, which has been requested so far, so much; and many such things. abundantly and clearly a while ago, only after so many 8) That he writes me a "Master" as a mockery, who (I) overcome resistors, by D. Jacoben Straußen 3) (who has have crowned myself with no other title than Uly Zwinglin, hitherto been unknown to me in all ways, unless [the one] according to the Aetti 11); and yet he does not let his who a few years ago let the very stirring final speeches "Doctor" be a "Master". about temporal property and interest go out in Jsennach 4): I have first seen that the trade is not thoroughly known to him; and therefore I have gained the desire to report it amicably along with others who might be seduced by him with the appearance of words.

6) And so, from the bulwarks, 5)

1) i.e. the disdain.

2) whether we - with regard to our.

3) Zwingli writes: "Strussen" and "Struß".

4) i.e. Eisenach. Compare the introduction to the 19th volume of the St. Louis edition and No. 132, p. 47 f.

5) i.e. words of shame.

6) d. i. light.

7) The register of things that Zwingli wants to leave unaccountable still runs through the two following paragraphs.

8) d. i. moves up.

9) In the old edition: "incompetent attributions". But "incompetent" is "incompetence."

10) sam - as if.

11) i.e. father; in the old edition: "äty".

back there. That he calls us subtle masters and sophists, who have despised sophistry from childhood. Yes, what would it be that one hemmed in such gossip and counter-gossip 1) long? What else would it plant among the Christian people, neither Schanz words? Therefore, we will soon 2) penetrate to its reasons, and dig them up with the bit of the divine word, so that only men will see that their bodily flesh is essentially eaten or present, or as they want to have the words, a cowardly pamphlet, that is, a word cloak and poem, which has no foundation in God's word, nor in the mind and spirit of the believer a certain nor clear understanding. God grant mercy!

9. First of all, Doctor Jacob Strauß does me an injustice that among all my writings that have gone out, he does not dare to contest any of them, neither those that I have written in great haste, I mean truly (in) one night, against the Popes Eggen (Eck) and Faber, greatest enemies of the Gospel and Christian tranquility; so he will have read out the further and crossed out ones 3) before, although he wants to be seen as if he had fallen about it at the market, and had never heard of the things before. However, he has also in the short so nothing at all entweget 4) that he has more fortress with his book carried, neither our taken. Therefore, it would have been kind of you to judge: to whom, against whom, at what time I have written, and according to it the more perfect writings were subject to contest.

10. I. Now that he speaks, "If the unkind deceivers shrink from us the pure body and blood of Christ of his miraculous and joyful presence in the Sacrament, 5) and give us only dry bread and sour wine." These are his words. From these words one realizes that Strauss himself is not sure that the body of Christ is present, for he says that the presence of Christ in the sacrament twitches him. If Christ's body is present, dear, who will twitch it? Therefore, by the form of his words, we see that he is afraid that the truth will come to light, against which he shields falsehood; for if he is sure in faith that the body of Christ is present here, then he will

not fear that it will be taken away from some believers.

(11) The fact that he says, "We serve only dry bread and sour wine," indicates that he does not know otherwise, neither is the Lord's supper instituted for the sake of food; it is instituted for the sake of thanksgiving or remembrance, for he says, "Do this in remembrance of me. Therefore the ancients called it *Eucharistian*, that is, thanksgiving. And for a sign of Christian unity, Christ ordained an open friendly sign, which he called after his body and blood, to eat with one another in brotherhood; so that those who gave thanks to him with one another for his salvation, as they testified to one faith, might also give themselves the open sign of being one body with all the members; therefore it would be quite shameful not to walk in a Christian manner.

(12) St. Paul, seeing that he wished to draw the Corinthians away from the idolatrous church or congregation, thus says: "Is not the drink of thanksgiving, when we give thanks, the commonwealth of the blood of Christ? is not the bread which we break the commonwealth of the body of Christ? For we, the whole multitude, are One Bread and One Body, since we all share of One Bread." Now it is found that thanksgiving is the essential and noble thing for which we come together in the supper, and that the next thing is to make an open sign of duty to one's neighbor, so that the first two commandments of the love of God and of one's neighbor may shine forth in all the words of God; for in them hang all the statutes 6) and prophets.

13) If then we praise and give thanks to God in the supper of Christ, and teach brotherly love in the outward sign (without a doubt, neither a bouquet), how can he have us so pompous about dry bread and sour wine? 7) Does anyone also say that baptism is nothing but cold, unflavored water? Therefore, bouquet of such sacrilegious words should be justified, if he is the one he wants to be seen. We teach the great grace and love of God toward us, and for this we give thanks to Him; and as He has given us a visible sign of duty for the open manifestation of brotherly love and the display of the members and body of Christ, we also teach brotherly love. Therefore we come together, practicing this also; and do not come together to drink sour wine, as a bouquet rude, let alone uncivil.

1) d. i. Re-schelten.

2) In the old edition: "the neighbor".

3) "learned" here probably as much as: "received knowledge of it" or also: studied at leisure.

4) i.e., removed from the way; invalidated, refuted.

5) i.e. to undress, to snatch.

6) d. i. Laws.

7) d. i. hang up.

(when he speaks of us from *impis teuschet*¹⁾). Therefore, it is found that Strauss has never learned the noble and essentials of Christ's supper, because he thinks that if the body of Christ, which they seal here, is taken away from him, then the sacrament or supper is over and forgiven.

14, II. According to this, he thinks that if we drop the mighty words of Christ, which he opened in the supper, then 2) the whole of Christ would soon be gone, and the outward word. As if the supper were only a part. How? is not the whole Christ eaten there? bodily, spiritual and mental? then we have already overcome. Now therefore I show that you, devout reader, learn to recognize the precious words which they lead, that they are only winged or dazzling tricks; and if one deceives the good, 3) then they are only spoken, that one may dazzle and frighten the simple with them. Otherwise, who will accept the words of Christ? Yea, ye, if ye now say with them, "This is my body," and therefore gladly, and for the advantage of strife, say, "Who is given for you," but in whom the ground of truth is found. We are so far from wanting to disregard the words of Christ that we first teach them to understand the right divine way, so that the words of God may be pleaded rightly even before the enemies; and this not from our heads, but from God's Word.

(15) When he says, We are high, seeming, and sweet words, he shows a little orator, though he has not, without doubt, made the rhetoric dirty; for [with that which] he does, he wants to appear that one does not take it from him, and lays it on us. And it is found in the case of anyone who knows how to speak that nothing makes him write or puts him off in a trade that he does not understand, neither that he trusts the color of his words so well; for I want to show him in this little book of his, since he uses the word "high" in six lines for the third time, by which one can see that he cannot grasp the mouth (I must also speak his language) full enough; is B on the other page. 4) And there is not much greater compophaceloremon to me, 5) who speaks one-and-a-half words more, neither he. Against this is all my writing,

in German, so simple and bad, that where I hoped to get over something with words besides ostriches, I would really have to sell the workshop and store. But we are founded in the simple truth, and even if we are incapable of speaking, we still have so much understanding of the truth that we thank God that it is all, be it little or much.

IV. But he says, "They abuse the precious languages, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, for this purpose. Dear, my ostrich, how can you know that? You don't know any languages, how do you know whether we abuse them or not? But if others have told you, why don't they write against us? But, dear Strauss, that we undertake in the languages, we want to prove with the languages themselves that we take it right in our hands. And do not judge more highly than you understand yourself, lest you be like the donkey who judged, 7) that the Guggler sings neither the nightingale nor the nightingale. And know herewith that the knowledge of the languages is the right pointer by which one is pointed to the right way in this trade. I will tell you a few things here, in the hope that you will accept the report of the truth.

(17) The kind of Hebrew language is so necessary also to the writings of the New Testament, which is written in Greek, that without it nothing can be understood. For those who wrote it in the Greek language were of Hebrew descent, as was also our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore they did not leave their own language in another language; just as when one puts Latin after the German way, or again German after the Latin way. Example: You have given the name to your book: *Wider den unmilden Irrthum 2c.* Then you took *impium* from 8) the title of *Pomsrarrus'* childish epistle, and rewrote unmild in the German manner, because one of the blind leaders taught us that Pius was mild, impius unmild; because the words are sometimes also, though rarely, used in this way by the right Latinists; but *Pomeranus* did not take *impium*, but you rewrote it. That is why you have betrayed yourself in the title, that you do not know the kind of Latin language: you are therefore a good German schoolmaster, and should not take the writing so seriously.

1) "teuschet" - täuschet is mockingly said instead of: "teutschet". Strauß has translated the word *impi* with "unmildiglich".

2) "accordingly" put by us instead of: nevertheless.

3) d. i. when you get to the bottom.

4) § 27 of the previous writing.

5) Probably formed from , to bring into bundles: someone who forms long vsrdu colnpositn.

6) i.e. something.

7) In the old edition: untheilete, probably a misprint. - Guggler - cuckoo.

8) d. i. from.

(18) Now the Hebrew language has a way of using a lot of *tropos*, that is, speech used or otherwise understood; therefore Christ used it so much. He says of John [the] Baptist, Matt. 11, "He is Helias." And was John not Helias; therefore it is a "*metaphora*," that is, a taking away. For John was like Helias in spirit and power, Luc. 1. indeed, so great a prophet that no greater has ever been. Item, Luc. 16. Christ speaks: "There was a rich man" 2c., and has not been one, but it is only "*parabola*," a likeness, not a history; nor does he speak: "There was" 2c. after the Hebrew manner. Paul speaks Gal. 4th, "Abraham had two sons," 2c., "which are the two testaments." And the sons of Abraham are not the two testaments, but it is an "*allegoria*" (let no one make a mistake about the xxxxx, I urge to the simple, clear sense), that is, a different speech. And Paul wants to say: We may well understand the two testaments through the two sons. Again he says Gal. 3: "Christ became the curse for us", but he is the blessing and salvation that took away the curse from us. Therefore it is a transformation of names (*metonymia*), since one also gives to the good the name of the evil, which it accepts; as, in the Old Testament the word "sin" is taken quite often for "the sacrifice for sin". And here Christ is called the curse according to the words written in the 5th book of Moses 21, who is the blessing against the curse.

(19) Now thou hast two witnesses, and of each two tidings, whereunto thou shalt learn, as also in the New Testament the manner of the Hebrew language is used. And hear me 1) of these; for in former writings I have shown many more things. Now I will show you such figurative or other understandable speeches in the Old Testament, and before that the *metonymias*, that is, after-naming, by which you see that Christ spoke in these words according to his anterior manner, and yet had another meaning, neither of which we suppose at first sight. In Exodus 29: "Burn the flesh of the bull and its dung in the fire outside the camp; it is sin." Or according to the 70 [interpretations]: "It is sin." Here the sacrifice is called "sin," though it is not sin, but the sacrifice for sin; nor is it an that is. Re-naming, and confusing the name).

20) So here the friendly brotherly measure 3) in the supper of Christ is called the corpse of Christ, because it is used in the remembrance of the corpse, that is, death of Christ, from some likeness or taking away. 4) But if someone were to say that the example of Exodus 29 does not serve this purpose, 5) on the one hand, that it says nothing either significant or essential about the body of Christ; on the other hand, that it may well be interpreted, "It is for sin," that is, it is a sacrifice for sin. Answer: First, the sacrifices in the Old Testament, which are often called sins (but for atonements), have all been meanings of the perfect sacrifice of Christ JEsu. Secondly, Hebrews indicates that *hatath*, sin, is not a genitivus, as is learned in Leviticus 4 and elsewhere in many places. Therefore this interpretation "it is sin" is by no means obscured by us 6); for the meaning is well brought out, yet the words are different. But if it befits the 70 [interpreters] to actually bring out the meaning by changing the words, and since (in their and our language it is incomprehensible that the sacrifice is sin) thus speak: "It is the sacrifice for sin"; why should it not befit us to act on these words "this is my corpse", which are not comprehensible to us, with comprehensible ones, and to actually bring out and speak the meaning: This is the memorial of the body, that is, death of Christ? or a meaning?

(21) It was proper for St. Jerome to bring out the meaning, and he departed from the Hebrew way; why should it not be proper for us also? For 4th book Most 19, where Moses speaks of the red cyt-cow, "She is sin"; Jerome says, "For the cow is burned for sin;" and does him justice, for the cow was not sin, but burned for atonement, and the ashes cast into the water 2c. Now why should we be told in the words:.. Why should it not be proper for us to say in the words: "This is my body, which is given for you": "This is a meaning, a feast of thanksgiving, that the body of Christ is given for us"? If we see so publicly that in the words there is the Hebrew way, which is not understandable to us, we bring them forth with another way of the Greeks, Latins and Germans. As St. Jerome himself does, who speaks of the words of Matthew 26 thus:

3) Measure" ---- meal.

4) Randglosse: 8ie aāpsllavit Oseolamxsāius ūne tropum metapvorML, nā usum seiūest spsotavs.

5) d. i. firstly.

6) i.e. rejected, spurned.

1) i.e. content myself with it.
2) Marginal gloss: Aletou^mia stlana est uomium commutatio.

that he, Christ, signifies the truth of his body and blood 2c., with other more words, with which Jerome publicly gives to understand that he has understood these words "this is my body" 2c. also only that they are meaningfully spoken. But to say much about it here would be superfluous, since enough has been said and written about it by many before.

In the other book of Mosiah at the 12th we will actually learn this kind and characteristic of the Hebrew language for all sciences, because there is the same form of the words. And since Christ used the paschal lamb and his memory [in] the night when he substituted his memory for the old one, it becomes clear that he also used the same form of words. Now God speaks there of the paschal lamb or of the feast: "This is the transgression". And if the lamb was not the overtaking, because the overtaking happened only afterwards in the night; the feast, which the children of Israel practiced in the following time, was also not the overtaking: still so the lamb, and the feast, me- tonymicds, that is, by an after-naming or alternation, is called "the overtaking". So here the thanksgiving and the bread that is broken in thanksgiving is called by a Hebrew me- tonymiam, that is, surname, "the body of Christ"; not that it is the bodily body of Christ, but a memorial and thanksgiving that he gave his body in death for us.

(23) But when some say, Let no figurative or falsified or used speech be made unto me here, for the commerce is too great; and if Christ had willed that his words should be otherwise understood, he would well have signified it: such combatants show that they have heads, but little sense in them; for the most solemn things in the holy scriptures are all now and then falsified with figurative speeches. As that all things are in God's power, that he is the Almighty, according to the content of the first article of faith, the Psalmist speaks thus: "Lord, in your hand are all the ends of the earth. Now God has no material hand. But if a ruffian wanted to argue about it: The scripture gives him hands, so he also has hands, he would miss, because the scripture needs here "hand" for "force". Jesaiä at the 66th chapter: "The sky is my chair, and the earth the footstool of my feet" 2c. We speak here only of the Godhead, which we do not know how it is measured, and do not speak of the humanity of Jesus Christ.

24 Item, the whole sum of the Gospel Christ says with figurative words, John on the

Chapter 6: "My Flesh is the Right Food" 2c. With which words he wants to tell us that his death is the payment for our sin, and whoever accepts it, 1) is assured of blessedness. Item "He sits with the righteousness of God, Father Almighty" is a figurative speech, by which it is understood that Christ Jesus is equally powerful with the Father. And the whole Scripture is full of such speeches, even in the most serious matters of faith, in which tropical, that is, figurative and used speeches are used. For, as Fabius and Cicero teach, every trade becomes higher and more beautiful because of the speeches used, neither without them; 2) therefore God needs them even in the most serious things. Therefore, we should refrain from justifying Christ as if he did not speak tropically in a great commerce; for he speaks as befits commerce, but we are unintelligent. As if the king said to his son, "I give you my crown," and the son understood only the golden crown and not the whole kingdom. So we fall on the flesh of Christ, and he called the thanksgiving of it, that he gave the flesh for us for a sacrifice, "his body".

(25) So much, dear Ostrich, about the filth, since you scold us that we abuse the languages, that you may see that we do not abuse them, but take them in hand as the right tools, and with them dig to the truth. And there is no need for your blustering and scolding; the faithful and the learned know well what we say. And take care that some of you have not yet reached the measure in which you think you are. No thing is too great for God that he does not often speak and do it tropically. In the beginning he says: "And the Spirit of God held upon the waters, or weaved 2c. Say whether it is a tropus or not? Therefore open thou thine eyes, and thine ears, and shut thy mouth, and put forth thy pen; and learn beforehand, before thou hast taken thy stand (for there are other men in the matter more despondent than thou), and give glory to God, and to the truth; and we shall know that thou hast faith, and that thou hast the Spirit. For because the clergy see that you now want to lean on faith and spirit out of ignorance, they will not give way to your rumbling, and we will not let you continue with untruth, if God wills.

26. v. He also tells us "to give one another titles that are proper to Christ alone". This he devises; and has not enough that he unwittingly-

1) i.e. rely on it.

2) In the original "dron" i.e. "their without", or "without the same".

lich 1) writes, he must first lie to it. For I do not recognize any high title, whether it would be attributed to me; do not attribute it to anyone. But it could be that Strauß, like Faber, Egg, and the wild animals, would not yet know what the titles are called. As when one writes *episcopum*, a bishop, that is, a guardian, describes that he be admonished of his office by the name.

VI "We have separated ourselves from those who persist in preaching the gospel", he also puts on us in a feminine way, those who, not being able to answer with the truth, rebuke it. For where, according to our measure, have we lacked in the diligence of the gospel 2)? Consider our work in the Gospel, whether it be stöpfli, 3) heuin or hölzlin. Therefore, dear Ostrich, notice that they have separated themselves from the steadfast Christians who, against all custom and order of the church, do not allow all doctrine to occur, and therefore do not leave the church alone free to judge, as Paul points out in 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Thessalonians 5. This you do, Ostrich, and others more, introduces a new tyranny and violence; for you want to be seen as having held with the Christian infidel princes of Baden that our writings have been banned. Then I require you to show me the scripture or the proven spirit, so that this may be appropriate for you. What else has the pope done, neither commanded: Do not touch this! Do not read this! This is heretical? 2c. If you now, in the same way, deny to your churches the truth that you see inwardly but are ashamed to confess inwardly, because you have immersed yourselves in it, what are you but new popes who take away the judgment of the church, and the pious lords, just as the pope also did, are moved to protect your error? This is to renounce God's word, and to make distinctions and discords. This, however, is the only way of unity, in that the church is left free to express an opinion for and against, and thus the church is left free to judge; for God is not a God of discord, but of unity, who will not let His own, who are gathered in His Spirit, err; and thus there will be peace, atonement, and unity among all churches. But where one lord, city, people or commune lets the teaching of God's Word go freely, and not the other, there must ever be discord.

28 Now watch, which of God's

Word and His Church, but you or we? We let your, the pope's, and all antichrists' writings be read freely, and put down the errors with the sword of God's word; so you want to do it with prohibition. Now I will choose you, you ostrich, to be a judge. Tell me, which seem to you to have the more suspicious cause? those who let their adversaries' writings come freely before their churches without any violence, and fight against them before the church; or those who bark against their adversaries before their simple-minded, and write against them publicly, also recommend their writings to their sheep to read, and often lie to them in their writings, 4) than you do here, and Faber and Egg do in all their writings? And if the opponents apologize or explain themselves, they cry out: Let them not be heard; more pernicious heresy never arose 2c. Yes, therefore, judge, know which are the more suspicious!

(29) For it is of no avail to say, "Evil conversation offends good morals," 1 Corinthians 15:15. For to pretend that in this sacrament one eats flesh and blood bodily, or that Christ is present bodily, does not make good morals. Proved: The Christians have never been more angry, neither since one has held the erroneous opinions.

(30) In addition, it is publicly found that we have never taught anything shameful, 5) sacrilegious, evil, or wicked; indeed, we have taught with more virtue and baseness 6) than some of the pillars 7) that are respected; therefore, our doctrine, for the sake of annoyance, shall not be justly reproached 8). If, however, we were to teach falsely or angrily, our writings should sooner be let before the church, for men would see their falsity from the beginning and accept the miracle, for the teachers would soon turn them back if there were such open falsity in them. That is why they are colors and fictitious requests of the tyrants of the Scriptures.

Accordingly Strauss says: "The holy apostles also did not falsify the truth for the sake of the weak, but only allowed something of the old holy ceremonies, 9) and did not teach 10) besides that, so that they would not be necessary for salvation.

4) In the old edition: anliegen.

5) In the original: schampers.

6) d. i. Demuth.

7) In the original: Sül.

8) In the old edition "happened", which is probably a printing error.

9) Randgloffe: Ancient sacred ceremonies! Have thanks.

10) About this "not" compare the note to §11 of the previous scripture. Zwingli interprets this printing error in such a way that the following up to § 36 incl. has been written against it.

1) i.e. in an ignorant way.

2) "ienen" - any. In all editions erroneously "those".

3) stöpfli - from stubble.

32 Behold, devout Christian, to the learned ostrich, how well he is reported to the Scriptures, so you will not be surprised that soon afterward he speaks so grandly and disconsolately:

33. VIII. ostrich: "But after this, in a short time, their foolishness (meaning us who do not want to eat Christ's flesh in the flesh) shall come to light more clearly through me (see, he puts himself first, so that he does not miss himself) and many others of even greater reputation with the help of God."

34 Answer: We, like the apostles, have not falsified the teaching for the sake of the weak. That the apostles yielded somewhat, we also did. We did not put the doctrine of the flesh and blood of Christ in the sacrament on the track, but we spared the weak until God put it on the track, and without doubt neither Paul nor other apostles attacked the circumcision. To this end, we have not wanted to attack commerce until one would be so well grounded in all things that nothing would want to deceive him any longer. In this Carolstadt breaks out and speaks the truth; but he has the defect, which the Father of Light has also left us, that he first of all did not bring the misunderstood words to light with the Tuto in the most skillful way. We could not let the truth lie there, because he did not really hit it with the words; for it should be proper for everyone to speak in the church. And so we did not teach the old error, because unfortunately it was now taught too strongly, but spared the weak in it, and still brought forth the truth in time enough. Therefore, the first part of this speech of yours is a calumnia, that is, fictitious calumny.

The other part, however, is an open lie, but I will call it ignorance; for the apostles not only taught that the ceremonies were not useful, but also that they were harmful, unpleasant, and to be done away with. Paul to Galatians, chapter 4: "Ye keep the day, and the new moon, and the feast, and the year: I fear I have labored among you in vain." Item Galatians at 5: "I Paul say unto you, that where ye are circumcised, Christ shall not be profitable unto you." Item Hebrews, chapter 9, which is a different understanding 1) of the same time in which gifts and sacrifices were offered, which things did not make him perfect who did them. For who would be perfect in food and drink, in various washings 2) and carnal ceremonies (that is, in outward din-

Who alone were appointed until the time of the abdicacion) will be saved or perfected? Item, Peter Acts at the 15th chapter: "Why do you tempt God to put a yoke on the believers, which neither we nor our forefathers could never have borne? Christ our Savior Himself says in the 15th chapter of Matthew: "That which enters into the mouth does not defile the man. Item Marci 2: "The holiday is made for man's sake, and man not for the holiday's sake." Item John 4: "The time is coming when you will worship the Father neither in Jerusalem nor on the mountain, but the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth." These proclamations, to which an innumerable number might still be added, all extend to your seeing that Christ and his apostles have publicly taught against ceremonial things; and by this you learn not only your ignorance, but also iniquity.

36) Accordingly, I have long considered 3) why you have spoken these words, that the apostles did not say that the ceremonies were not necessary for salvation, and have not been able to find the cause from the argument or content of the matter, because it does not fit the place. 4) But after a long time I thought, 5) you have said it, as if we should not teach that the bodily flesh of Christ is not useful, and that nothing is promised to the bodily food, which not only you, but some who are much greater, also cry out. But why should we not teach that which our Captain Christ JESus himself teaches? since he says, "The flesh is not profitable"; understand to eat, and not carnal mind, as ye mightily bend his word. Even though your mind is more carnal, neither the kind of flesh described by Paul and Isaiah; if you want to show up God's words 6) for his meaning, which comes only from your ignorance, and therefore only over-fleshy poems, which are also grasped by the children, will be word colors.

(37) Yea, saith Christ, "The flesh is not profitable," and understandeth, to eat. For he said of him, killed long before, that it is the true bread that makes the world alive; that is, that his humanity is the lamb and sacrifice that takes away the sin of the world-not because he is a man, but because he is God and man;

1) Marginal gloss: Paradola pro alteZoria, üsdraieo Wors.

2) d. i. Washings.

3) i.e. minded.

4) d. i. fits.

5) Compare the note to §11 of the previous scripture.

6) i.e. impose.

but according to mankind he might suffer, and according to the Godhead he maketh alive. Therefore the disciples said: "We believe that you are the Son of the living God"; and not: "We believe that you must be eaten in the flesh"; or: We believe that you are true man; or: We believe that the carnal mind is not useful. For this Christ would not have been misled by the Jews, who wanted to understand his words even after the urge of the words to eat of the flesh bodily, if he had spoken these words "the flesh is not useful" of the carnal mind. And lastly, Christ does not speak so lukewarmly as if he had said: "The flesh is not useful", for: the carnal mind is not useful; as before it was more abundantly brought forth: if you now also read it, and let it be reported to you. Therefore we say for and for: The flesh of Christ is not useful to eat, and again give up trying to prove from God's Word that His flesh, eaten in the flesh, is useful.

38, IX. Soon as Strauss does not want to mention Harrow's name in his book, he strongly suggests how little it matters, from whom the truth is spoken, and yet he does not need palate 1); for he undoubtedly does not spare mine. Then he knows that he will not be seen standing with the priests. And does he, as well as the popes, protect that which is against God's word, yet with greater clumsiness, he and his associates, neither do the popes. For so the popes cry out: Let the words of Christ remain with the simple mind, and thou therefore sayest unto them, It is written, Who is given for you; and therefore must he be eaten bodily sensibly: they seem to yield to this, and say: Yea, he is eaten tenderly, as he hung upon the cross, 2c., as the recantation of Berengarii signifieth.

39 But Strauss and his associates, if they shout with the popes: One should let the words of Christ remain with the simple mind; we have the words clearly, it says "Is", so it must be, and one answers them about it: Well then, let the words have their simple meaning, and see what may be understood of them; and the meaning will be found: The bread is my body, which is given for you. If therefore the bread is the body which is given for us, then the bread must be crucified for us; for his body is given for us.

40. as one also speaks: let the words

1) In the old edition: Goumens, which probably stands for "Gaumens", i.e. "Meidens".

Christ's body to the simple mind, then the pope must be right, and we must eat Christ's body not only sensibly, but also visibly; for he is visibly and sensibly crucified. Thus they say, Behold! these are new sophists. And if they say: How can this be sophistry? if you urge us to the simple unused mind; then we take him in our hands, he does not add 2). For so they say: This is the simple mind: This is my body invisible, which is given for you visible. Here we give answer: Does corpus actually and unused mean an invisible corpse? or *tradtur*: is visibly given up?

This is how they want to do it with shouting: We believe the simple words of God. It is right. Who is a believer who does not do this? But you are the first who do not let the words of Christ remain in the unused mind, when you say, Let it be the invisible body 2c. For Christ has never said: This is my invisible body, which is visibly given up for you.

So it turns out, dear ostrich, that those of your party who speak like this, as first reported, are the first who have taken the natural meaning of Christ's words, and yet have not met them. Therefore it has become better for you, and the unused sense has wanted to be too strong for you, and you have said that this is the simple sense of the words "this is my body": "in the bread is my body. But then, whether you interpret it or not? Is it not now a synecdoche, when you say: In the bread is my corpse, for: This is my corpse? Is this not a trope, when we say: The feast is a memorial that my body is given for you? which is a metonymy; for the supper, thanksgiving, or feast, is named after the body of Christ. So they argue and shout: One may not suffer the tropum! and lead them in the midst of the tropum, and lay it out by the tropum. I often find out that they do not yet know what a trope is, so they fight against it and make do with it.

42) And at last Ostrich comes, and sees that they may not receive it: "In the bread is my body," and says: "3) The body of Christ is present in the sign incomprehensible to all the senses, likewise his holy blood," but nothing corporeal is due to the eater. Behold, this is a new handle! Because can I ostriches right

2) i.e. fits.

3) These words will probably refer to § 67 of the previous scripture.

He wants to say that the body of Christ is in this sacrament, but it is not eaten in the flesh. Why then does he fight? Our dispute is not primarily whether the body of Christ is in the sacrament, but whether it is eaten bodily in it. Although he is not there, he may not be in it with the permission of God's word. And if we prove with God's word that he may not be in it, then our opinion follows that he is not eaten bodily in it. So they say against God's word that he is in it, but may not receive that with God's word.

(43) Now therefore, Ostrich, behold what this is: the body of Christ is in bread, and nothing corporeal is eaten. What then is he doing? How do you answer the pretextual excuses, since you have all spoken: He is essentially eaten bodily, but invisibly? But this has brought thee hence, that thou canst not answer for "he that is given for you"; for he ever ought to be sensitive there, because he hath suffered sensitively. Thus thou sayest mightily, Yea, he is there, but nothing corporeal is eaten there. Do you know what it is to say about the red pants? What one says, so says another: It is not called that. And that is the most beautiful thing about you, you first tell me how I am an Aristotelian sophist, even if you have also read something in Aristotle; but you are open sophists. For sophist (as it is used at this time) comes from *sophizein*, 1) that is, to wit and seek cunning without reason of truth. But this is what you do, if you now come with the invisible corpse, and say: it will be eaten bodily, without reason of truth, that is, without God's word. For God's word, "This is my body, which is given for you," unless it is to be a used speech (as you argue but do not hold in exposition), may not suffer him to be there invisibly and insensibly, for he did not hang invisibly nor insensibly on the cross. Soon you say: he is there, but nothing corporeal is eaten; also without any reason of God's word. Now stand before the mirror, and examine thyself, and thou shalt find thyself a more open sophist than any Gryllus ever was.

44 Again, we may not be blamed for being sophists with any semblance of truth. For to truly introduce and conclude from God's word is not sophistry, but the truth itself; or else our Lord Jesus Christ would have to be suspected of sophistry, because he is always smiling on God's word. As he says, Luc. 16: "If they do not follow Mosi and the prophets, then

Nor will they believe, though one rise from the dead," is *losus ab autoritaty, or a majore ack minus*. Marc. 3, Luc. 11. collects Christ, and thus concludes: "Every kingdom that is ambiguous in itself is destroyed; if Satan is ambiguous in himself, his kingdom may not exist. What kind of syllogism is this? I will not give any more examples here; I have given enough elsewhere.

45 Therefore we rightly conclude from God's word: If the body of Christ is the bread, or in the bread, then he must also be visibly sensitive in it; for he speaks (if one must understand the words according to your violence): "Who is given for you. Now he is visibly, sensibly, essentially bodily, also mortally given for us; so he also ought to be there, and so to be eaten, as he is crucified. So we also conclude: If the bread is the body of Christ, then the bread is crucified for us; and is no sophistry nor deceit; for introducing, following, closing is needed before all artists are ever born.

(46) Neither are we sophists, for that which we have ever taught is so firmly established in the Word of God that no one has ever liked it, nor will ever like it. And do not be concerned about what the sophists preach against us in imperial congresses and elsewhere; we have another day, neither the blind may see, nor at this time, in which we may well walk.

47. X. When Strauss now begins to reverse my reasons, he first attacks the word of Christ, John on the sixth chapter: "The flesh is of no use." And comes forth with the old little piece that Christ meant to say: The carnal mind is not useful. Enough has been said about this before, and often before, as about everything that is found in it. But how often they see that Christ here speaks of his fleshly flesh, not of the carnal mind; yet they do not object to it, and cannot answer for it; for their conscience tells them that Christ spoke in the error of the Jews, saying that his flesh was of no more use to eat than they supposed it to be. Still they fight, and they think they can get through with it, that they deceive 2) and lie, what they want, and cry out thereby: God's word, God's word! and call us: False prophets, false prophets! But when their error is brought to light, they let no one read it. How honorable this is, Christians do not need to judge, but Turks and unbelievers may recognize it.

48. when now ostrich long from the spiritual meal

2) i.e., to bring up debris.

1) xxxxxx.

much said, as if it had never been heard before, he says: we will preach a spiritual Christ. Dear Strauss, are you preaching a carnal one? I thought that if we had known Christ immediately according to the flesh, 2 Cor. 5. I say this only to drive you, for you do not know what you are saying. For you are those who do not let the true humanity of Christ, according to the Marcionite way, remain truly human, if you say that his body is eaten bodily and essentially, and say that it is eaten spiritually. So the body, of which you say, must be a spirit and not a corpse. For I ask you, Ostrich, whether in this sacrament the body eats or the soul? If the body eats, how can the body eat spiritually? But if the soul eats, how can it be a corpse? Does the soul also eat bodily food? If it is a spirit, then you make Christ's humanity a spirit, not us. Yes, it is a little wooden pigeon of which you say. You write words, which neither you nor any angel understands, as you weave the words together, 1) and in the midst of it you reproach so badly, that whoever of you does not want to be reproached to the highest, has to say that he understands it; and it is nothing but sophistry and word poetry. So notice this.

(49) Thou sayest, Ye speak of eating the flesh of Christ, not as the Jews, but that it is spiritual meat, eat it also spiritually. We have recently confessed that to eat Christ is to trust in him. Now you are looking for the sophistic rank: Yes, this is the spiritual food, but the sacramental. Eating has another form. Tell me, do you eat the sacraments too? You do not know yet whether sacrament is a custom and practice or an essential thing. You say that the body of Christ is eaten sacramentally. Dear, what is sacramental eating (*sacramentaliter edere*)? For it seems to me that you want to give the simple one over the eye with the word. Is it essentially eating the body of Christ himself? or, is it trusting in him? Now you come, offer us the little wooden scaffold, and say: One eats him essentially bodily, but spiritually, and only the clergy understand it; and to this you make with God's omnipotence, and to this you pity with sacrilegious words: whoever does not believe this, let him revile Christ 2c. Dear, not so! Let go! Tell me, how many are the spiritual meals of Christ? If ye say one, we will speak unto you straightway. If you say: two; God be with you! So you are the ones who bring innovation; for you cannot say a word of God about your spiritual food.

1) "wättend" probably as much as: connects. Cf. § 50.

Nor do I indicate any old, stately teacher, for they all understood spiritual food as we all commonly understand it. But I should spare you here; for you still speak anew, that one eats here nothing corporeal, [because] the body of Christ is still there.

50 Therefore sacramental eating, devout Christian, is not something fraudulent or sorcerous, as these dyers paint it, but it is nothing else than eating the sign, but in the supper of the remembrance of Christ. And no creature can deny this. The pope also understands sacramental eating, as we speak of it in the often mentioned Canon: *Ego Berengarius*. In turn

"Eating spiritually" means nothing else, neither trusting in Christ Jesus, the true Son of God; and eating together spiritually is a poem of those who do not want to let themselves be rejected. And as little as thou knowest what a wooden poker is, though thou understandest the compound words, yet, if it be wood, it cannot ever be iron. So little do these fighters know more of the bodily body, spiritually eaten, or of the spiritual bodily eaten body, neither that they have the words together, but which have no acceptance nor home 2) unbelieving mind. In the same way, as if we spoke of a black snow, and said: it would be black; but we would not see it. Finally, a spiritual eating of Christ is trusting in him; and a bodily eating is praise or thanksgiving. And to eat the body of Christ bodily, as the popes say, is a gross misunderstanding of the words of Christ, which, after the manner of Hebrews, mean the commemoration and praise of the death of Christ with the words of the body of Christ. But to eat the corpse of Christ bodily, yet spiritually, and not according to the pure spiritual meal, is a sacrilegious sophistical poem of those who do not want to be told the truth.

51 Therefore, Ostrich, the words of Christ, "The flesh is of no use at all," are true for and for, and are not spoken of the carnal mind, but of the fleshly carnal eating; which is of no use. Still thus you rage before the simple-minded: If the flesh be of no profit, for what is the death of Christ? And now we have shown in seven or eight stories with bright words that we speak only of the bodily eating of the flesh of Christ, that it is not useful. See now whether ye be not open calumniatores, protectors, and traffickers, when ye, as often as it is accounted for and rightly presented, draw it out harshly before the ignorant, and so introduce them, yea, seduce them.

2) d. i. Heilmath.

3) talame - already.

as if we deny Christ; and forget 1) in the midst, that the truth be not read.

We must not, dear Strauss, make a special *aphorismum*, that is, a separate piece, out of the words.

53 Strauss: "So Christ gives His body and blood above inward eating in outward, visible, and sensible signs, which are also bodily eaten and drunk."

(54) For thou wilt say nothing else, but that the signs shall be eaten. But if you also want the body of Christ to be eaten, but invisibly, we require you only for this reason, that you prove with God's word that the body of Christ is eaten invisibly here. For these words, "This is my body, which is given for you," may not be understood of any invisible body.

55. we also require you for the sake of the words which you all say, but you with this form: 2) "But only for comfort and spreading of faith" 2c. And soon after, "Therefore it is a sign only to fruitfulness to the faithful." There you all speak from a harbor of sophistry, without God's word. For the supper is not to spread the faith or to increase it, nor does the sacramental meal bring any benefit; or else you would set up again not only the papacy, but also the old ceremonies, should external things increase or bring forth fruit in the inner man; but it is a thanksgiving of the death of Christ. Therefore you all speak the words without reason. Examine on thy iij [third leaf] these thy words; let see how much findest thou the tidings of God's word?

56. xi. ostrich: 3) "Therefore man eats not here the flesh of Christ carnally, but according to the content of the almighty mighty words, so Christ says: This is my body, this is my blood."

57. Answer: Behold! so shall ye rumble and conjure before the simple. If you eat not the flesh of Christ carnally, what is your warfare? Now are we not one, that whosoever eateth it spiritually shall be healed? Say: I speak carnally. Say, How can you eat the flesh of Christ otherwise, either spiritually, or carnally, or bodily? Behold, now you must bring forth your little wooden dish, of which enough was said before. Accordingly, you give the simple, like-

(Dear ones, always leave out the words "which is given for you", so it will be seen what kind of customers you are) were spoken by Christ in such a way, as if he had used the words to force his body into the bread or supper bodily, and if his body was there by the power of the words, because he had said: "Do this in remembrance of me", also that he was almighty.

58 And Christ did not mean to say, "Do this in remembrance of me, that by words you should commit my body to death; but thanksgiving is remembrance, as we understand it publicly in the words of Paul, 1 Corinthians 11: "As often as you eat the bread and drink the drink, you will praise and glorify the death of the Lord, and therefore give thanks," that is, proclaim it. Thus, while the church stands until the last day, we are to remember the good deeds of Christ and give thanks with one another. This is what Christ means to us; not to make his body to be there and to be eaten bodily, for the words are tropical.

(59) Forasmuch then as ye cry, He is almighty; prove not therefore that there is flesh and blood. For it does not follow, You are an ostrich, and God may make you a goose, but you are a goose. Just as it does not behoove us to teach: Christ is almighty, therefore if you eat him sacramentally, he may drive out your bump; so it is driven out of you. But if you ever do this, and if you ever do this, say: What are the words: "The flesh 4) is not useful" to eat; "again I leave the world"; "you will not have me forever" rc? Are they not Christ's? Yes. Is he not as well omnipotent to keep the words, as that you say against his presumption, that by his omnipotence he makes himself bodily in the bread or supper? Are not our words, as being good, as which ye have spoken, 5) yet not understood? For understood they are common to us all that believe.

60. XII. Strauss also says: 6) "They teach that nothing more should be accepted or admitted here than what human reason is able to comprehend" 2c., with many other lying words, which are unpleasant for a lover of truth. For we speak here not of the reason of the flesh, but of the reason of the inner man, that is, of the believer, as Paul also speaks to the Romans in the seventh chapter. There it is also evident from their own experience that it is not possible for the mind of the

1) "To forget" means to beware, to be careful; hence "to forget" here probably means to prevent.

2) In the previous paper, § 31.

3) In the previous paper, § 33.

4) In the old edition: "Fälsch".

5) "vorwelbet" (to be translated as "to bulge").

6) In the previous writing § 36.

It is incomprehensible to believers that flesh and blood are eaten here in the flesh, or in the flesh-spiritually, as they say; for they therefore fall short of the omnipotence of God, that they themselves cannot remain on their flesh-spiritually.

61 But Strauß did not want to 1) revile Oecolampadius, who, however, does not count his, but Augustini's opinion. He wants that in the night meal no new miracle is to be pretended. How? Is it comprehensible to the human mind that Christ is the Son of God and payment for our sins? No. To whom then? To the one whom God has drawn. But is this not a miracle? Yes. From this you see, dear Ostrich, that Augustine does not want to speak of the high secrecy of Christ, for which reason he is a comfort to the soul; for this is the miracle that God has done for us, according to the prophet's legend and Ps. 117, but that in the night meal it is to be expected that the body of Christ will be miraculously eaten in the flesh. On the other hand, he does not speak of carnal reason, but of the faithful, which knows that "eating Christ" is entrusted to him, and does not ask for any other food, Jn 6: "Whoever comes to me will not hunger" 2c. And has the pious man well seen that these words of Christ are a used tropical speech, which calls with the corpse the memorial or meaning of the corpse of Christ; just as we still today call the memorial of the Ascension also the Ascension, as he indicates *ad Bonifacium*.

When Strauss speaks to us of not knowing faith, he always makes it sound as if this is faith, if one believes that flesh and blood are eaten or present here; and with this he wants to blind the simple; for he has said enough about spiritual food, how the same is trust in Christ; and now he makes it sound as if we believe that flesh and blood are here 2c. We know faith well and truly, thanks be to God! of which Christ thus speaks, John 6: "Verily I say unto you, he that trusteth in me hath everlasting life," and of which we say in faith, "I believe in Jesus Christ." But in this they must all strangle, that they shall not bring forth that Christ hath spoken: Verily I say unto you, He that believeth that my flesh and blood be eaten there hath eternal life, or is feasted in faith 2c.

63 Yes, they say, "Which is not to each one of them?"

1) Perhaps it is to be read: "hiemit". Should "hie not" be correct, it is to be taken ironically.

2) In the original: *zwarten*.

If any man believe the words which Christ spake, he is damned. Here I would like to give another answer, but for the sake of the simple I will not do so; for this following is the firmer, and better for the simple.

64 Answer: You speak rightly, but you lie, first of all, that he who believes the words of Christ has the right understanding; for to misunderstand the words of Christ, and to believe them, is not to believe the words of Christ, but your own misunderstanding. For example: "On the rock I will build my church", Matth. 16, the pope shouts at himself and also says: "God is able to do all things, he has done it for man's benefit, that he has given me such power in Petro; God may not be deceived. Yes, let it be! But now the right-minded one comes and says: You do not understand the meaning; he does not mean Petrum, because he was not the rock, but a "rocker", called by the true rock. Now Christ builds his church on the rock, of which Peter is called a "rocker". Behold, therefore, one must not rely on God's word, erroneously understood, for that is not God's word; for he may not err, but our error.

In the saying or words, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," the ostrich holds himself out, so that it may be seen that he is not a juggler, 3) as he calls me, but a gossamer ostrich; for he pretends that Christ is speaking there, John 3. So well trained are the journeymen in the languages that they do not yet see what *similia*, parables, are, and how one teaches the simple by them; which Christ has had in use without intermission, and here especially uses in the most beautiful *similia*, parables, of the birth of the flesh and spirit. Thus, after Nicodemus did not understand Christ's teaching about the rebirth or innovation of the spirit, Christ held up to him the summa of salvation with the words: "Whoever is not born again with the water (that is, the right divine wisdom, and does not speak here of the water of baptism; read John 4) and the spirit (for without the spirit man does not accept the divine), may not enter the kingdom of God." Now he explains to him what the spiritual birth is, and takes the likeness of the right fleshly birth; but he omits, according to the Hebrew way, the word of likeness in the beginning, 4).

3) In the original "gougler" and "gouchfarber". "Gauch" is "fool", therefore "gauchfarben" will mean: dressed in fool's colors.

4) Marginal gloss: *lets, notam similitudinis srebra ornittunt llsdrasl*.

thus: You see that everything that is born of the flesh is flesh; therefore everything that is born of the spirit must also be spirit.

(66) See, dear Ostrich, that these two *gnō- mae*, that is, two unbetrayed senses or conclusions, are understood everywhere by all flesh and by all spirit; for *gnomae* or *sententiae* must be true everywhere, or else they would not befit to go out for certain. You see also that Christ uses the words: What is born of the Spirit must likewise be the Spirit, from the former, "What is born of flesh is flesh." So then I have indicated your error in the way of conduct half *ab effectu aut sequela* with such a conclusion: Everything that is born of flesh is flesh; if then something is born of the flesh of Christ, it must be flesh. You all may not break this calculation, Syllogismum, and immediately become nonsensical. But you German schoolmasters lack much; you are not so reported that you can go over the wells yourselves; learn from the German books, and then put on a different coat as if you had born it, and want to make a name for yourselves with it, and if one looks for you behind the shield, you are not at home.

67 I realize thoroughly that you have never clearly understood the piece in the Gospel of John 3; nor is my conclusion, which I draw from it, certain. If something is born from the eaten flesh of Christ, it must be flesh. This I have silently wanted to show to the greater ones, neither you are, against their false pretenses, since they speak: The flesh of Christ, eaten, makes faith firm, yea, also gives the gospel present; and such nonsensical speeches as turn back all the birth of the gospel, which alone comes from the drawing Father, with the words. And we have a sure word of God, which is born of the flesh, and ye cannot signify one, that ye may prove that faith is established thereby.

68. xv. That I therefore say these writings: "But you will not have me forever" and: "Again I leave the world and go to the Father", and the like, must be understood only from the human nature of Christ; that *alenfanzt* Strauß so freventlich with so open disgrace of the truth, I want to be silent, that I almost want to think that it is not an ostrich, but a Guggler. 1) Dear ostrich, why don't you also cry out here: A little book of God's words may not fall? Now he has said that he will leave the world; so he must

ever leave them. But he may not leave them with his grace to us Godhead, for with it he sustains and permeates all things: so this must be spoken of human nature alone. For this you know that the believing mind indicates this, and all who have ever interpreted these words. You may still rumble; but it is evident that you have not read, indeed, without doubt, you may not read the right old theologians, in which you have learned to walk a little bit in the Scriptures.

69 Thus you account for everything with the single word "invisible. The bodily presence of the body of Christ is not taken away from us, but only the face and the emotion; and the same is now your deed. When will you hear it? Present a scripture for it, or else you are the most sacrilegious sophists I have ever seen. You want to talk out of your heads and not present a word of God for it; this you have in common with other sophists. But that you first speak about the same thing bodily, yet invisibly, from the body of Christ, you do not only against all reason (in this you are more evil than the Sophists), but you speak against God's word. Yea, and ye reproach the humanity of Christ, because ye say that he is invisible and insensible in the sacrament, when he saith, This is his body which is given up for us. If then he is visibly and sensibly given up for us, and you say that we eat him by the power of words, and yet deny the sight and sensibility; you deny that he suffered visibly and sensibly. Still you hump and sound hard and firm, and do no writing, but may not escape. If you want to understand it literally, when you cry out that the words are clear: "This is my body!" then you must stand down with the Marcionites, that he has not suffered; this is an open reproach of the Lord Jesus Christ, and we do not reproach him.

70 Therefore, as soon as you say that the invisible corpse is there, you now take the word *corpus tropice*, that is, the corpse for the invisible corpse, and still scream against the tropos, as if he wanted to oppress you, as is indicated above.

71 Thirdly, learn also from God's word, that if Christ were with us bodily, yet invisibly, he would not have spoken the words, "Again I leave the world. For he alone who deprives the face is not therefore called absent. Once, when you were a preaching monk, at night in your cell, you were invisible, nor were you

1) d. i. Cuckoo.

2) "small" here seems to stand for "little".

3) "Murder" As much as: to murder. The meaning of the phrase: as if someone wanted to murder you.

present, and could not be said that you were not there. I alone show you, that you seek such poor escapes, and think to blind the simple. When Christ was a little while of the disciples, he said not, "I leave the world;" but, "Ye shall not see me a little while." In short, not to be seen alone may not suffer the strong words, "I leave the world"; for if he were bodily with us, he would not have left the world, for he would be divinely and bodily with us. The angel proves this when he says, "He is not here," and does not say, "He is here, but invisible. Say: But he is in the sacrament. Answer: To be in the Sacrament would mean that he would have to be in a hundred times a hundred thousand places, which is not possible for mankind, not even for a corpse. And to be at so many ends is not fitting for anyone, except for that which is incomprehensible; that alone is the Godhead. Therefore, neither in the Sacrament nor elsewhere can the body of Christ be more than in one place. And the angel's saying, "He is not here," proves well and truly that he is bodily in only one place. As also Augustine de consecratione, dist. 2. cap. prima.

Here you need a fine piece. You lead us with your sophistry to say: it may be that a corpse is more than once in one place. And when we break your lies, you say: You are sophists. Say, What is the word: "He is risen, and is not here"? And this: "Me you will not have all away"? If it is mine, it is sophistry; but it is his who is the truth. But if we had him bodily, this word would not be true, for we would have him all the way.

73) Fourthly, you may not reverse this, Apost. I.: "Jesus, who was conceived by you in heaven, will come again as you have seen him go to heaven. Here we indicate to you that when he comes bodily, he will come visibly. Thus you indicate to us from God's word that he will come invisibly into the sacrament; you are not able to do so, for it is nothing but your blue trumpety: when he comes, he will come visibly; and you adorn and pamper yourselves as you wish. He might well have said, I will be with you invisibly; and should not have said, I leave the world; and, It is for you that I depart from you. 2c.

74 Finally, Strauss reveals himself to be a German schoolmaster, that is, that he has learned his reasons solely from German books. For he speaks the words, Matth. 24, Marci 13: "If someone were to say to you: Here or there is

Christ; so do not believe it," that should be understood only for the sects. There I am told that an excellent man 1) drew the word *neißwa* in a booklet; but Strauß from the beginning thinks it is the natural meaning of the words, and does not go over the well himself, because he has no creator. 2)

So Christ wants to say that the tribulations will be so great that even the unbelieving Jews will cry out for the Mosiah, the container or Christ; then the false prophets will show them the container here or there; they should not go there, because he will not be there; understand bodily, when they will look for him. So the disciples ask him, "Where will he be?" He gives them two parables: one, that he will come as bright and clear as lightning, filling the whole circle of our faces in a moment. The other is that they do not assume the place, because as the eagles gather to the carrion, so with him, the heavenly eagle, the train of the elect will be gathered.

(76) First of all, if Christ does not want to be shown here or there, why do you show him in the supper? Understand me only for the sake of mankind. Secondly, you see whether he comes visibly or invisibly. Third, the elect will be with him. He also wants his servants to be with him where he is. If he is in the sacrament, the great Christ must also be with him. See whether the clergy serve us or not. But that of the sects is only an included one, and not the noble or principal one.

Here I must give an answer to some preachers, who also stood there in a very deceived city and cried out like this: Behold, devout Christians! These new teachers are the false prophets who show Christ: Behold, he is here! Behold, he is there! for they say, Behold, he sitteth with the righteousness of God the Father! Do they not show him in one place? Yes, they say, God has no hand, therefore to sit with the righteous as much as to have equal power with him 2c., with much other wisdom. Behold, devil, how thou art bowed down! Shall we not show him above, as Marci 16. thus saith, "He is conceived in heaven, and hath sat down with the righteous of God"? And Stephen says, "I see heaven open, and the Son of man standing by the righteousness of God." Is Marcus a false prophet? like St. Stephen? Now they are talking just like us.

1) In the original: "Träffenlicher", by which Luther will be meant.

2) d. i. bailer.

78. O you mockers, Isa. 28. and Ps. 1, notice! does sitting with the righteous mean having equal power with God? Yes, so it is a trope, a used speech. Do we not now also rumble and shout? We keep the simple words, we do not make "sitting with the righteous" into "ruling with". Therefore, notice (as indicated before) that God speaks tropically even in the highest things. Therefore, dear brethren, did Christ come recently to the righteousness of God, or has he been there forever? Will you answer without doubt, and also rightly, that he is eternally seated, that is, equal, and reigning, according to divine nature?

I ask: What has gone up there? Without a doubt mankind. Without doubt, it was not there before. If it has not been up before, then the humanity of Christ is never more than in one place; or else, if it had been everywhere, as the Godhead says, it would also have been everywhere up, and would not have needed to go up. Thus you learn by going up that it is now in one place; for otherwise it would have been above all things with God, and would not have been allowed to go up. Learn also that the ascent and "sitting with the righteous" here reaches only to the humanity of Christ. And take the *communicationem idiomatum*, that is, the common features of both natures, right in hand, and all things will become clear to you. And see this: If he ascended (when he is undoubted), he is not here bodily; for if he had wished to be here bodily, and in heaven, he would not have said of mankind, "Again I leave" 2c.

80 Will you not call this also the work of the sophists? Yes, yours is not only sophistical, but genosphistical; that is unfaithful to God's word. For we speak with the holy apostles, Acts 2, that he of the righteous, that is. Power, God has exalted; not according to the Godhead, according to which he was not allowed to exalt, because he has the same clarity from eternity, Joh. 17. And again with Petro, 1 Petr. 3: "He sits with the righteousness of God. He has gone up to heaven, and there the angels are subject to him." And with Paul, Rom. 8: "Since Christ is seated with the righteous of God." And again Heb. 10: "Who sitteth for ever unto the righteousness of God." And well we know that he reigns with the Father and the Holy Spirit; still thus we know that his humanity is now in one place, as even 1) the holiest form of the face of God. We

but do not show him, 2) because he shows himself. But you show him in the bread, in the supper; also, as one should not show salvation or comfort in any outward things, you show in his food the fortress of faith, also the presence of the preached gospel; yes, everything that comes to your mind, so that you hope to talk your way out of it, but everything out of your heads, without God's word. Therefore, mend and change, or else you will move the wrath of God where you will not yield to the open truth.

After a long pondering, however, Strauß comes back and says: "It is obvious that the body of Christ is not bread, or that bread is the body of Christ; but bread remains bread, and the body of Christ also remains unchanged. If Strauß were to leave it at that, he would have spoken rightly and according to God's word. For Christ says Matt. 26: "For this cause ye shall see the Son of man sitting upright in the power of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven." In which words we well perceive that he will not change his seat or dwelling or abiding until the last day; as we also prophesy in faith, "He sitteth unto the righteousness of God the Father Almighty, [from] whom he is to judge henceforth." 2c. So we do not read that he then 3) will not be in any other place in the flesh in the future, nor for any other work, neither to judge.

82 But Strauß does not stop at words, but speaks immediately afterwards:

Ostrich: "Therefore the Lord Christ said of that which was hidden under the bread, that the bread is an outward sign. And so the body of Christ is truly present with the bread" 2c.

Eriväge, dear reader, these words of Strauß well, so you invent that Strauß does not believe that in the bread the body of Christ is eaten, as Pomeranus and the part holds. For I also noticed and understood beforehand actually everywhere on his word that he now wants to say that the corpse of Christ is present, but is not eaten. But whatever he may say, it is evident that he is leading nothing but an impotent, unfounded pretense; for when he says that the body of Christ is hidden under the bread, he leaves it hidden. If he says that the body of Christ is hidden under the bread, he does not leave the words of Christ "this is my body" simple, but makes it *tropically*, otherwise understandable: under the bread is the body of Christ; but this may not be suffered. For if he had been under the bread, he would have been invisible under it; then it follows

2) i.e. nowhere.

3) dadannen - away from there.

1) d. i. yes also.

but that he suffered invisibly, for it is written, "Who is given for you."

83 XVII That he murmurs about St. John's blessing is a calumnia, a transgression. I have wanted to give the simple-minded in this matter an example of metonymy, that is, of calling by names, and have sought one for them that is known to all men. But if he wants to have biblical examples, he will find them everywhere in our writings, which have written about it, also here, as is indicated above.

84. XVIII. Since he therefore presents himself with an example or simile, with the external and internal word: the external word is only a human voice; but that which is signified by it is the eternal word of God, neither he nor those who have made the foolish 1) (I must ever give it the right name) little book in Swabia against the pious Oecolampadium, do more than the Sophists do when they ask: Termini an res veniant in praedicamentum? of which it is not proper to say here, because they are looking for a button where there is none.

The external word that comes from our mouths is also the very word of God that is with God and in our believing hearts, as long as we call it the word of meaning and truth. But if they understand by the external word the breath, the voice, the speech, the sound that falls from the lips, without the understanding: ah, God, what do [they] want to gain by this? Is there not a difference between any word of breath and sense? But if the bodily word is to make the inner word, then we take it in hand: Ostrich preaches the gospel outwardly; so be it that he preaches it rightly, and the man who hears him will be told inwardly just what Ostrich has told inwardly. For here I only give an example of their deed, otherwise all believers know that no one accepts the word, neither he whom the Father teaches. But I will teach only this, that when they give parables of the outward and inward word, they quite foolishly call the blast 2) and voice of the word the outward word, which is very bad for such highly learned people. The outer word that Paul preached (now I call "word" the sense and mind) is the sense and mind that God has; and the inner word of Paul was also of one mind and sense with the outer. And then the same word, if God planted it in the hearts of men, was just the word that God wants, and Paul has inside.

Therefore, we Christians are One Body.

of which Christ and the apostles taught much, for we conduct One Spirit, sense, mind, opinion, speech within and without. For which reason Paul says: "No one speaks: the Lord Jesus, except in the Holy Spirit." How? teach an agolstren 3) or parakeet to speak: Lord Jesus; as those rabbits could 4) speak, whose emperor says they have 5) much at home; do they also speak in the Holy Spirit? So now you see, devout Christian, what the outward word means to the apostles; not the voice, as these blind men speak, 6) or the tules would speak in the Holy Spirit; but the very opinion, which they have in their hearts, spoken out. So now the Zurich limites want to say: The external word "this is my body" not only gives birth to the mind, but also essentially makes the body of Christ to be there through its power. Now 7) God is pleased with me, pope and popes, you pillars of all darkness. So the pope will say: When Christ said to the bedridden 8) "Son, your sins are forgiven you", then the almighty word spoke, and it was so in himself; and therefore when I speak by the power of my keys: Your sins are forgiven you, then not only the teaching follows, but by the power of the words man's sins are forgiven; I have the almighty word. Grace-pastors, then go, not to the sinners 9) (for you blind men are not to be sent to men, you deceive them), but to the mangy dog Ulysses, and say to him: Until pure, Matth. 8. Let see, may you drive him away with it!

Forgive me, Christian reader, for speaking thus to the peacocks! I know what God does through His believers. But these blinders have to be attacked, or else they thought they had it right, since they have so many boasters, and yet in many years the foolish book has never gone out. Yes, they say: 10) verbum caro factum

3) Agolster - magpie; parakeet --- parrot.

4) "Rappen" will probably be "Raben".

5) "they", namely the Spaniards, "they" put by us instead of themselves.

6) In the old edition: "Zürlimürlend"; zürlimürlen --- talk like parrots. - Tulen --- jackdaws.

7) are - are.

8) Bettriß --- the gout-broken., In the old edition: "Bettrisen".

9) "Sündersiechen" Well as much as: "who are sick in sin. The expression seems to be chosen in order to remind of "Sondersieche", that is, lepers, as the reference to the "mangy dog" indicates. Cf. Col. 1439, § 390.

10) This is the so-called St. John's blessing of which Zwingli speaks so often, which was used to avert all kinds of misfortune, namely the striking of thunderstorms. Cf. Col. 1488, § 58.

1) In the original: "narrachten".

2) Blast bubbles, breath.

est (even as we children, when we were afraid), the Word became man. Behold, the Word became flesh! So it also happens here, when these words "this is my body" are spoken. Answer: When Christ became man in the pure body of Mary, who spoke the word "the word became man" with his breath, and then the word or command became man? No one. So you understand, how your Zürlimürten has reason. But suppose it were recommended that an angel should say to Mary, "The Word is made man"; would it therefore have been made man by the power of the external word, or even by the mind of the angel? No, they would say, but by the power and effect of God. So it is right for him. Why then do you cry out: We have the almighty Word; as also Ostrich often does here? If the word has no power either in man or out of man, why do you preach to the simple, you *tenebriones*? Suppose also that these words "this is my body" and "the Word became man" are of the same power (as you say): so it follows that as often as one says: the Word became man, so often will Christ become man. Just as you say, by virtue of the words "this is my body" the body of Christ will become.

88) Therefore, summon the quarrelsome devil from you, 1) dearest brothers, and also teach you! you walk on walls. You have to get out of

see in the words of God which are words of narration or history; and on the other hand, also see which are words of promise. By the words of the story understand also the words of the external things, which are called or forbidden. Words of promise are: "Whosoever trusteth in me hath everlasting life"; "whatsoever ye do unto one of the least of mine, [that] shall be done unto me." "The signs shall follow them that trust in me" 2c. The Scriptures are full of these, and yet they are distinguished. Some are general, as, "Thy faith hath made thee blessed," and, "He that giveth a drink of cold water," 2c. But some are particular, as, "He will give me a choice barrel or crockery." Words of the story that forbid are: "But ye (understand the apostles and ministers of the word) shall not so rule." "Pray not evil for evil" 2c. Words of history commanding, "Go ye, preach the gospel"; "Baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"; "Make thanksgiving unto my death"; "Wish peace to the house whither ye go" 2c. Words of history or narrative alone are: The Word became man: "She gave birth to her first and only Son", and laid him in the manger; "Her daughter was healed at the same hour" 2c.

Now take a figure of it, whether you would like to be reported after all 2).

Words (1) Of promise, promissionis verba. Are:

general, *univrsalia*, and special, *privatza*.

(2) the fact, facti verba. These are:

(a) Words telling the simple-minded story.

(b) Words that forbid: This shall not be done. Are also:

general: Ye shall not be angry.

And
special: You shall not rule, concerns only the apostles, and those we call ministers.

(e) Words that command: This shall be done. Are with difference:

Words that are ceremonial alone.
Words that encounter life or customs.

90 Now, I hope, you have noted the difference, for I am cutting you off roughly. If you now want to fall from one gender of words into the other, and prove one by the other, which, however, is of a different gender, you err nothing less, because the advocates or intercessors do not correctly represent the action or naming. As when God speaks: "Him-

Heaven and earth may pass away, neither a letter of my words"; it is a word that is understood under the promise. Now if you would speak, "Christ became man," it is written, "The Word became man," and therefore, where the Word is spoken, there Christ will be from that time forth; for heaven and earth (behold, now you lift up [to] perish).

1) In the old edition: "beschwer".

2) "those" - any, put by us instead of: those.

(1) into another generation of words) must pass away, neither one of his words, then thou art mistaken. For the word "the Word became man" is a simple story told, and may not be counted among the words of promise, nor proved with them, nor drawn into a misunderstanding.

91 Now take an example in one generation, as in the promise, but in other members. "I remain with you until the end of the world" is a word of general promise; and, "He becomes my chosen cask or harness" is a word of promise, but to a particular [man], namely Paulo. Now if you were to say to any one, He is a chosen vessel of God, he is Paul (as the Anabaptists did), you would be mistaken in supposing it to be a word of promise; for it is not of the promise common to all believers, but of the particular promise.

Now we want to go into the other gender of the words of action, and there also show that the words, which are like one gender of action, but not one member, also do not like to prove each other. Christ speaks to the mute, Marci 7: "Hiphathah, is 2) opened." This is a word of special promise, because he spoke it (for I understand the present command of Christ's miracles also under the promise), but when it is held out to us, it is a louder story, what Christ spoke and did. And the word: "You received it in vain, you give it in vain" is a word that tells us what to do. If then I should say to the teaching evangelist, Speak the word Hiphathah over the dumb man, and make him speak; for Christ also spake it, and the dumb man was made to speak: You are mistaken, for you may well think that he is telling you the doctrine without reward, for Christ said it; but with the word "is opened," he cannot make a mute speak, for it is only the simple story described in this way, not that the words have this or that power.

Now take two examples in one generation of the deed, but in other members. One: "Baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. This is a word of the act, but still a ceremonial word. (I say this now only so that I do not delay, because I otherwise know well that the apostles also had baptism for a ceremony, 3).

they did not consider these words to be the definite words, without which baptism is not, because they also baptized in the name of Jesus). Nevertheless, there is nothing new in this case, for those who baptize in Jesus also baptize in the Father and the Holy Spirit, and those who baptize in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit also baptize in Jesus. These words are not to be omitted in baptizing. But do not understand by the words the breath, but the meaning and the opinion, namely: that the baptizer should incorporate the baptized into the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, to whom he also is incorporated according to God's opinion.

(94) Take therefore a word of commandment, which is not a ceremony, but which teaches the manners. As, "Into which house ye enter, there eat that which they have." If then you will take the foregoing words of the ceremonies of baptism to mean that nothing is to be omitted in the mind of God, and therefore, just as baptism is given as a ceremony for those who are introduced into the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, so also the word, "Eat that they have," is to be fulfilled, you will become a remaining householder. For who would let you eat all his possessions?

95. Now take an example from the line of words not to do, and first a general one: "You shall not give evil for evil. Applies to all believers. "What you do not want done to you, no one does to you," the like. 4) Again, "You shall not carry sackcloth or coats of mail with you," and "You shall not rule," apply only to the apostles or messengers; or else whoever had sackcloth and coats of mail, or whoever was a ruler so as to rule, would be condemned (as the Anabaptists would say). Therefore, it does not follow that one should prove the one with the other in that place: Yes, God has commanded this, and it applies to all men; and if this also has been commanded, it also applies to all men; for the one he has forbidden to all, but the other only to some, not to all.

Now let us come down to our business. Now if someone wants to say: Christ has said "this is my body", and he may not lie, so it follows that the body of Christ is there, then you see clearly now, devout Christian, that he deceives himself, because he wants to prove his error from the words that are not of one gender. It is true, Christ does not like to lie. Therefore, when he said, "This is my body," for: This is the memorial of my body; was

4) "the like" - this applies equally to all believers. ,

1) "perish" - to go astray.

2) will" - become.

3) In the old edition: "gehebt", which is: kept.

So to him: for he instituted the ceremoniam of thanksgiving for his suffering. And they that this very day make thanksgiving acknowledge him truly to have suffered for us, and praise God for it; and they that do this outwardly, but have not the truth of Christ in their hearts, are guilty of the blood and flesh of Christ.

97 But that here, because Christ thus spake, it should be pretended, where the words are spoken, or the supper of Christ is eaten, that the body of Christ should be bodily eaten, or be present; this shall not be, and may not be; for therefore "is" is not a word of promise. For Christ does not say, "Speak the words, and my flesh will be darkened," or anything like that, but there is no word of promise here, neither that the body will be there, nor that in the eating of the supper there will be a stronghold of faith. So also "the Word became man" is not a promise that the Son of God would become man; but it is a simple historical account that he became man. And if one puts the two words together, either 1) may explain the other, for they are not of one gender, the one is a described history, the other an insertion of the memorial of the death of Christ, without any promise.

But if you, simple one, ever want to profit from this diligence and learn to compare the spiritual with the spiritual 2) for clarification, as Paul says in 1 Corinth, chapter 2, first consider the nature of the words, whether they are words of promise or of action. If they are words of promise, see whether they are general or particular, and then contrast the words that are of one gender and one member, and you will find clarity. But if they are words that mean or forbid a deed, see among the words that mean deeds whether they mean deeds that are ceremonial or that affect morals. If they are ceremonial, take other words of commandments or deeds that are also ceremonial (and not of a different gender), and put the ceremonial deeds together.

99. example. We have no more than three ceremonies in the New Testament: [1] the baptism (which is a common sign of all the members of the Church, as was circumcision), the supper (which is a fraternal measure 3), so that one may give thanks and praise to the surpassing goodness of God in giving His Son to die for us), and the be-

Only those who can remember in faith, as Paul teaches; and the laying on or offering of hands, which is done only to those who are ordained to the ministry of preaching. From these, let us take the two most common ones, and then contrast them with the two ceremonies of the Old Testament, and we will see how the erring people willfully deceive themselves.

If it is to be said that Christ has said, "This is my body," and therefore the body of Christ is there, it will also be true: Christ has said, "Baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," so also under the water must be the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and herewith the essential humanity of Christ, which he will never do from him. Say [you]: God is everywhere, and therefore he is also in the water. Answer: Therefore he is also outside the water. From this nothing else follows, neither that he is no longer in the baptism, nor in the whole sea. Therefore, since it is impossible to compare them with each other, let us take 4) them into our own hands:

(101) Just as one who is counted as a member of the Church of God is recorded in baptism, so also in the supper of Christ appears one who trusts in Christ Jesus, the Son of God and our Redeemer. Here it must not be said that God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are in the water by virtue of the words and do this or that, nor in the supper of Christ, how his body is eaten there. For baptism is not given to work anything 5) in a man, but that the crosses may be baptized on him who comes to the church, 6) that is, that he may be marked with the common sign of the people of God. So also the supper of Christ is not celebrated to eat the body of Christ, but that those who give thanks with one another for the death that has made us alive also eat this friendly meal or measure with one another, so that each one also has given open evidence of himself that he trusts in Christ; and also then 7) lives Christianly toward the other members.

102 Now lift it up against the ceremonies of the Old Testament, against the circumcision and supper of the paschal lamb. It does not follow: God has commanded circumcision at a high price, therefore something is given in circumcision, or it has some power; for it is only a sign of the covenant, Gen. 17.

1) "eithers," neither of the two, used by us instead of: either. Cf. Col. 709. twederes also occurs.

2) "lift" - hold, compare.

3) d. i. meal.

4) let" put by us instead of: let.

5) i.e. something.

6) i.e. marked, applied.

7) i. furthermore.

are essential in the covenant. But it follows that just as circumcision is prescribed at great cost, yet it does not make a man righteous; so also baptism does not make a man righteous, but is a sign of one who has either believed or otherwise been a member of the church.

103 So it does not follow: Christ has said: "This is my body", so it is also there and is eaten 2c. Also, since in the Old Testament it is written, Exodus 12. "This is the transgression", it does not follow that the lamb is essentially the power or angel of God that transgressed; but it does follow (that is, it illuminates each other well, so that Strauß does not think that I mean it is a consequentia); so it says: "This (understand the lamb or the feast) is the transgression", and was only a commemoration, thanksgiving or praise of the transgression. And therefore the words of Christ "this is my corpse" are not to be understood that he wanted to give his corpse to eat, but a memorial of his death (which he had to carry only on the corpse, because the Godhead may not die), provided that he has done such use just of the night feast, by taking away the old paschal lamb, which has only meant on him, and has represented himself now, now to death.

(104) Yes, so much I have had to show the simple-minded about a common form, against which they can lift all the speeches of the resisters, and see how even and straight they need the comparisons of the sayings from the Scriptures. For such things must not be attributed to the learned; for either it must not be so, or else it does not help them; they are so high up that they badly do not want to be taught; and, in turn, they are so self-centered that, even if they do not hold to the doctrine, they turn back everything that is said to them.

Mark a pretty piece, if one says, the words of Christ "this is my corpse" may well be understood in the Hebrew way: This is a meaning or memory of my corpse; for "this is the transgression" also stands for "this is a meaning or memory of the transgression"; so they cry out: Behold, they want to conclude from one to the general! Yes, the word "is" is taken meaningfully in one place, therefore it shall be taken thus everywhere; for thus the word "this is my beloved Son" would also now be able to mean "this means my beloved Son": Behold, what deaf heretics these are! And if we answer against it (as I alone now do talame 1) for the fourth time): No, that is not our opinion, that we want to force the mind with it,

but in other words, "The flesh is not useful at all"; and "He has ascended to heaven; sit down with the righteous" 2c. That the body of Christ may not be bodily present nor eaten, and therefore, if the simple cannot extricate himself from the words "this is my body," we indicate the nature of the language; not in other words than they, but in one way, so that one may learn that the defect does not come from God's word, but from our lack of understanding, and that such words have more such understanding 2c. So they do the same as the desperate Jews, who did not want to hear Stephanum, lift up 2) their ears. O of beautiful holiness! O of faith! and flirt 3) around the corpse of Christ, they want to take away our salvation. But not so, devout Christian, one must ever speak peaceably with one another in the right understanding of the Scriptures, without self-contradiction; and therefore look at the analogiam, that is, the like kind (as has been said enough) alone, without grief, or else we miss altogether.

I must give one more example. Christ says: "Inasmuch as ye do it unto one of the least of these which are mine, ye have done it unto me. About this word the popes rage, and say: "Behold, whatever one does to St. Peter, Wendelin, and the Gertrude, that is God's doing. Therefore I pray to St. Peter so much *pater noster*. St. Wendelin so much sheep sacrifice. St. Gertrauten so many candles burn 2c., so I have done it to Christ. Now you see how they miss; for the word of Christ has two parts: the first is to be done admonitively, and belongs under the words of the deed to be done, under the member of morals; and the other part, namely, that he will count it done for himself, is the word of promise. In this way, the popes put it under the words of the commanded deeds, which are ceremonies. In short, Christ speaks of helping and doing good to the needy, so they speak of ceremonies, therefore they miss; for even number praying is a ceremony. To worship otherwise, neither the one God, is idolatry. The elect, however, suppose [when the saints] are honored with the *Pater noster* or other prayer, is not only idolatry, but also foolishness.

Thus, the magic example that Strauss and his crowd 5) have written about the external and internal word is, I hope, well drawn out. For the outward word preaches Christ the pledge of the

1) d. i. already.

2) i.e. clog.

3) Perhaps: to flutter back and forth (to üirt).

4) d. i. hatch.

5) In the original: Hoof.

It is the same in the mind; it is the same in himself after the fact. And if one now expresses the opinion that Christ is the salvation of the soul with the words, as he himself does in John chapter 6: "The flesh of Christ is truly the food of the soul," then the works may be different, but the inner word is nothing else but: Christ is the salvation of the soul. But according to these people 1) it should be so: First, one would have to speak of the outward word, as it is here tuned with letters or by a mouth; then of the understanding; and third, Christ would not only have to be the salvation of the soul, but his flesh would also have to be essentially in the soul, or be eaten, or, as Strauss says, be present. Now if Christ did not intend anything else with the words "this is my body," 2c., neither commit the memorial of the good deed that I have given my body for you, with thanksgiving and praise, 2c., then not first must his body also be essentially or presently there, as little as when he says: "My flesh is truly food." But let us again take Strauss's words in hand.

108. xix. ostrich: 2) "Therefore, according to the content of the word here, it is to be believed without all error that Christ truly presents bread and wine to His own in the sacrament. But the true invisible body hidden under the bread, and the true blood of Christ under the natural wine 3) is that of which the eternal word reads: This is my body, this is my blood."

First, it is shown enough in talame 4) that they speak for and for the invisible body of Christ without God's word, when Christ did not speak at all of an invisible body, as far as one should understand the words according to their meaning; for he says: "This is my body, which is given up for you. Secondly, it can be seen that Strauss does not keep his part with the commoners; for he does not want to say that Christ's flesh is eaten there, but that it is there to be watched; 5) or I do not know how he means it. Lastly, if this were true of them, the priests of Jerusalem must not only have taken away the houses of the widows with their legerdemain, but they must also have eaten them substantially; for Christ says, "You eat the houses of the widows."

Widows." Would also like to speak: It is "the eternal word". But not so! but if one understands the eternal word rightly, then one should first say: So it is certain. If one understands that Christ understands by eating at houses, 6) then one sees that he meant "to be undeceived," namely, that they thus beguiled the widows with goodies. 7) And may not follow: Yes, they also have to eat the houses substantially. So also here, if Christ wanted to institute the thanksgiving of his corpse (as is clearly found in his and Paul's words), one does not have to argue that the corpse is also essentially there by virtue of the words; for with the power of the words he did not want to institute anything else, neither the memory.

110. XX. Ostrich: 8) "In such an opinion, the true eternal Word of God is proclaimed by human and sensitive word, and is thus united with the same, that where the word is uttered, there is God's word present without expression."

Behold, with what the dark ones and the deceivers deal, how they can no longer speak! They can no longer say: The word that Paul preaches is the word of God, when Paul himself says that he cannot boast of any thing of himself that Christ did not work in him. But they try to lead in a madness, as if the truth, which is taught with the words, were introduced under the word as under a cloak: so that when the words "this is my body, which is given for you" are spoken, they may penetrate to it, that then the body of Christ is introduced through them, or under them. But not thus, but that which is thus in itself, which the word thus shows to be; not that the word first makes something or therefore brings something, but as it is beforehand in itself (namely, a ceremonia and memorial of the death of Christ), thus the word shows.

(112) Therefore Paul says: "You have not received the word as if it were the word of man, but as if it were the word of God, which it truly is. Behold then, where is your difference between the outward word, as if it were man's, and the inward word, as if they have not One Being? The external word is not the word of which they want to say, unless it is God's word; now if it is God's, they will not say how the internal one is under the external one of man.

1) i.e. useless talk.

2) In the previous paper, § 61.

3) Randglosse: Hölzern Schüreiselein.

4) d. i. already.

5) It seems that one "too" is too much and that should be read: "to see". - "now" here, as often, for: only.

6) deprive of something by fraud.

7) "To beguile" will probably be as much as: To do wrong, to deceive.

8) In the previous paper, § 66.

because the external things that Paul preached would not be his, but God's opinion and word. But if you look long at the tired things, they are nothing else than *respectus rationis* and work of the idle word fighters; and take nothing from them now, devout Christian, or else you would have to learn *formalitates Scoti* first, but you speak thus: When God speaks through an angel or Paul, he speaks as the truth is in itself; not that the speaking makes or brings ütziid [anything], but the speech is an opening, as it is in himself. And if they say, Therefore is this the body of Christ, answer, If Christ had willed by words to give his body, it would be there; but he willed not this, because it would not stand by other his words. Therefore one must understand his word rightly, then one becomes aware and sure that he is as he means it.

113. example. When he says: "I have decreed that you eat at my table and drink in my kingdom", he speaks a word of promise; nor does he want to say that it will happen in the kingdom of heaven with eating and drinking, but he wants to understand with this tropical speech that they will have eternal delight and joy with him. But to the quarrelsome one would have to speak thus: The word, which here Christ speaks bodily, leads also in him the essential eating and drinking; and should be pressed also in heaven above, and that so much more, that this is a word of promise, but the "this is my body" is not a word of promise. But not so; but we must first hear what he means by eating and drinking, and not falsify the sense by the seductive introduction by the outward word, or by putting together the outward and inward word. With the words "this is my body, which is given for you" and "do this in remembrance of me," Christ wants to introduce the thanksgiving of his redemption. So it is also in Himself that He has redeemed us; therefore we give Him praise and thanks.

114. XXI John's description of how Christ entered the closed doors, Strauss shows, as if his invisible presence (as they speak) in the sacrament or supper should be proven, for the reason that it is more possible that one corpse is invisible in many places, than that two corpses are in one place. And although this is nothing else, neither philosophized, it still occurs to Strauss, and scolds us, we have learned our reasons from the Aristotle, also our wise Latin from the Aristotle and pagan fables; so he speaks. See,

Pious Christian, how should you deal with crickets? The captain of this matter (when he himself is deprived of it) should first tell how to learn Latin in Aristotle and the Fables? That is why so few of the right Latinists have never gone to the right well, namely to Aristotle and the Fables; that is where Strauss has spied us out. But you, pious Christian, let the pure boy dance around in his Guggelfedern 1) (he has it for Straußfedern) and you notice so:

That it is not possible for the mankind of Jesus Christ to be more than in one place (not by his power, but by his word). For he said, "For the time being ye shall see the Son of man sitting for the righteousness of GOD." "He ascended up to heaven; sit" 2c. "As ye have seen him ascend into heaven, so shall he come again", and other sayings. For this it is gnug indicated that it does not follow: God is able, so it is; or else, our beautiful ostrich would be a hoopoe; for he may well make it so. Secondly, neither ostrich nor I should say that, since Christ came in through the closed doors, there were two bodies in one place; for coming in to the disciples, that the doors were closed, has also, of course, to speak of it (as ostrich and his part do, and put it on other people), well other ways, neither that two bodies must be in one place. When he was born of Mary, unharmed of her virginity, there is also no need to know of two bodies in one place, nor was he born of her without her injury; which way, however, is well known to him. Much less is it necessary to bring in here, how he came in through the decided [doors] after the original state.

(116) Nor is it found that he was ever bodily, neither in birth, nor in appearance after the primal state, but in one place. And even if the same would be proved, nevertheless it did not follow that he would be eaten bodily in this sacrament: because he therefore neither named nor promised anything. For "do this in remembrance of me" does not refer to "making or eating his flesh," but to thanksgiving, as has been sufficiently demonstrated before. Notice here, too, pious reader, how Strauss [sometimes] perverts our doctrine. If we say that it is not possible for the body of Christ to be eaten, nor, moreover, to be in one place, we suppose that, according to God's word, God's word, spoken in other places (for it must ever be set against each other), does not permit such things. Thus

1) "Guggel" will probably stand for "Gugger" (cuckoo).

they state that we speak according to the course of nature, and then also come and want to prove that it is natural for two corpses to be in one place, and call us "naturalists" with fakers, harrows and such animals. And we do not want such a way, but only indicate that it is not possible according to God's word that his flesh may be eaten; for it may be nowhere else, neither in heaven above until the last judgment.

117. XXII. When I indicated for a conjecturam, that is, a factual assessment, that Thomas did not want to believe the primal states, it is equal to the matter that he did not understand the words of Christ "this is my body", that one eats the body of Christ there bodily. This is so pitifully done by Strauss, that it would have been quite obvious to him that the disciples would not have believed it either, 1) because he lets up that Thomas did not believe that flesh and blood would be eaten; that I am surprised that he cries out so mercifully to me.

Ostrich: 2) "Oh God, of the deceived teaching!" And speaks but from hour on these words on it:

Strauss: "If Thomas had believed the word of GOD unwaveringly, he would not have doubted the resurrection either."

118) So you, dear ostrich, let it pass that we here say that he did not believe unwaveringly. So also it followed after your commandment, 3) that Thomas at the same time had been a heretic, a false prophet, a most pernicious disciple-also condemned; or else you must also forbear us, that we therefore are not heretics, nor condemned, if we believe not bodily flesh of Christ eaten here. Behold, thus thou goest about in the scriptures, as a blind mariner on the sea. But mark this, Christ saith, "He hath not lost any of them which the Father gave him, neither the prodigal son of Judas." But if Thomas should be condemned according to your judgment (because he did not believe in flesh and blood), then more than one would have been lost. He says Luc. 22: "You are the ones who stayed with me in my temptations; therefore I decree it to you" 2c. Is all spoken of the elves, among whom Thomas was; for Judas had already gone to his merchants. But this is learned from the fact that Thomas, as well as the other apostles, well understood the Lord Christ in his words "this is my body"; but not that they understood his

The devil did not eat the corpse in the flesh, but that he called the thanksgiving of his corpse that died for us 4) "his corpse". Therefore, dear ostrich, do not give Thoman to the devil in time. But if ever the devil must have one, give yourself to him, that you write so ignorantly from Thomä Wider the truth.

119 Strauß speaks further in this point. Strauß: 5) "It is also undoubted that the disciples have not yet kept the night meal of Christ.

Where do these words go, dear ostrich? Did they not have the supper with Christ? Now it says: "He gave it to the disciples" 2c. Or do you mean that they never kept it for themselves after Christ's supper at that time? Yes, that is what you want to say. But what else do you mean by this, neither that you present yourself with ignorant speech, as if you wanted to say, "Yes, I cannot say about the other disciples either, whether they have believed to eat and drink flesh and blood, because they have not yet celebrated the supper. But I am sure they did not believe any more than Thomas, whom you have already rejected, did. And immediately before these words you speak thus of Thomas:

Strauss: 6) "Therefore it is far wrong that he should have been content with the hidden and invisible presence in the Sacrament."

With which words you want to indicate publicly that if Thomas had understood how the body of Christ is eaten invisibly, he could have well believed the originals. But what do we say differently? But if this had not been the case with Thomas, then he would not have been able to believe the original. If you also herewith present the other disciples (but with a dark speech) as if they were apostates from Christ because they never received by faith (see how you, dark one, have cut your words so that neither you nor those who read you may know what you are dealing with), which Christ often told them about the original state. So I cannot consider otherwise, 7) neither that you want to say of all disciples that they also did not receive faith from your invisible flesh-Christ's food; for if that, then they would also have received the original with faith (so you speak) and would not have been grieved without doubt in the prison of Christ.

1) d. i. held.

2) In the previous paper, § 91.

3) Throbbing (?).

4) "us" we have put instead of "the", which seems to us to be a typographical error.

5) In the previous writing § 93.

6) In the previous writing § 92.

7) d. i. hold for it.

ivorden (for they had already eaten him bodily before), nor fallen away. But you give your words a gloss, as you will, so that you will ever know with us that Thomas and the disciples did not hold that the body of Christ was eaten bodily. Why then do you rage against me? You are like the evil barnacles, who bark at all people, even at their friends, but may nothing be done to them. So you bark against what I have gathered from Thomae, only that you leave nothing unaccounted for; and you are of the same mind with me, except that I say that the disciples did not understand Christ to give his flesh to eat, but that he instituted a memorial of his death, and have done right by him, thus understanding. So you say that the disciples did not do right to him, or that they were mistaken, but you are more mistaken about this than about the churches. For as you say that he who in the sacrament does not believe that he is eating flesh and blood is himself eating damnation, Thomas and all the disciples must have eaten damnation in the Lord's Supper.

120 How is this then? Christ said: I was well pleased to eat the passover with you," but would he have longed to be damned? which is far from the Savior of the whole world 2c. On the other hand, it turns out that your false argument, in which you say that faith is fixed with the meal, is not true. If it were so, the disciples would undoubtedly (after Christ told them of their future apostasy) have also fortified themselves anew with it. But they committed the thanksgiving the very first, and not with ignorance and unbelief, as bouquet is put to them, but according to the opinion and pretence of Christ; and from that time on they fell more mockingly, neither before nor since they had not yet committed this thanksgiving. Behold, if we speak from ourselves and not from God's word, we deceive ourselves, so that even when we think we are with God, we are publicly against Him.

(121) Other vain and loose words of reproach and revelry, such as: whether I will not allow Christ to stand up? whether he must sit down all the time? and such things as these I will now leave in their value, and have admonished you, Ostrich, along with other resisters, for God's sake, that you stand from the pursuit of high words, even from your own treasure. For with your own treasure you deceive yourselves and the simple; yourselves, because you think that where you are soft, this harms your name. For that you have your honor

you can by no means deny that you do not love well, for your open and secret writings show this; and you could not gain greater honor than that it could be said of you forever how you had the truth reported to you. For that some of you lay upon us, as if we had set the matter on [the] course, that we might also have some new creature, is as truly conceived as it is strongly spoken. And if you have perhaps made something useful in the gospel of Christ (although I truly say that it will be found out in fact that those who think they have done much will have to unravel a great deal again; let each one take it where he will), then it is not without, there are always such simple-minded people who allow themselves to be led by a pretense to think that what this or that one says is the light, since it is thick darkness. Therefore forgive 1) yourselves, so that you do not fall under the umbrella of your name to these simple-minded people.

If we seek honor from men (as Christ says to the Jewish priests in John 5), how will we believe? If we want to protect our name, how will we stand, if the truth appears so clear that only men see how we have missed? We then raise such chicanery 2) we reproach the servants of truth, and press and urge the scripture that it may falsify 3) and look for theure words, under which we must bring forth the foul untruth; as Strauss does out through his whole little book. How often does he say: The tender body of Christ, or the tender presence 2c. and similar words! How often does he diminish our doctrine (which has its foundation in God's Word) so magnificently that even if he were learned and capable of doing something in God, he should not speak against the most wicked, the most contumacious, in such a lowly and arrogant manner! But where the matter is not good, and we do not want to be found wrong, the flesh does the same to him. This can be seen publicly in the case of the Anabaptists and those who protect flesh and blood here. What is too much for them to say?

But the costume of high words. How can he not be too quick for the simple? We all speak of the gospel; we read it; but many of them have truly not grasped it in their hearts and lives, because, alas, they only cling to the high and noble words of men. Yes, there are some friends and brothers who are dearer to me than I am, who also have no faith in the gospel and all doctrine.

1) i.e. shepherds.

2) "Chic" probably as much as: skillful way.

3) Maybe: sigh?

The people who have been blinded by the high speeches of the Logo-Dae- dalon, i.e. wordsmiths, have valued some doctrines (even after warning) so highly that they were nothing but polished words. And thus the seriousness to live piously and innocently was abandoned. And innumerable word-fighters have become, and a small number are those who do or suffer for the sake of righteousness (which is God); but for the sake of quarrels or gain, whether of good or name, we are prepared to do and suffer much. That is why we are so full of cruel deeds: for our speeches are now great and cruel, and in deed little brave. But bravery (as Seneca also teaches) is not doing cruel things, but holy, pious goodness for common peace and life. The feminine way, however, has come to us only from the poem of high words, and all talk highly and beautifully; and if one wants to see how brave we are with the deed Christians, we lie in the muck. We may not expect any danger, even harm, for the sake of God and our neighbor, but he has absolved us of his death with a board of directors. 2) In short, if we should become angels with life in the gospel, we become devils with quarrels and disputes.

124. And to this harm hardly a thing serves (I speak to God without contestation!), neither flesh and blood in the night meal and thanksgiving of Christ protect. For most of those who (after the manner of the prophets) should go to the highest princes and report their vices to them (with which some of them are so surrounded that it is seen that their home is with them), have not yet procured anything else from them, except that they are more ungracious toward the poor, more splendid with themselves, and stand forth, wanting to protect the flesh and blood; Let them then be said to be Christian princes, if they have brought the seducing teachers to forsake the true services of God, mercy, righteousness, and faith, and to protect the delusion, which no man ever believed, by killing the pious.

Therefore also here, pious princes, be admonished for God's sake, do not let yourselves be stirred up against the truth. Truly, truly, your scholars should not forbid you to hear or read this or that opinion, if it is still in the beginning of the unchallenged things; but since Carolstat first broke forth, they have graciously said to you: Do not argue and do not hurry,

learn the truth; it behooves even a sinner in church to speak where a thing is dark.

Now the whole of Germany sees what is at stake, and the lords (who are like the gospel otherwise) are regarded as if they were gilders. It all comes from the fact that we think Christ is worshipped by eating his flesh, because of the seduction of those who teach such things out of the fear of lavish honor and the fear of harm. And Christ Joh. 17. thus says: "Father, I ask you for their sake, I will not now be in the world, but they are in the world" 2c. What else is this said, neither that he will no longer be here in the flesh? For what would have been the point of the visions, if he had only taken them away from us? would he therefore not have been bodily in the world?

If one reads the aforementioned chapter more closely, one will learn where it lies; and one should strive to be God-fearing, not God-talking; to put on Christ, not to eat; to bear the fruits of heavenly righteousness and innocence from within, not to make something internal by eating the flesh of Christ. May God give us poor people the sweet clarity of His Word and refreshment of our souls, that we may desire to live according to God! Amen.

In order that the simple-minded, who do not soon see what is in high gossip, may be less deceived, I will show three points in which Strauss and his part proceed, 3) because they do not have God's word.

I. The body of Christ is eaten here bodily, but invisibly, and Christ is here bodily, but invisibly, they speak not only without, but against God's word and against the article of faith.

II. the body of Christ, eaten in the flesh, fortifies the faith, gives the essential that one preaches and believes, they speak without God's word.

III Jacob teaches how to anoint the sick and to pray for them. Now where the apostles of Fortress would have believed in the bodily eating of the body of Christ, as they pretend, Jacob would have said before all things: Bring him the bread of the supper. For one needs the fortress of faith most of all in danger of death. God grant mercy!

4)

1) i.e. something.

2) i.e. redeemed.

3) i.e., have taken the wrong path.

4) Walch: Printed at Zurich by Christoffel Froschover in the Weingarten, in the year as you count M. D. and XXVII. 8vo 6 sheets.

6. Zwingli's Augsburg Confession.

27 Ulrich Zwingli's Confession of Faith, which he had presented to the Roman Emperor at the Imperial Diet held in Augsburg in 1530. *)

July 3, 1530.

Translated into German by M Aug Tittel.

We have waited, most just Emperor Charles, with desire that also we, who preach the gospel in the cities of the Christian community and cantons, would be required to confess the faith that we have and recognize. And since we keep ourselves so calm, we hear, more by uncertain rumor than certain message, that many have already written a sum or content of faith and religion, which they wanted to hand over to you. So we know neither advice nor help; for on the one hand, the love of truth and common peace drive us to do what we see others doing; On the other hand, the fleeting opportunity makes us anxious, both because, due to your alacrity, of which we have also heard the rumor, everything would have to be done quickly and immediately, and because we, who are preachers in the towns and villages of said cantons, are too far away and remote to be able to come together in such a short time and discuss what might be necessary to write to Your Highness. Since we have now seen other confessions, and even refutations of the very same opponents, who seem to have been ready before anything was demanded of them, I thought it would now be time for me to make my confession of faith [for] myself alone, but without detriment to my countrymen. For where otherwise it has been slow to proceed, it has at least been necessary to hasten in this, lest, if the bargain were missed, there should be danger either of suspicious silence, or of a

defiant carelessness would fall upon me. I therefore hand over to you, Lord Emperor, my summa of faith, that I at the same time testify that I want to trust and leave the judgment not only of these articles, but also of everything that I will ever write or write with God's help, not to one or a few alone, but to the whole Church of Christ, insofar as it judges according to God's holy Word and His Spirit's government.

(2) First of all, I believe and know that there is one God and that he is by nature good, true, powerful, just, wise, a creator and governor of all things visible and invisible. That the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three persons, but one and simple being. And hold throughout in all things of the Godhead itself and of the three names or persons according to the declaration of both the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. Of the Son I hold and believe that He is flesh, that is, human nature, indeed, the whole man, consisting of body and soul, truly assumed by the immaculate and ever pure Virgin Mary, and in such a way that the same whole man has been assumed into the unity of the independence or person of the Son of God in such a way that the man has not constituted a person of his own, but has been assumed into the inseparable, indivisible and indissoluble person of the Son of God. Although both natures, namely the divine and the human, retain their nature and characteristics in such a way that both are found to be true and natural in him, the particular nature of the Son of God separates them from each other.

*) This writing was written by Zwingli in Latin and appeared, even before it was sent to Augsburg, in print in Zurich under the title: Oarolum Uomnnorum imperntorem, OerMuniae eornitin ^uKustne oelebrmntkM, üäei Hulärwüi L^inZlii ratio. On the third of July, 1530, Zwingli sent a copy of the same to Augsburg. In the same year it was reprinted in Zurich with the Dpistoln aä Ulustrissimos Oermanine Principes in cornitiis ^uAustnnis conAreZutos, in which he defends his confession of faith against an attack by Eck. In Zwingli's works, this writing is found Dorn. II, p. 538. In addition, this writing is appended to Oeolampad's vinloZus wider Melanchthon, Basel 1590, and printed in the "Unterricht von kirchlicher Vereinigung der Protestanten" by Ernst Saloin. Cyprian, Theil 2, p. 1. The authors of the "Historie des Sacramentsstreits" report p. 128 that Zwingli's special confession "was printed in Latin and German at Zurich on July 3, 1530, and soon arrived at Augsburg. Walch, because he could not get the old translation, had the Scripture translated anew. We reproduce this translation.

The fact that the qualities and works of nature do not in any way affect the unity of the person, just as body and soul do not make two separate persons in the human being. For as these are by nature quite distinct, so they also have different qualities and effects. The human being, however, who consists of them, is therefore only one, but not two persons. Thus God and man are One Christ. Son of God from eternity; Son of man from the order of time in eternity: One Person, One Christ, perfect God, perfect man; not that one nature becomes the other, or is mixed under itself, but that each remains its own and only the unity of the person is not separated by such quality. Accordingly it happens that after the human nature the same some Christ whimpers as a child. He grows, increases in wisdom, hungers, thirsts, eats, drinks, has heat, freezes, suffers pranks, sweats, is wounded and killed, is afraid, becomes sad, and suffers more such things, which belong to the punishment and chastisement because of sin, although he remains far away from sin itself. But according to the divine nature, together with his Father, he rules heaven and earth, penetrates everything, sustains and carries it; he makes the blind see, the lame walk, the dead live, he terrifies and strikes down the enemies with one word, even when he has died, he comes to life again, goes to heaven, sends down the Holy Spirit from there; so that all this is done by the same one Christ, although in a different way and nature, and remains in one person of the Son of God. In the same way, what is merely of the divine nature is sometimes attributed to the human nature because of the unity and perfection of the person, and what is human is sometimes said to be of the divine nature. He said that the Son of man was in heaven at the time when he had not yet touched or entered heaven with his body. And Peter says that Christ suffered for us, since mankind can only suffer. But because of the unity of the person, it is rightly said that the Son of God suffered and the Son of Man forgave sin; for he who is both the Son of God and the Son of Man in one person suffered according to human nature, and he who is the Son of God and the Son of Man in one person forgives sin according to divine nature. As we say that man is wise, although he consists of both body and soul, and the body has nothing at all to do with wisdom, indeed, is poison and hindrance to wisdom and understanding. Again, it is also said of him that he is wounded, since the body alone can receive wounds which

But soul by no means. Here no one says that two persons become from the human being, if each part is assigned its own. Nor does anyone say that the natures are mixed, if that is said of the whole man, which belongs to the whole (being) because of the unity of the person, but because of the properties of the natures is only one of them. Paul says, "When I am sick [weak], then I am strong." But who is it that is sick? Answer: Paul. Who is healthy (and strong) at the same time? Paul. But doesn't that sound unequal, contrary and self-contradictory? Not at all. For Paul is not one nature, though one person. Now when he says, "I am sick," it is true that the person who is Paul is speaking; but what is said does not refer to both natures, but only to weakness of the flesh. And when he says, "I am strong and healthy," it is certainly Paul's person speaking, but only the soul and his spirit are meant. In this way also the Son of God dies, namely he who is God and man at the same time according to the one and simple person; but he dies only according to humanity alone.

3. in this way I do not believe alone, but all the old orthodox teachers, as well as the new ones, have believed in this way about the Godhead and the persons and the assumed nature; and all who know the truth are still of this mind.

4. secondly, I know that the supreme being, who is my God, decides freely about all things, so that he does not rely and depend with his counsel on any creature opportunity; for this is the characteristic of lame human wisdom, that it decides something by a previous consideration or example. But God, who overlooks everything from eternity to eternity with a single and simple glance, does not need any reasoning or consideration at all, or that something has happened beforehand (to act according to it), but as an always equally wise, prudent, kind 2c. Being he decides freely about all things, because his is everything that is there. Hence it came about that, although he created the man who would fall with knowledge and good consideration, he also thereby decided to clothe his Son with human nature, that he raised up the fallen one. For thereby his goodness was revealed in all things. Inasmuch as it carries with it both mercy and justice, and therefore made justice manifest, since, when he sinned, it drove him out of the blessed dwelling of paradise, and put him into the dungeon of human misery and the bondage of toil and sickness, and with the

He was not only in the midst of a double misery, but also in the midst of the fear of the transgressed law. For here he learned in double misery not only that the flesh would be in misery, but also that the mind would be afflicted with the fear of the transgressed law. For since he saw in the spirit that the law was holy, just and a message of the divine will, because it required nothing but what was in accordance with equity, but at the same time he also became aware that he was not fulfilling the law with works, he condemned himself, gave up all hope of attaining salvation, and fled from God's presence in despair, thinking only of how he would endure eternal torment. Thus, the justice of God was revealed. But since it was also necessary to reveal the goodness that He had decided from eternity to show as well as the justice, God sent His Son to accept our nature in all things, except in so far as it is inclined to sin, that he might become a mediator as a brother and equal to us in all things, who would be sufficient for us to the divine justice, which had to remain completely holy and unbreakable, just like his goodness, so that the world would be assured that justice was reconciled and that God's goodness was present. For since he gave his Son to us and for us, how should he not give us everything with him and for his sake? What should we not hope for from him who condescended so far that he not only became like us, but also ours? Who could admire enough the riches of divine goodness and grace, since he so loved the world that he gave his Son for its life? I consider this to be the right source and streams of the Gospel, the only remedy and strengthening of the languishing soul, by which it is brought back to God and to itself; for nothing can make him certain of God's grace but God Himself. But He has poured out such grace upon us so mildly, abundantly, and wisely that we can desire nothing more than the highest and overflowing abundance.

Thirdly, I know that there is no other sacrifice to atone for sin than Christ, for even Paul was not crucified for us, and that there is no more certain and undoubted sign of divine goodness and mercy than the same; for nothing is so certain as God. And there is no other name under the sun whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ.

(6) Thus are set aside here both the justification of our own works and satisfaction, and that of all the saints who may be in heaven.

or earth, their satisfaction or intercession, to procure the goodness and grace of God. For this is the only mediator of God and men, namely the God-Man, Christ Jesus. But God's choice remains firm and unchanged. For those whom he chose before the foundation of the world was laid, he so chose that he united them to himself through his Son. For as he is merciful and kind, so he is also holy and just; thus all his works contain mercy and justice. Therefore also the election of the same has in itself. This is goodness, that he chooses those whom he wills; and this is righteousness, that he unites and binds the elect to himself through his Son, who became a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice for us.

Fourthly, I know that our forefather, the first man, out of self-love, since the devil had wronged him out of envy, fell so far as to want to become like God. Since he decided to commit such a sin, he ate the forbidden and harmful apple, thereby deserving death as an enemy and insulter of God. Since God was able to destroy him according to all law, He, out of kindness, changed the punishment into a state and made him a servant whom He could have executed. Neither he nor anyone born of him could change this status (because no servant can beget anything other than servants), and consequently the entire descendants fell into servitude through this harmful food. Here is my opinion of original sin: it is rightly called sin because it is against the law; 1) for where there is no law, there is no transgression, and where there is no transgression, there is no sin in the true sense, inasmuch as sin is vice, evil, crime and debt.

(8) I therefore confess that our father sinned in the right sense, that he committed an evil, wickedness and wrong. But those who are descended from him have not sinned in the same way; for which of us in paradise reached for the forbidden apple and ate it with his teeth? Must we therefore admit, even without our will, that original sin, as it is in Adam's children, is not really sin, as has already been shown; for it is not a deed contrary to the law.

1) This sentence seems to us to be erroneous, and it cannot be brought into agreement with what is said in the following paragraph. We suppose that it should be read: "it is not rightly called sin, because it is not contrary to the law. For Zwingli also teaches in other places (as in the following) that original sin is only "an infirmity" (Prest).

the law. It is actually only a disease (infirmity) and state. A disease, because, as he fell out of self-love, we also fall in the same way. A state, because, as he became a servant and guilty of death, so we are also born as servants and children of wrath and consequently are subject to death. Although I do not deny that such a disease and state, according to Paul, is called sin, yes, such a sin that all who are born in it are God's enemies and adversaries; for the state of their birth brings them to this, not the actual act of wickedness, insofar as the first man once committed such. Is therefore the wrong and sin committed by Adam the true cause of the divine insult and death? And this is truly sin. But the sin that is attached to us is also truly a plague and state, or necessity to die. But this would not have happened according to birth, if sin had not corrupted birth; thus human misery comes from sin as a cause, but not from birth. From birth, however, not unlike something that flows from the source and cause.

This opinion is confirmed by testimony and example. Paul, Rom. 5, speaks thus: "For if death has prevailed through one for one sin, rather" 2c. Here we see that sin is actually taken away. For it is Adam alone through whose guilt death hangs over our necks. In the 3rd chapter he thus speaks: "For all have sinned and lack glory", that is, the goodness and grace of God. Here sin is taken for sickness, state and birth, so that it is said of us that we all sin even before we are born, that is, that we are in the state of sin and death even before we really sin. Which opinion is quite irrefutably confirmed by the very same words of Rom. 5, thus: "But death reigned and prevailed from Adam to Moses, even to them that sinned not in like manner as Adam transgressed." Behold, we have death, though we have not sinned in the manner of Adam. Why? Answer: Because he sinned. But why does death come upon us, who have not sinned in the same way? Answer: Because he died because of sin, and thus begat us dead, that is, condemned to death. So we also die, but through his fault, only according to our state and sickness, or sin, if it is taken in the unqualified sense. Now I will also give an example: A prisoner in war has, through disloyalty and enmity,

deserves to be kept as a servant. Now those who are born of him, as members of the household or those born at home, become bond servants; not through their guilt, crimes and misdeeds, but through the state that is descended from guilt. For the father from whom they were born deserved it through his guilt. The children are without guilt, but not without the punishment and penance of guilt, namely, serfdom, servitude and penitentiary. If one wants to call this misdeed (or sin), it must be because one suffers it for the sake of no actual sin.

(10) This original sin, I further believe, is inherent in all men by the natural pestilence and estate, which are derived from the lust of man and woman. And I know that we are children of wrath; but by grace, which through the other Adam, Christ, has helped our fall, we are undoubtedly made and accepted again as children of God. But this in the following way.

(11) Fifthly, it is evident from this that if in Christ, the other Adam, we are brought to life again, as Adam's, the first man's, fall brought us to death, we wrongfully condemn the children of Christian parents. For if Adam by sinning corrupted the whole human race, but Christ by dying did not redeem the whole race from the harm done by him and make it alive again: so the salvation obtained by Christ is not equal to corruption, and so (which God forbid!) wrong (what Paul says): "As in Adam we all die, even so in Christ shall we all be made alive again." But be it as it may with the children of the Gentiles, we assert this, because of the power of the salvation acquired through Christ, that those judge falsely who condemn them to eternal damnation, both because of said redemption and because of the free election of God, which does not follow faith, but precedes it; of which in the following article. For those who are chosen from eternity are necessarily chosen before faith. Therefore, those who do not yet have faith by age must not be condemned by us so quickly; for even if they do not have it, God's election is still hidden from us. Which, if he has chosen them, we judge too soon from what we do not know.

(12) But of the children of Christians we say another thing, namely, that the children of Christians, as many as they are, belong to the church of God's people, and are parts and members of the same church. Which we thus prove: It is almost through all

The prophets promise that the church will be gathered from the Gentiles to the church of the people of God. And Christ himself says: "They will come from morning and evening, and sit at the table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Likewise, "Go ye into all the world" 2c. But to the Jewish church also belonged their children as well as the Jews themselves. Therefore, our children also belong to the church of Christ, as well as to the Jews themselves; for if it were otherwise, the promise would be null and void, for we would not sit at the table with God as Abraham did. For he also was reckoned to the church with those who were also born of him according to the flesh. But if ours were not so reckoned with the parents, Christ would be meager and envious toward us, since he denied us what he gave to the ancients. But this is ungodly to say, for then the whole promise of the prophets concerning the calling of the Gentiles would come to nothing. Since the children of Christians belong to the visible church of Christ as well as the adults, it is also clear that they belong to the number of those whom we call the elect as well as the parents. Therefore I believe that those act presumptuously and ungodly who curse the children of Christians. For so many clear testimonies of Scripture are against this, and say that the church of the Gentiles will not only be equal to the Jewish church, but will be much greater. All of which will now become clearer when we present our faith in the church. (13) Sixthly, we hold of the church in this way: that the church is taken in Scripture in various ways; a.) from the elect, who are ordained by God's will to eternal life, of which Paul speaks when he says: "It has neither wrinkle nor spot," Eph. 5. This is known to God alone, for He alone knows, as Solomon says, the hearts of the children of men (1 Kings 8). However, those who are members of this church know well that they themselves, because they have faith, are the chosen and most distinguished members of such a church; but other members than they do not know it. For thus it is written in the Acts of the Apostles, "And as many as were ordained unto eternal life believed." Now those who believe are ordained to eternal life. But those who truly believe know no one but the one who believes, for he is already certain that he is God's chosen one; for he has the pledge of the Spirit, according to the word of the apostle, by which he is betrothed and sealed, and thus knows that he has been set free and has become a child, but is no longer a servant. For the same Spirit cannot deceive. If then he says to us that God is our Father, and that

we call him Father with all confidence, and are reconciled that we shall inherit eternity: then it is certain that the Spirit of the Son of God has been poured into our hearts. It is therefore certain that he is chosen who is confident and secure in this way, for those who believe have been ordained to eternal life.

(14) But since many are chosen who do not have faith; for the Holy Mother of God, John, Paul, when they were children and little ones, were they not chosen from the beginning of the world? But they knew it neither from faith nor from revelation. Likewise Matthew, Zacchaeus, the thief, and Magdalene, were they not chosen before the world began? And yet they did not know it until they were enlightened by the Spirit and drawn to Christ by the Father. Thus it is concluded that the same first church is known to God alone, and that only those who have a certain and unaltered faith know that they are members of this church.

15. b) But the church is also taken to mean all those who are called by Christ's name, that is, those who are called Christians, many of whom recognize Christ outwardly through confession and the communion of the sacraments, but do not respect or know him in their hearts. To this church we count all who confess Christ's name. Thus Judas was of the church of Christ, and all those who afterwards departed from Christ. For the apostle counts Judas as belonging to the church of Christ as well as Peter or John, since he was nothing less than a member of it. But Christ knew who were his own and who were of the devil. This, then, is the outward church, even though it does not come together (or is not united) in this world, namely, all who confess Christ, although there are many reprobates among them. For Christ delicately portrayed it in the likeness of the ten virgins, some of whom were wise and others foolish. For she is sometimes called elect, though she be not the first that hath neither spot nor wrinkle: but as she is a church of God according to the opinion of the people, according to the outward confession, so is she called elect, because we hold them to be faithful and elect which call themselves after Christ. Thus Peter said, "To the elect," he says, "who are in various places in Ponto," 2c., where by the elect he understands all who belonged to the churches to which he wrote, not only those who were actually chosen by the Lord; for as Peter did not know such, he could not have written to them.

16. c) At last, the church is also used for a

Each separate cluster of this general and external church is taken as the Roman, Augsburg, and Lyonian churches.

(17) But there are other meanings of the church, which it is unnecessary to mention now. Now here I believe that one church is those who have one spirit, so that they are assured that they are true children of God; these are the firstfruits of the church. This may not err in faith, namely in the first reasons of faith, on which the main work consists. I also believe that a general external one is, if it holds to the confession of which we have already said. I also believe that those belong to the Church who profess it according to the precept and promise of the Word of God. I believe that the children of Isaac, Jacob, Judah, and all who were of Abraham's seed, as well as the children whose parents became Christians at the beginning of the church, at the time of the apostles' preaching, belong to such a church. For if Isaac and the rest of the ancients had not belonged to it, they would not have had the sign of the church. Since they were of the church, the children and infants of the first church were also of it. Therefore I believe and am sure that they are also marked with the sacrament of baptism. For even children make their confession when they are presented to the church by their parents, yes, when they present the promise, which is so abundantly made to our children, yes, more abundantly and more often than to the old children of the Hebrews.

(18) And these are the reasons why children should be baptized and given to the church, against which all the arrows and armor of the Anabaptists are useless. For not only those who believe are to be baptized, but also those who confess, who belong to the church according to the promise of the word of God. Otherwise no apostle would baptize anyone, since no apostle knows for sure whether the one who professes to belong to the church has faith. For Simon the Magician, Ananias, Judas and who else is not baptized, since he outwardly professed Christianity, even though he did not believe. Isaac, on the other hand, was circumcised as a child, since he neither professed nor believed, but the promise drew him to the church. Therefore, since our children are as good as the Hebrew's, the promise also gives the name to our church and confesses (for them). Does baptism as well as circumcision (but we are talking about the sacrament of baptism) really require nothing but one of the two, either confession or outward accession, or the covenant and promise. All of which will become clearer from the following.

Seventh, I believe and know that all sacraments do not confer grace at all, that they do not even extend or withhold it. In this I might seem to you, most great emperor, to be all too freely excusing myself. But it remains so. For grace is wrought and given by the Holy Spirit (but I speak in Latin when I use the word grace, and understand it to mean pardon, kindness, and benevolence without merit or reward), and therefore this gift belongs to the Spirit alone. The Spirit, however, does not need an escort or a chariot, for he himself is the power and the carriage by which everything is led, and does not need to be led; nor do we ever read in sacred Scripture that external things, such as the sacraments, certainly bring the Spirit with them, but if external things have ever come with the Spirit, it was the Spirit who brought it, not the external things. So when a violent wind came, the languages came with it by the power of the wind, but the wind was not carried by the power of the languages. Thus the wind brought quails, and carried away the locusts; but never were quails or locusts so sufficient and fleeting as to bring the wind. So, since such a great wind, that it could also carry away mountains, passed by Elijah, yet the Lord was not in the wind. In short: "The spirit (wind) blows where it will", that is, blows in such a way as it is its kind, "and you hear its voice, but you do not know where it comes from and where it becomes still. So is every one that is born of the Spirit"; that is, is enlightened and drawn in an invisible and unnoticed way. Truth has spoken this; therefore, is not the grace of the Spirit brought about by this immersion or that potion or anointing; for if it were, one would know how, where, whither, or upon what the Spirit came. For if the presence and power of grace is bound to the sacraments, they work where they are brought; and where they do not come, everything becomes dull and miserable. And here theologians do not have to talk about the matter or person who receives them, that such must be in good condition, that is, that the grace of baptism or the Lord's Supper (so they say) is given to him who is first sent to it. For he who receives such grace through the sacraments (as they will) either makes himself fit for it, or is prepared by the Spirit. If he does it himself, we are also able to do something by ourselves, and the grace that occurs is nothing. But if he is prepared by the Spirit for the reception of grace, I ask: whether it also happens under

the guidance of a sacrament, or apart from the sacrament? Where it happens by means of a sacrament, man is prepared for the sacrament through the sacrament, and this will always go on indefinitely, so that a sacrament is always necessary for the preparation of the sacrament. But where he is prepared for the reception of the sacramental grace without the sacrament, the spirit with its grace is also present before the sacrament, and thus grace has happened and is present before the sacrament comes. From this the conclusion is drawn (which I readily admit and permit in the sacramental trade) that the sacraments are given as a public testimony to that grace which is already present in each individual person beforehand. Thus baptism is given before or in the presence of the church to those who, before receiving it, have already confessed the Christian religion, or have the word of promise, by which it is known that they belong to the church. Therefore, when we baptize an adult, we ask if he believes. If he says, "Yes," then he receives baptism. But when a child is presented, we ask: do the parents present it for baptism? And if they answer by witnesses: they want it to be baptized, then the child is baptized. And here God's promise has gone before, that he will count our children to the church as well as the children of the Hebrews. For when those who are of the church present it, the child is baptized, with the condition that, because it is born of Christians, it is counted among the members of the church by divine promise. Thus, through baptism, the Church receives the one who is first received by grace. Therefore, baptism does not bring grace, but only testifies to the Church that the one to whom it is given has already received it.

(20) I therefore believe, Lord Emperor, that the sacrament is a sign of a holy thing, namely, of the grace that has taken place. I believe that it is a visible form or image of the invisible grace, which was given and bestowed out of God's benevolence, that is, a visible example, which is quite similar to the thing done by the Spirit; in short, that it is a public testimony. For example, when we are baptized, the body is washed with the purest element (or earthly substance), but this also indicates that (such people) are accepted by the grace of divine goodness into the community of the church and the people of God, in which one must live purely and innocently. Thus Paul explains the mystery in Romans 6, testifying to the one who receives baptism that he is a member of the Church of God.

who serves their Lord by healthy faith and holy life. And for this reason the sacraments must be held in great honor as holy ceremonies (for the word comes to the element and then becomes a sacrament), so that they are held in high esteem and treated honorably. For even if they do not give or confer grace, they still visibly add us to the church, which before we were only invisibly received into it; which, if it is proclaimed and made known at the same time as the divine words of promise, must be accompanied and venerated with the greatest devotion. But if we think otherwise of the sacraments, as if they, when used outwardly, purified inwardly, there is already a new Judaism, according to which it was believed that sins were atoned for by anointing, smearing, offering, eating, and the like, and that grace was, as it were, purchased. Which the prophets, and especially Isaiah and Jeremiah, have always rebuked, and taught that the promises and benefits of God are bestowed by pure grace, and not because of any merit or outward ceremonies. For I hold that the Anabaptists, when they deny baptism to the children of believers, are terribly mistaken, and in many other things as well as in this; but now is not the time to speak of them. But I, by God's help, have first taught and written against them, not without danger, that one should avoid their foolishness or wickedness, so that. Thank God! their pestilence among our people has abated very much. So I have been far from accepting, teaching and claiming the slightest thing from this rebellious mob.

Eighth, I believe that in the holy supper, that is, the thanksgiving supper, the true body of Christ is present in the vision of faith, that is, that those who give thanks to the Lord for the benefit shown to us in his Son recognize him in this way, that he truly took on flesh, truly suffered in it, truly washed away our sins with his blood, and thus everything that Christ did is, as it were, presented to them through the eyes of faith.

22) But that Christ's body is essentially and really, namely the natural body itself, either present in the Lord's Supper or chewed and eaten with the teeth, as the Popes, and some who look back to the Egyptian fleshpots, have pretended: we not only deny this, but also constantly hold it to be an error in conflict with God's word. Which, with God's help, I have told Your Majesty, Mr. Emperor,

in a few as clear as the sun is in the sky. And that a) with sayings of the holy scripture; b) afterwards with conclusions from the same, which I want to let loose like storm goats against the adversaries; c) finally with attraction of old divine teachers, who have also been on our side.

23 But You, Creator Holy Spirit, help us and enlighten the minds of Your people. Fill the hearts you have created with grace and light! Christ Himself, a) God's mouth and wisdom, therefore speaks aa): "You will always have the poor with you, but you will not always have me" (John 13). Here it is only denied that he will not be present with your body, because according to the Godhead he is present everywhere, because there he is everywhere at all times, as another saying testifies: "I am with you until the end of the world", namely according to the Godhead, power and grace. Augustine agrees with us. And the opponents must not object: the humanity of Christ is everywhere where the divinity is, otherwise the person would be torn apart. For in this way the true humanity of Christ would rather perish, for nothing but God can be everywhere. And the fact that mankind is in one place, but the Godhead everywhere, separates the person as little as it separates the unity of the essence that the Son assumed mankind. Indeed, it would be more necessary to separate such unity of essence by the fact that one person accepts the creature, which the other [persons] do not accept, than that the person should be separated by this; for mankind is in one place, but the Godhead is in all. For We also see that among the creatures there are bodies which are bound to one place, but whose power and authority extend very far. We have the example of the sun, whose body is in one place, but whose power travels everywhere. The human soul travels above the stars and into the lowest world, and yet the body remains in one place.

24. dd) Again he says: "Again I leave the world and go to the Father." Here the word "leave" is written, as above "have", that the opponents must not say: We have him not visibly. For when he speaks of visibly taking away his body, he thus speaks, "Over a little, ye shall not see me." And would it come out great if one wanted to argue that his natural body was present, but invisible. For why should he not be seen who would be present, since he showed himself to his disciples so often after the resurrection? "But it is good for you," he says, "that I go." If

But if he remained here, it would not be good that he should not be seen. For as often as the disciples fell into error at the sight of him, he evidently showed himself that neither the senses nor the thoughts were deceived. "Take hold of me and feel me," he says. Likewise: "Do not be afraid, it is I." And: "Mary, do not touch me" 2c.

25. cc) When at his going he commanded the disciples to the Father, he said, "I shall henceforth be no more in the world," *χαί ύχ ει* etc., here the *verbum substantivum* is: "I am henceforth no more in the world," as in these words: "this is my body," so that the adversaries cannot say here either that it is a vague speech (or word-form), since they deny that in *substantivis* such a thing takes place. Although we do not need this here either, for it follows: "But these are in the world" (John 17). This contrast shows that he would not be in the world at that time, according to human nature, if the disciples were in it.

26. dd) And that we know when he departed, not, as they more clear than declare, made himself invisible, so Lucas saith, "And it came to pass, when he departed from them, that he departed from them, and was received up into heaven." He does not speak: he disappeared 2c., or: made himself invisible.

27. of which Marcus thus says: "The Lord, after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God. He does not say: He stayed here, but made his body invisible. Likewise Lucas says in the Acts of the Apostles, "When he had said these things, he was lifted up and taken away in their sight; but a cloud took him away from before their eyes." The cloud covered him, which it would not have needed if he had only withdrawn his sight from them, but had otherwise been present. Nor would he have needed to be lifted up and moved away.

28 There it is written: "This Jesus, who was taken up into heaven before you, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven. What is clearer than this? "Before you," he says, "he was taken up." So then he has not been with them, either visibly or invisibly, according to human nature. When we shall see him come again, as he went, we shall know that he is there. Otherwise, according to human nature, he sits at the right hand of God the Father until he comes again to judge the living and the dead.

29) But there are some who deny the place of the body of Christ, saying that it is in no place.

place, let them see how they shut their eyes to the truth. He is in the manger, on the cross, at Jerusalem, where the parents were on the way, in the tomb, apart from the tomb, as the angel says, "He is risen, and is not here; behold the place where they laid him." And lest they should say that his body is everywhere, let them hear what follows: "Jesus came when the doors were shut, and stood in the midst of them." What would he have needed to come if his body had been there before, yes! invisibly present everywhere? It would have been enough that he had not come, but, because he was already there, had only shown himself. But away with such lying gossip, by which the truth of Christ's humanity and of the Holy Scriptures is destroyed!

(30) These testimonies prove that the body of Christ is not present everywhere except in heaven, if one speaks in a canonical way, that is, as much as the Scriptures teach us about the nature and quality of the assumed body, and as much as self-contradictory things enforce, since we would never have to twist and exalt the power of God, no matter how great we imagine it to be, in such a way that we would have to believe that God does something contrary to His word. For that would be more powerlessness than power.

31) But that the natural body of Christ is not eaten with our mouth, he himself shows, when he says to the Jews, who disputed about his bodily food, "the flesh is of no use," to indicate that it does not serve for natural food, but for spiritual food, because it gives life.

32. that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. If therefore the natural body of Christ is eaten with our mouths, what else can naturally eaten flesh become but flesh again? And that this conclusion may thin no man small, we may hear but the other piece: "That which is born of the spirit is spirit." So then, what is spirit is born of the spirit. Now if the flesh of Christ is wholesome to the soul, it must be enjoyed spiritually and not bodily. And this also belongs to the matter of the sacraments, that the spirit is begotten of the spirit, but not by anything corporeal, as we have already touched.

33) Paul dd) also remembers that even though he once knew Christ according to the flesh, he no longer knows Him according to the flesh.

34 By such passages we are forced to confess that the words "this is my body" are not natural but significant.

as the: "This is the passover" (or paschal lamb), was to be understood. For the lamb, eaten annually, with the celebration of the feast itself, was not the passage (or pre-passage), but only meant that such a passing or leaping had happened. In addition, there is also the succession, namely that the Lord's Supper followed the paschal lamb, so that Christ would certainly have used the same words; for such a succession is of one kind. In addition, the words are used in the same way; likewise, the time when in the Lord's Supper first the old Lord's Supper is mentioned and then the new thanksgiving (or thanksgiving meal) is instituted. In addition, there are all the memorials 1) property, which tend to be called after the thing that they mention or bring back to mind. Thus the Athenians called σεσάχ&εαν; (?) not that all the The reason for this is that Solon's debts were paid off every year, but because what Solon did was always celebrated; and they called such celebrations after the thing itself; so it is also called Christ's body and blood, which are signs of the true body (and blood).

35. d) Now follow the conclusions, aa) As the body cannot be nourished by a spiritual thing, so also the soul cannot be nourished with something physical. But if the natural body of Christ is eaten, I ask: does he feed the body or the soul? Answer: He does not feed the body, but the soul; if the soul, then the soul eats flesh, and so this would not be true, that the spirit is born only of the spirit.

36. bb) Secondly, I ask this: what does the naturally consumed body of Christ do? If forgiveness of sins, as one part says, then the disciples have already received forgiveness of sins in the Lord's Supper, consequently Christ died in vain afterwards. If it presents the power of Christ's suffering through eating, as the same part says, then the power of Christ's suffering and redemption has been shared before these come to pass. If it is eaten for the resurrection, as another even unlearned one claims, it will rather heal our body and save it from diseases. But Irenaeus wants it in another way, how our body is fed by the body of Christ to the resurrection, because he wants to show that our hope of the resurrection is strengthened. Ei! of the beautiful efflorescence!

37. oo) So also, if Christ's natural body was given to the disciples in the Lord's Supper, it must necessarily follow that it is eaten as he was at that time. But at that time he was suffering.

1) In the margin: xxxxxxx, the memories, commemorative sign.

If they say that they ate the same body, but not as it was wounded, but just as it was after the resurrection, we object: either he had two bodies, one that had not yet been transfigured and another that had already been transfigured, or one and the same body was both corporeal and incorporeal at the same time. And so, since he was so afraid of death, he did not want to suffer, but to use the gift of the body, so that he did not feel pain. Thus, he did not really suffer, but only in appearance, so that Marcion is brought back to us by our opponents in a very fine way. One could draw many hundred other conclusions, dear Mr. Kaiser, but these may be enough for this time.

38. o) But that the ancients (which is the last part of this article) believed the same with us, I will prove with two witnesses, which are probably the most distinguished among the others.

39 Ambrose, speaking about 1 Cor. and the words: "You shall proclaim the death of the Lord", says: "Because we are saved by the death of the Lord, we remember it and aim with food and drink at the body and the blood that was sacrificed for us". 2c. But Ambrose speaks of the food and drink of the Lord's Supper, and pretends that we mean by it the true things which have been sacrificed for us.

40 Similarly, Augustino, tract. 30. in John asserts "that the body of Christ, raised from the dead, must be in one place," since in the printed copies it says "may" instead of "must," but quite wrongly, for one reads both in the *Magistro sententiarum* and in the canonical decrees where such a passage is referred to Augustini.

41 From this we must clearly see that the ancients understood it not of the natural eating of the body of Christ, but of the spiritual, they may otherwise speak so gloriously of the Lord's Supper. For since they knew that Christ's body must be in one place, and that it was at the right hand of God, they did not pull it down to give it to be chewed with the rotten teeth of men.

42. the same Augustine has also *Wider Adimantum* Cap. 12. the following three things: The blood is the soul; that is my body; and the rock was Christ, significantly, that is how he

a sign and a way of meaning. And among many others he finally comes to these words: I can also interpret that such a commandment is a sign. For the Lord had no hesitation in saying: 'This is my body' when he gave the sign of his body." So far Augustine.

(43) There then is the key by which we may unlock all the Old Ones' speeches about the Lord's Supper. He says that what was called "body" was merely the sign of the body. So let those who want to heresy us go and reproach us, but at the same time know that they condemn the highest theologian, *Wider der Pabste Decrete*.

44 From this it is evident that the ancients always spoke meaningfully when they spoke of the body of Christ being eaten in the Lord's Supper, namely, not that sacramental food could purify the soul, but faith in God through Jesus Christ, which is the spiritual food, of which the outward food is only an image and shadow. And as bread sustains the body, and wine strengthens and gladdens it, so (such food) makes the mind certain and firm of the mercy of God in giving us His Son. Thus it comforts the mind that the sins which offended it are blotted out by his blood.

45 With these passages we want to be satisfied this time, whether one could write out whole books to explain and prove that the ancients were of our opinion. And no one must be mistaken by the recently published writing of the opinion of the ancients, which he promises to assert with explicit words 8oi1. For we will soon see the refutation of it by our highly learned brother *Oecolampadii's* work, who has especially set himself to defend the ancients' opinion. But what is still required to explain these matters further or to refute the opponents, we, who are of this opinion, have already sufficiently explained and accomplished in many writings addressed to different ones.

46. d) I believe that ceremonies which neither come from superstition nor are contrary to the word of God (although I do not know whether such things are to be found) can be tolerated out of love until he, the morning star, rises more and more; but at the same time I also believe, as love teaches me, that such ceremonies are to be abolished if it can be done without great annoyance, whether those argue against it who are peacefully minded. For Christ did not forbid the Magdalene to perform her

1) "zwo" is wrong here. Because "zween" is used masculine, "zwo" feminine, "zwei" neuter.

The ointment was to be poured out, although Jude's avarice and disloyalty prevented them with great clamor.

(47) I do not count the images that are displayed for worship among the ceremonies, but among the things that clearly conflict with God's word. But those that are not displayed for worship, or where there is no danger that they will be worshipped, I do not condemn at all, but rather accept both painting and sculpture as gifts from God.

48 Tenth. I believe that the office of prophecy or preaching is sacred because it is most necessary before all other offices. For if one wants to speak canonically or correctly, we see that the outward preaching of the apostles and evangelists or bishops preceded faith among all peoples, which we attribute to the Spirit alone. For we see, alas, many who hear the outward preaching of the Gospel, but do not believe because they lack the Spirit. Where prophets, that is, preachers of the Word, are sent, it is a sign of God's grace, because he wants to reveal the knowledge of himself to his elect. And to whom such teachers are denied, it is a sign of impending disgrace. 1) As can be inferred from the prophets and Paul's example, who was sometimes called to some, but prevented from going to others and forbidden to do so.

(49) Even the laws and authorities for the administration of the common law cannot be better supported and established than by prophecy. For what is right is commanded in vain if those who are commanded do not observe justice and love equity. For this purpose the minds prepare the prophets as servants, but the spirit as the master, both of the teacher and the hearer. Such kind of people or servants, who teach, comfort, warn, care and watch, we recognize by faith in the people of God. Also those who baptize and in the Lord's Supper carry the body and blood of Christ (for so we also call the holy bread and wine by a change of name); who visit the sick. They feed the poor from church property and in their name; yes, also those who read, interpret and teach publicly, so that either they themselves or others may be sent by it and one day preside over the church. But the kind with high bishop's hats and staffs, which are only there to eat and drink and are a harmful plague of the fields, we recognize to be wrong, and that they

1) Should probably mean: "of the disgraced" i.e. that they are disgraced.

Nothing is better on the body of the church than the goiters and humps or humps on the human body.

Fifty-fifth. I also believe that the lawful authority is in God's stead, as well as the office of prophecy. For as the prophet is a minister of heavenly wisdom and goodness, as one who teaches by faith and brings error to light, so the authorities are ministers of goodness and justice. Goodness, that it may hear the grievances of its own in God's stead with faith and humility and help them for the best. Justice, that it may punish the wicked and protect the innocent. If the prince has such gifts, I believe his conscience has nothing to fear. But if he does not have them, and yet shows himself terrible and fearful, then I believe that his conscience is not free because of this, and has nothing to fear, because he has been rightly chosen and crowned. At the same time, however, I also believe that a Christian must obey such tyrants until the occasion of which Paul speaks: "If thou canst become free, much more must thou do so"; which, however, God alone must show, but not man, and that not in a dark, but in such a tangible and obvious way, as Saul was formerly rejected, but David was chosen as his successor. And because of the womb and duty that one must give up in order to be protected, I certainly agree with Pauli, Rom. 13.

(51) Twelfthly, I believe that the poem of the purgatory is as blasphemous a thing to the gracious redemption given by Christ as it is profitable and profitable to its poets. For if we have to redeem our sins and misdeeds with punishment and chastisement, then Christ will have died in vain, so grace is vain. And what more vain thing can be devised in Christendom? Or what kind of Christ do those have who let themselves be called Christians, and yet are afraid of this fire, which is more a vapor than a fire? But that there is a hell, where the faithless, the disobedient and the apostate are eternally punished with Jxion and Tantalus (in the fables), I believe and am sure of it. For the truth, when it speaks of the general judgment, reports that after such judgment some will go into eternal torment. So after the general judgment there will be an eternal fire.

52 For this reason the Anabaptists are all the less able to get away with their Olam, that is, eternity, which they need for the sake of their error, since they want the eternal not to go beyond the common judgment. For here Chri-

stus From the eternal fire that will burn after judgment, and will torment the devil with all his angels, with the wicked who despise God, with the cruel tyrants who suppress the truth with lies, and do not relieve the poor man's distress from the heart and in faith.

I believe, teach and defend this, as I have now stated it one after the other, not with my own words, but with the words of the holy Scriptures, and I promise that I will do it according to God's will as long as there is breath in me. Unless someone explains and explains the opposite from rightly understood sayings of the holy scriptures as clearly and distinctly as we do what is ours. For to submit ours to God's word and to the church, if it judges according to it in the spirit, we do so willingly and gladly, as it is fair and right. We could have done everything more extensively and abundantly, but since there was no opportunity, we have been satisfied with it and consider it to be things of the kind that can easily be touched, but not overturned, according to today's common way. But if someone wants to say it, he will not hunt much. For then we will fully bring forward and need our remaining rifle. For now, what we have witnessed may be far enough.

54. Therefore, most noble emperor and you other princes, lords, estates, and the envoys and heads of the free imperial cities, I beg and implore you through our Lord and brother Jesus Christ, by his goodness, justice, and judgment, in which he will give to each one according to his merit, before whom all counsel is revealed, who destroys the counsel of the ungodly-minded and evil-ruling princes, who exalts the humble and humbles the proud, that you 1) not spurn the speech of the lowly. For often also fools have said something useful, and the truth itself has often chosen weak and bad people to be proclaimed through it. For all men are liars. And unless they are taught by the Holy Spirit something other than what they themselves know and desire, there is nothing to be hoped for from them but that they will overthrow themselves by their wit and art. For the prophet Jeremiah said perfectly true: "Behold! they reject God's word, what further wisdom can they have?" Therefore, since you are the leaders of righteousness, no one needs more than you to know God's will. And from where can such knowledge come but from His holy Word? Therefore, do not be repelled by their opinions, which refer to God's word. For this is what we generally call upon ourselves.

so that the more the adversaries oppose it, the more it will shine out and the lie will be eradicated. If, however, as I am well aware, some are telling you much about our ignorance and even wickedness, consider also this among yourselves: 2) First, whether we who follow this way of the gospel and the Lord's Supper have led our lives in such a way that anyone could ever doubt whether we are to be counted among honest people? But we do not boast of anything, since Paul himself was also what he was by God's grace. But where a fresh and cheerful life has been given, it has never degenerated into revelry and insolence, nor has it been abused for cruelty, pride or defiance. So that the adversary's attempts, when truncated by the testimony of life, often receded. Scholarship is indeed greater than the enemies can endure or despise without conscience; but it is much less than those who persecute us in the day think. Nevertheless, in order to finally reach our goal, we have been practicing divine and secular sciences for so many years that we do not teach anything without thought.

But it will be granted to us to praise the grace and goodness of God, which He so abundantly shows to our churches. The churches that hear the Lord GOD through us have accepted the word of the Lord in such a way that lies and unfaithfulness are more and more perishing, but hopefulness and indulgence are inhibited, and useless gossip and blasphemy must completely give way. And if these are not true fruits of the Holy Spirit, what are they?

But consider, both of you, most noble emperor, and you princes and estates as a whole, what fruit the larva of the doctrine of men has produced for us. The purchased fairs have increased both the princes' and the mob's arrogance and insolence, introduced and spread the popes' revelry and the messmakers' drunkenness; indeed, what havoc have they not wrought! for who will penetrate the money heaped up by fairs if they are not clogged and strangled in the veins? 1)

57 Therefore, may God, who is much better than all of you together, whom we gladly recognize and praise as very good, destroy this and all other errors from the bottom up, and destroy Rome with its ash heap, which it has imposed on Christendom and especially on Germany.

1) It seems to go on eating and drinking. (Walch.)

and desolate, and that you let all the power, which you have used against the pure gospel, be used against the evil plots of the godless papists, so that righteousness, which has been completely driven out because of your negligence, and innocence, which has been completely darkened with false make-up and a false coat of paint, may appear again among us.

There has been enough raging, so it should not be anything wild and cruel to command, condemn, even murder, kill, rob, burn, and plunder without cause. Since it cannot be done in this way, it will have to be done in another way. If the council is from God, then do not fight against God; but if it comes from somewhere else, then it will perish through its audacity.

Therefore, O children of men, let the word of God sow and spring up freely, you are also as high as you want to be, so that you cannot prevent a grain from sprouting and growing. You can see that this fruit is moistened by the rain from heaven, and that no man's power can destroy it so that it withers. Do not think both of what you would like and of what the world demands in the trade or cause of the gospel. Let this, which I have presented here, please you in the best way, and prove by your actions that you are children of God. Given in Zurich, July 3. In the year 1530.

Your Majesty's and all the faithful's most
submissive
Huldreich Zwingel.

d. of the confession of the four cities.

28. confession of the four cities, Strasbourg, Costnitz, Memmingen and Lindau, in which they declared their faith to imperial majesty at the imperial diet in Augsburg.*)

July 11, 1530.
Translated from Latin by M. Aug. Tittel.

Most Great and at the same time Most Gracious Emperor! Your Majesty has commanded that the estates of the Holy Roman Empire, as much as each of them cares and as much as he would like to contribute to the reassurance of the Church of Christ, should state their opinion of the religion as well as of the errors and vices that have crept in against it, in writing in Latin and German, and submit it to Her for examination and consideration; so that she could then the sooner find ways and means to restore the pure teachings of Christ and to abolish all the errors that have occurred.

This order, which also came from a godly intention and which will undoubtedly be profitable for the church in the future, but which most of all shows the incomparable kindness and grace of Your Imperial Majesty, so that you have already endeared yourself to the whole world, we should most obediently obey. For we have never sought anything else in these matters than that those things be abolished which run counter to the holy Gospels and Christ's commandments, and that we, as well as all other Christians, may preserve his doctrine, which alone is blessed. Therefore, we ask and implore Your Imperial Majesty in the most humble manner that you do so,

*) This writing, which was delivered in 1530 at the Imperial Diet of Augsburg, appeared in 1531 at Strasbourg, and later several times, under the title: Conkssio rslIKionis ekristianas, saeratissiwo imper "tori Oarolo V. Oassariin uomMisanno 1530 per lssatos oivitatum "rZsntorati, Oon-stantiae, Msmst Hiulavias skkidita. It was also translated into German and went out (without indication of the year and place) under the title: "Bek nnnis der vier Frey- und Reichsst tte, Strasburg, Costanz, Memmigen und Lindau, in deren sie Kayserl. Majesty at the Imperial Diet of Augspurg in the 30th year, have given an account of their faith and intentions, for the sake of religion." This German edition deviates from the Latin edition several times, which is why Walch had the text retranslated. We reproduce the text of the old edition. As F rstemann, Urkundenbuch zu der Geschichte des Reichstages zu Augsburg, vol. 2, p. 42, states, this writing, the so-called Ovnkss o tsrapolitana, was handed over to the emperor on July 11, 1530, according to our chronology.

what we shall bring forward to answer for the hope that is in us, with such a mind that you may be assured how we first of all let our wish and desire go only to this, that God our Creator and Christ our Redeemer, and Christ our Redeemer, and thereafter also to serve and obey Your Imperial Majesty hereunder, and that we do not accept a doctrine that is somewhat different from the previous common doctrine for any other intention or opinion than because we firmly believe that He who created and redeemed us demands it of us in this way. We have also promised ourselves, and that because of the special praise that you have gloriously received from us of religion, godliness and righteousness, that it would come to pass that if you (Your Majesty) were rightly and completely informed of all that we have long since accepted under the name of the doctrine of Christ and pure religion, you would completely approve of our opinion and count us among those who have ever and always been willing to show obedience to it in good faith. For Your Sacred Imperial Majesty's world-renowned love of truth and justice, and Your ardent devotion and godliness, did not allow us to fall in the least bit on the suspicion that, if You had not yet heard us, You might have been of a mind to our disadvantage before 1) us, and not hear us too graciously and willingly, or, if you have heard us and considered what is holy, that you should not immediately notice through God's good spirit, which has so far guided Your Majesty so well and happily in other matters, how we follow Christ's own teachings from the heart.

Cap. 1.

From the content of the sermons.

First of all, since almost ten years ago, by the special grace of God, the teachings of Christ were more clearly and more certainly established in Germany than before, and therefore, as in other places, so also in our country, most of the doctrinal points of our religion were publicly and daily more sharply disputed among the scholars, and especially among those who administered the office of preaching Christ in the churches, and thereby the devil also necessarily had his work cut out, so that the populace was dangerously divided by adverse preaching: have we well considered what St. Paul writes: "That the Scriptures, inspired by God, may be profitable to teach," so that thereby sin, where it exists, may be affected and punished, and righteousness established, "in order to

1) Maybe: from (?).

that the man of God is perfect, and fit for all good works". And therefore, because the fear of God and the certain danger of our common nature drove us to do this without further delay, we ordered the preachers among us to teach nothing in the pulpit except what was either expressly written in Scripture or flowed from it. For it seemed to us quite reasonable, in this great danger, to flee to where not only the holy fathers, bishops, and princes, but also all common (simple) people have turned before and always, namely, to the divine reputation and testimony of the holy Scriptures. According to which the Thessalonians formerly examined the heard gospel of Christ, as Lucas remembers with their praise, in which also Paul wanted his Timothy to practice with diligence; without which testimony the popes never wanted their decrees, nor the fathers their writings, nor the princes their laws to be recognized as valid and credible; from which also the great imperial council at Nuremberg, held in the year of Christ 1523, ordered the sermons to be proved and taken. For if it is true what Paul taught, "that the Scriptures make the man of God perfect, and fit for all good works," then he who studies the Scriptures with devotion will not lack Christian truth and wholesome teaching.

Cap. 2.

Of the Holy Trinity.

Since the sermons in our country have been brought out of this, and the harmful quarrels have been put away, those who were only a little attached to godliness have received the teaching of Christ much more clearly, and have sought to live their lives more diligently according to it, so that they have been kept away from what was evil in Christ's teaching, and on the other hand have been strengthened in what is in harmony with it.

Among these is also this, which the Church of Christ has hitherto believed about the Holy Trinity, namely, that one God is in essence, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and has a difference only in the persons. And that also our Saviour Jesus Christ, who at the same time became true God, also became true man; that the natures are indeed unblended, but nevertheless so united in One Person that they will not be separated further in all eternity. And in this no one is of any other mind than what the Church believes from the Holy Scriptures about our Savior Jesus Christ, namely that he was conceived by the Holy Spirit, then born of the Virgin Mary, and finally, after preaching the Gospel, born of the Holy Spirit.

He died on the cross, was buried, went to hell, rose again on the third day, so that he would live forever; and after that he proved his resurrection and life before the witnesses chosen for this purpose, and ascended to heaven at the right hand of God, from where we expect him to be the judge of the living and the dead.

In the meantime, we recognize that he is nevertheless present with his church until the end of the world, constantly renewing it, sanctifying it, and adorning the so beloved bride with all the adornment of virtue.

Since in this we teach nothing different from what the Fathers and the common Christian faith say, it will be enough that we have testified to our faith in this case.

Cap. 3. From justification and faith.

But what else is commonly taught about the way in which we are made partakers of the redemption wrought by Christ, and likewise about the duties of a Christian man, ours have admittedly begun to teach somewhat differently than has hitherto been done. And how we have done it, we want to present to Your Imperial Majesty in the shortest possible way, and at the same time honestly indicate the passages of Scripture that have led us to this.

First of all, since it had been taught for some years that man's own good works were necessary for his justification, ours attributed them entirely to the grace of God and the merit of Christ, and taught that they were obtained by faith alone. Among other things, they were moved by the following sayings, e.g. John 1: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the children of God, who believe in his name; who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God. John 3: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of GOD." Matth. II: "No one knows the Son except the Father, and to whom the Son wills to reveal it." Matth. 26.: "Blessed are you, Simon, bar Jonah, for flesh and blood has not revealed it to you." John 6: "No one can come to me, except the Father draw him." Eph. 2: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and the same not of yourselves: it is the gift of God, not of works; lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ JEsu for good works, which God prepared beforehand that we should walk in them."

Now that our righteousness and eternal life is in God and in our Savior, Jesus Christ, he

and therefore it cannot be a work of the flesh and blood, that one must therefore be born anew, and we cannot come to the Son, unless the Father begets us, nor learn the Father, unless the Son reveals it, and Paul wrote so clearly: "not of ourselves! "Not of our works!" it is obvious that our works do not contribute at all to our becoming righteous from unrighteous as we are born. Since we are by nature children of wrath and therefore completely unrighteous, we cannot do anything that is righteous and worthy of the kingdom of heaven, but the beginning of all our righteousness and salvation must come from the merciful God, who, out of pure grace and in view of the death of His Son, first teaches the doctrine of righteousness and His gospel by sending those who preach it, and then (since the natural man, as Paul writes, cannot understand anything that is of the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 2.) 1) so that in the darkness of our hearts the ray of His light may dawn, so that we may believe the Gospel proclaimed, because the Spirit from on high convinces us of its truth, and then, relying on this Spirit's testimony, we may call upon God as Father in childlike trust and say Abba! dear Father, in order to be truly blessed, according to the word: "Whoever will call upon the name of the Lord will be blessed."

Cap. 4. Of the good works that come from faith through love.

But we do not want this to be understood as if salvation and righteousness were to be sought in idle thoughts of the mind and a faith without works, which they call unformed; for we are certain that no one can become righteous and blessed unless he loves God most highly and diligently seeks to imitate Him. For "those whom He saw before, He also ordained beforehand that they should be conformed to the image of His Son," as in the glory of the blessed life, thus also in the perfection of innocence and complete righteousness, "for we are His workmanship, created for good works." But no one can love God above all things and imitate Him righteously if he does not know Him rightly and take care of what is best for Him; therefore, we cannot be justified in any other way, that is, as righteous, so we can be blessed (for righteousness is also our salvation), than if we first of all come to terms with the

1) These brackets are set by us.

We must be endowed with faith, by which we believe the Gospel and are assured that God has adopted us as children and will always love us fatherly, thus relying on Him completely. St. Augustine's lib. de fid. et op. calls this faith the evangelical faith, which is active through love. Through this we are born again, and the image of God is restored in us; through this we become good and right again, even if we are born wrong, so that our thoughts are inclined to evil from our mother's womb. For then we become completely full of all good from God alone, as the eternal and always abundantly flowing source, and show ourselves to others as gods, that is, as true children of God, who seek their benefit through love in all ways. "For he who loves his brother abides in the light, and is born of God," and is heartily devoted to the new and at the same time old commandment of love for one another. And this "love is the fulfillment of the whole law," as Paul says: "The whole law is fulfilled in one word," namely in this: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself," Gal. 5. For everything that the law teaches runs out of it, and requires only this, that we be changed once rightly after God's image, and be good in everything and willing and useful for man's benefit, which cannot possibly happen if we are not adorned with all virtues at the same time. For who would judge and do everything for the true edification of the church and for everyone's true benefit, as befits a Christian, 1 Cor. 10, if he does not think, speak and do everything rightly and properly, and thus does not let the choir of all virtues dwell with him?

Cap. 6.

To whom the good works are to be attributed and how necessary they are.

But since those who are children of God are more driven by the Spirit of God than they themselves work, Romans 8, and all things are of Him, through Him, and to Him, Romans 11. So all that we do rightly and holyly must be attributed to no one else but to this Spirit alone, who gives all virtues; although he by no means compels us, but guides us with will, and works in us both willing and doing, Phil. 2. Hence St. Augustine writes very finely: "that God may reward his works in us. Here, then, we do not reject good works at all, but rather deny that anyone can be saved if he does not come so far through the Spirit of God that no good work is sought in vain in him, for which God will reward him.

For the fulfillment of the law is so necessary that heaven and earth will pass away sooner than the smallest point and tittle will be remitted. But since God alone is good, and made everything from nothing, and completely renews and governs us through his Spirit (for in Christ there is only one new creature), nothing of this can be attributed to human powers, and we must confess that everything of God, who benefits us by grace, without our merit, is a pure gift.

From this it is easy to see what we mean by justification, through whom we obtain it, and in what way we can enjoy it; likewise, what scriptural passages moved us to believe this way. For although we have drawn only a few from many, anyone who has only a little experience of the Scriptures will soon see that such sayings, in which, as Hosea says (Cap. 13), all sin and destruction are attributed to us, but all our righteousness and salvation are attributed to God, occur quite often in them.

Cap. 6.

Of a Christian's Duties.

It will also be known enough what a Christian's duties are, and what works he must especially perform, namely, such that he may serve his neighbor as far as possible. Namely, 1) for eternal life, so that he may learn to know, worship and serve God; 2) then also for the present life, so that he lacks nothing that belongs to the bodily necessities. For as the whole law of God, which perfectly prescribes all righteousness, is summed up in the single word: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," Romans 14; so all righteousness must be summed up and perfected in such demonstration of love. Therefore nothing is to be counted as a Christian duty that does not benefit the neighbor to some extent, and every work will be the more incumbent on every Christian and will belong to his duties, the more the neighbor is served thereby and a benefit is created for him. Therefore, after the spiritual office, we consider the administration of the common good to be one of the noblest duties of a Christian man, that he be obedient to those who administer it, because they thereby provide for the common good; likewise, that he take due care of his wife, children and family, and honor his parents, because without such things the life of man cannot exist;

Similarly, we include all honest arts and crafts, because without their practice one would have to forfeit much good that is very useful to the human race. In these and all other matters of life, however, no one must take anything thoughtlessly into his own hands, but must pay godly attention to what God calls him to do. This, then, will be everyone's best and most noble duty, by which man will be most helped and served.

Cap. 7.

From prayer and fasting.

Nevertheless, we also consider prayer and devout fasting to be holy works that are proper for a Christian, to which our clergy very diligently exhort their listeners. For right fasting is, as it were, a forsaking of the present life, which is always subject to evil lusts, but a contemplation of the future, which is free from all such disturbances. Prayer, however, is an ascent of the mind to God, and such a conversation with Him that no other thing so inflames the mind with heavenly desires, and directs it more and more powerfully according to God's will. But whether or not these are holy duties that are necessary for Christians, they do not serve the neighbor, nor do they prepare man so that he can serve his neighbor with benefit; therefore they cannot be elevated above holy teachings, godly admonitions and reminders, or other duties that benefit man directly. Hence we read of the Savior that he prayed by night, but by day he healed the sick and preached. For as love is greater than faith and hope (1 Cor. 13), so that which first proves the same and is most beneficial to man must be preferred to all other holy practices, as we think proper. Therefore, St. Chrysostom writes (Hom. 48 on Matthew): "Fasting is at the bottom of the list of virtues.

Cap. 8.

From the commandments of fasting.

But since no one can pray and fast properly and profitably except such souls as are devoutly and specially impelled by the Holy Spirit, we believe that it is better, according to the example of the apostles and the first pure church, to entice with holy exhortations than to compel with commandments, especially those which

make everything a sin, as they have done in recent times, when the priesthood has become quite out of fashion. So we would rather leave the place, time, and manner of praying and fasting to the Holy Spirit, without whom no one can pray and fast properly, than to prescribe them by certain laws, especially if they are not to be broken without iniquity and indebtedness.

But that for the sake of the young and imperfect a certain time and manner are set, because they are thereby prepared, as by certain preliminary exercises, ours are not at all displeased, if only such things are done without entangling the consciences. This opinion is not only due to the fact that all unpleasant constraints conflict with the nature of such works, but also to the fact that neither Christ nor the apostles have anywhere laid down such commandments. This is also testified by St. Chrysostom, Hom. 48. on Matthew, when he says: "You see that a righteous life helps more than anything else. But I call this a righteous life, not the toil of fasting, nor the camp in sackcloth and ashes, but when one despises money in the way that is proper, when one burns with heartfelt love, feeds the hungry with one's bread, overcomes anger, does not covet vain honor, and does not let envy rule over him. For these are samples of the same (namely, the right fiefdom). For he does not say that his fasting is to be followed, although he could have presented his forty days (fasting), but: 'Learn from me, for I am meek and humble in heart'. On the contrary, he says: 'All that you are commanded to do, eat. Nor do we read that the ancient people (the Jews) were commanded in the Law to fast in any orderly and solemn manner except on one day. 1) For that which prophets and kings, according to the report of the holy Scriptures, commanded, was nothing proper, but was only instituted in its time, because either an imminent or a present need impelled it." Since, then, as St. Paul expressly says, the Scriptures instruct us in all good works, but know nothing of these fasts enforced by commandments: we do not see how the successors of the apostles had more power than they themselves, namely, to burden the Church with so great and dangerous a burden. Irenaeus at least testifies that fasting was kept in various and free ways in the church before, as we read in the History of the Church, Book 8, Cap. 1. In the same book Eusebius remembers that a

1) the Day of Atonement.

Apollonius, the first heretic of the church, also refuted the heretic Montani's doctrine with this reason, namely that he first imposed fasting laws. He even considered this indecent for those who confessed the sound doctrine of Christ. Therefore Chrysostom says in one place: "Fasting is an honorable thing, but no one must be forced." And elsewhere he exhorts those who cannot fast to avoid tasty and superfluous food, which is not much different from fasting, and a strong arrow to ward off Satan's fury. Moreover, experience proves, alas! too much, that such commandments of fasting are very harmful to godliness.

Just as it seemed quite certain that the rulers of the church had taken this power to order fasts in such a way that consciences would otherwise be guilty if they did not keep them, without the testimony of Scripture: so we have also allowed consciences to be loosed from such cords, but by Scripture, especially Paul's, who throws these elements (childish letters) of the world off the necks of Christians quite diligently. For what Paul says in Col. 2, "Let no one judge you about food and drink or the choice of holidays, new moons and Sabbaths," must of necessity apply to us. And again, "If ye be dead with Christ unto the elements of the world, why then let yourselves be kept by the commandments, as the living?"

For when St. Paul, whom Christ taught as well as anyone, asserts that we have been set at liberty by Christ from outward things, so that not a few creatures are permitted by him to trouble those who believe in Christ even with such customs and ceremonies as God himself has instituted, but in his time only wanted to be useful; indeed, he also clearly states that those who have fallen from grace and lost Christ, and Christ is of no use to them, have allowed themselves to be taken captive by such things: What ought we not now to think of such commandments, which not only have no scripture for themselves, but also no one righteous example, and which men have invented of themselves, and which consequently have been not only weak and scanty, but even harmful, not mere elements (temporal earthly things) or initial letters of holy discipline, but rather hindrances to true godliness for very many? And how much more unjust will it be that one should arrogate to himself over Christ's inheritance the power to press it with such servitude! And now how many places would we be deprived of Christ, if we were to submit to such laws! For who does not see that the

Is the honor of Christ, which we must live to the full, which He Himself purchased and redeemed with His blood, more obscured if we, without His command, entangle our conscience with such laws, which are inventions of men, than which have God as their author, whether they had to be kept only in their time? It is certainly less to live Jewishly than paganly; but it is paganly to accept laws to worship God about which God has not been asked, and which are mere human conceits. That is why Paul's word is especially applicable here instead of 1 Corinthians 7: "You were bought at a high price, therefore do not be servants of men."

Cap. 9.

From choice of dishes.

For the same reason, the choice of food on certain days was forbidden, because St. Paul calls it a doctrine of the devil when he writes to Timothy. And it is still not correct that some point this only to the Manichaeans, Encratites, Tatians and Marcionites, who forbade some kinds of food and marriage altogether. For the apostle here condemns those who forbid foods that God created to be eaten, 2c. which now also forbid only some foods for some days, they nevertheless say that one should abstain from foods that God created to be eaten, and thus come very close to the doctrine of the devils; which also appears from the reason that the apostle adds: "For everything that God has created," he says, "is good and nothing reprehensible, if it is received with thanksgiving." For he does not omit any time, even though he loved moderation, sobriety, special mortifications of the flesh and fasting more than anyone else. Of course, a Christian must be sober, but at all times; he must sometimes mortify and kill the flesh, so that his modest portion may be somewhat shortened. But to this belongs rather the food's bad constitution and measures, than any kind and species. Finally, Christians are to keep a fast now and then, but not to exclude certain foods, but all foods; and not only to abstain from them, but also from all the pleasures and caresses of this world. For what kind of fasting or abstinence is it, merely to change the way of life of pleasure? As also those are wont to do who are nowadays considered very spiritual, since Chrysostom considers it no fasting if one remains without food, and moreover until evening, if one does not, while fasting from food, also remain free from harmful things and diligently apply oneself to spiritual things.

Cap. 10.**There is no need to seek merit in praying and fasting.**

After this, our clergy also remember this in fasting and prayer, that people should be taught in general not to seek miraculous merit and justification by it. For by faith through grace we are not only saved but also justified. But of the works of the law, which certainly include fasting and prayer, Paul wrote in Galatians 5: "Christ is no longer of any use to us, but is vain; all you who are justified by the law have fallen from grace. For we wait for the hope of righteousness in spirit and faith."

One must pray, then, but to the end that we receive and take from God, not that we give Him something through it. One must fast so that we may pray more fully and keep the flesh in discipline, but not earn anything from God. This ultimate purpose and custom of prayer and fasting is given both in the Holy Scriptures and in the writings and examples of the Fathers. For the rest, our affairs are such that even if we pray and fast with the greatest devotion, even if we could accomplish everything that God has commanded us to do to the best of our ability, even if no human being has been able to do so, we must still confess that we are useless servants. What do we therefore want to dream of merit?

Cap. 11.**That a single God must be invoked through Christ.**

Another abuse has also been rejected, since some want to make friends of the Blessed Virgin Mary and other saints by praying and fasting, so that through their merits and intercession they will be freed from the ills of body and soul and provided with all kinds of good things. For our preachers teach that we should call upon the one Father in heaven through Christ, our one Savior, and ask for everything, who, as he himself has testified, will refuse us nothing that we ask of him in faith and in the name of Christ. Since Paul, 1 Timothy 2, praises this one man, Jesus Christ, as God's and man's mediator, and since no one can love us more or be more acceptable to the Father, ours gladly admonish that we should have enough of this one intercessor and reconciler with the Father. But the Holy Mother of God and the Virgin Mary and the others

All the saints command us to honor them with all diligence, and that this will only be done when we earnestly seek that in which they are especially pleased, namely innocence and godliness, of which they have left us such beautiful examples. For since the saints love God with all their heart, with all their soul, and with all their strength, nothing could be more dear to them than for us to love and imitate God warmly with them. For the pious do not attribute their own blessedness to their merit, nor do they ever desire to help us with it. They all said, while they were here in the world, with Paul: "What I now live in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me. I do not consider the grace of GOD to be reprehensible." If they now ascribe everything to the grace of God and the salvation of Jesus Christ, no greater favor will be done to them than if we also rely on the same kind of help.

Cap. 12.**From the Monk's Stand.**

For this very reason, that all our righteousness consists in faith in Jesus Christ, and therefore we have attained freedom from all outward things, the bonds of monasticism have been dissolved by our admission. For we saw that this freedom of Christians is very much saved and defended everywhere by Paulo, so that each one is certain for himself that all our salvation and righteousness is to be sought in Christ our Lord alone; likewise it is certain that all things of this life are to be used at all times, as for the benefit of the neighbor, thus for the glory of God. Therefore, he must freely leave himself and all that is his to the Holy Spirit of Christ, as the giver of true filiation and freedom, to rule, to guide, and to order, apply, and use both for the benefit of his neighbor and for the glory of God. If, then, we persevere in this freedom, we show ourselves to be servants of Christ; if we betray such to men and make ourselves subservient to their inventions, we are, so to speak, defecting from Christ to men, which is all the greater ungodliness, the more he has bought us so dearly, since he has saved us with his blood from the damnable service of Satan. And this is the reason why Paul, writing to the Galatians, curses so highly that they were so attached to the ceremonies of the law, which after all was divine, since, as we have shown above, it was much more to be tolerated and excused than to take upon themselves such [ceremonial] yokes, which men

from their heads. For he writes, and rightly so, that whoever wears such ceremonial yokes rejects the grace of God and considers Christ's death to be nothing. And therefore, he says, he fears that he has worked on them in vain, and exhorts them to stand in freedom, so that Christ may redeem them, and not to crawl again under the yoke of servitude.

Now it is obvious that the monastic state is nothing else than a servitude of human statutes, and indeed such a one, which the said Paul has now condemned in the named places. For those who become monks give themselves over to such human inventions in the hope of merit. Therefore they do such a great sin when they turn away from 1) the freedom of Christ. Since both our body and spirit are of God for two reasons, namely, creation and redemption, Christians cannot be free to enter into such monastic bondage, any more than worldly servants are free 2) to accept other masters. Moreover, it cannot be denied that by such surrender and vow to live according to man's commandment, the necessity of transgressing the law of God is involved, as it always is, Matth. 15. For the law of God wants a Christian to serve the authorities, parents, relatives, and all others whom God has given to him as neighbors, and has given him to help them, to the best of his ability, regardless of the time, place, or manner in which they need such assistance. Likewise, that he adopt such a way of life that he may best serve his neighbor in his cause, and that he not choose the celibate state, for he has the gift, for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, that is, for the advancement of godliness and the glory of God, to circumcise himself and to renounce marriage. For there is God's commandment, made known through Paul, so that no vow can ever be overturned: "For the sake of fornication, let each man have his own wife, and each woman her own husband," for "not all grasp the word" that one should remain single for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, as Christ himself testifies, who certainly understood best and presented most faithfully both what man is able to bear and what the heavenly Father's will is.

Now it is clear that those who take monastic vows are thereby made to belong to a certain kind of people in such a way that they are not subject to the authorities.

They can neither be at the command or pleasure of their parents, nor of other people (except the head of the monastery), nor assist them with their goods, and least of all they can marry, even if they are in heat and thereby fall into many shameful vices. Since it is therefore clear that such monastic vows bring the man who is free in the bondage of Christ into the servitude or yoke, not only of men but also of the devil, and impose upon him a necessity to transgress the law of God, as happens with all human statutes in general, and thus clearly contravene God's commandment: we think it reasonable that they should be destroyed, since not only the written law but also the natural law prescribes that one should break the promise, which is contrary to good morals, not to mention religion.

We have therefore not been able to resist anyone who wants to exchange the monastic life, as an undoubted bondage of Satan, with the service of Christ. Just as we have not resisted others from the spiritual state who have married and chosen a way of life in which they can benefit their neighbor more, live more honorably, and remain with a clearer conscience than before. Finally, we do not exclude those who have remained with us in the preaching ministry from the right of marriage for reasons that have been reported, no matter how much chastity they have vowed, because even Paul, who taught true chastity excellently, gladly accepts a bishop who is a husband. For we have preferred this divine law to all human laws: "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife" 2c. Which law, because it has been rejected for so long, has torn down in the spiritual state all the abominable abominations and aversions, the most shameful fornication (to be reported with honor before your most sacred majesty, most gracious emperor), such that no kind of man is today in worse repute for it than the same.

Cap. 13.

Of the office, dignity and power of the clergy in the Church.

Of the office and dignity of the spiritual state, we teach: 1) That there is no authority in the church without correction. 2) Then, that no one in this position is to be regarded differently than Paul, Peter, Apollo and the like would have regarded themselves, 1 Corinthians 12, namely, as Christ's servants and stewards of the mysteries of God, of whom this must be especially demanded, that each one be found faithful.

1) "dazu von" put by us instead of "davon zu", which is probably a typographical error.

2) Slaves are meant.

These have the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to bind and loose. They have the power to forgive and retain sins, but in such a way that they are only servants of Christ, whose own power and right alone. For as he alone can renew and change hearts, so he alone can, by his own power, make the heavens out of men, and loose them from sins. Both of these things happen to us only when we receive a new mind through God's grace and have our citizenship in heaven.

But it is incumbent on the clergy to plant and water with the word, which in itself does nothing: "But it is God who gives prosperity. For of himself no one is able to think of such a thing, except of himself, but what one is able to do. This is from God, who makes those ministers of the new covenant whom he wants to persuade people rightly of Christ and make them rightly partakers of him, but not the dead letter, that is, the teaching that only resounds from without, but does not change the mind, but at the same time dispenses the life-giving spirit that renews the heart. And so they are only co-workers with God, 2 Cor. 3, open heaven rightly, and forgive sin. Therefore Christ, when he gave this power to the apostles, breathed on them and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit," adding, "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose soever sins they forgive," 2c. Therefore we believe that they are sent by God. For "how shall they preach, if they be not sent?" Rom. 10, that is, power and courage to preach the gospel and to feed Christ's flock, as well as the cooperating, that is, having received the heart-convicting spirit; and this makes quite capable and anointed ministers of the church, bishops, teachers and shepherds. The other virtues with which the people of this state must be adorned are told by St. Paul in 1 Tim. 3, Tit. 1.

Those who have been sent, anointed and adorned in this way, and who diligently care for God's flock and feed it with all fidelity and care, we consider them to be true bishops, priests and shepherds, worthy of twofold honor. But those who pursue other things also earn other respect and names.

However, no one's life should be so troubled that someone among the Christians should doubt and have misgivings about accepting what he would like to present from Moses or from Christ's chair, that is, from the Law and the Gospel. But if they preach strange things, the sheep must not hear such a voice,

John 10: But in worldly matters, because such power is ordained by God, he would contradict God's order who would not obey those who receive such power, in matters that do not go against God's commandments. It is therefore blasphemy when some blame our people for destroying church authority and jurisdiction. For the temporal power that such have has never been hindered by our people. But the spiritual power, by which they are to loosen consciences and faithfully feed them with the gospel of Christ, they have often begged or demanded, not to mention that they would have resisted it. But that we did not tolerate the teaching of some clergymen and appointed others in their place for our need, or kept those whom the bishops had deposed, this was the cause, because these proclaimed our shepherd's voice louder, but those of others theirs. For when it comes to the matter of the gospel and salvific doctrine, we must turn completely to the bishop of our souls, Jesus, and not at all listen to the voice of the strangers, if we believe otherwise in Christ. In this no one can suffer, if what Paul says is true: "All things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, whether things present or things to come; for all things are yours, but you are Christ's, and Christ is God's," 1 Cor. 3. If Peter and Paul with the whole world are still ours, but we are not theirs, but Christ's, and that as he is the Father's, namely, that we live to him all that we are: so, if we need everything as ours, no one of the clergy can justly complain about us as if we did not obey him rightly, if we are only sure that we do God's will. This is what we are taught about the office, dignities and authority of the ministers of the church, which we have been moved to believe by the passages of Scripture that we have consulted, and their like.

Cap. 14.

Of human doctrines (statutes).

From the traditional teachings of the Fathers, and which even now the bishops and churches enjoin, our opinion is this.

They do not count among those human statutes that are condemned in Scripture as running contrary to God's law, e.g. those that bind the consciences from food and drink, times and external things, as forbidding marriage to those who need such for an honest life, and

the like more. Deny, which agree with the Scriptures and! are ordered for the good discipline and benefit of men, even though they are not expressly written in the Scriptures, such, because they are nevertheless derived from the commandment of love, which sets up everything fine and praiseworthy, are rightly considered divine rather than human. Of the kind were those which Paul urges, 1 Cor. 11, that women should not pray in church with their heads bare, but men with their heads covered; that those who wanted to communicate should wait for one another; that no one in the congregation should speak with tongues (or many languages) without an interpreter; that the prophets should present their prophecy without disorder and have it judged by the attendants, 1 Cor. 14.

The church of today holds such things in high esteem, and arranges new ones according to opportunity and necessity. But he who rejects such things despises not men, but God, whose all useful law is even his own power. For what is rightly spoken or written is spoken and written by the gift of him who is truth itself, as St. Augustine well writes.

But there is often a dispute about which statute is useful or not, that is, which one promotes or hinders godliness. But he who does not look to his own interests, but devotes himself entirely to the common good, will soon see which is in accord with God's law or not. Since, furthermore, the Christians' cause is such that even injustice benefits them, a Christian will also be willing to obey unjust laws, if only they do not command evil, according to Christ's words: "If anyone forces you to go a mile, go with him. Thus, in truth, Christ must become everything to everyone, that he is willing to do and suffer everything for the benefit and service of men, if only it is not against God's commands. Hence it comes about that everyone obeys the civil laws, which do not run counter to godliness, the more willingly he is instructed in the faith of Christ.

Cap. 15.

From the church.

Now we must also report what we think of the church and the sacraments. Is the church of Christ, which is sometimes called the kingdom of heaven, a group of those who call themselves Christians and completely obey him, but with whom will be mixed until the end of the world those who are hypocrites under the faith of Christ, who therefore do not have it right.

The Savior taught this well in the parable of the weeds, Matth. 13, and of the net that was thrown into the sea and brought out both rotten and good fish, and of the king who called everyone to the wedding of his son, but then cast out the one who was not dressed for the wedding, Matth. 22. Likewise, when the church is called the bride of Christ, for which he gave himself to sanctify it, Eph. 1. for which He gave Himself to sanctify it, Eph. 1. Likewise, a house of God, a pillar and stronghold of truth, Mount Sion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, the congregation of the firstborn who are written in heaven, 1 Tim. 3. Heb. 12. This praise belongs only to those who righteously believe in Christ and thus truly belong among the children of God. Among these the Savior truly reigns, therefore His church is also called the congregation or company of the saints, as the word (church) is explained in the Apostles' Creed. The Holy Spirit rules them; Christ is never far from them, but sanctifies them so that he presents them to himself, as having neither spot nor wrinkle. Whoever does not want to hear this must be considered a heathen and a tax collector; this church, although that which actually makes it the church of Christ, namely faith in Christ, cannot be seen, may nevertheless be seen itself and recognized from its fruits. Among such fruits is first of all a joyful confession of the truth, a righteous love open to all, and a brave contempt of all things against Christ. All these things cannot be lacking where the gospel and the sacraments are purely practiced. Since the church is also God's kingdom, and therefore everything in it must be done properly and orderly, it has different offices of the clergy. For it is one body, consisting of different members, each with its own business. And these, if they do their office faithfully and work diligently in the words of doctrine, they truly present the church, so that whoever hears them is justly said to have heard the church. But what kind of spirit and gifts these must have, we have told above, when we gave our faith in the spiritual ministry of preaching, and thus gave an account of our faith in it. For those cannot take the place of the church who teach what is contrary to Christ's commandments; but this can happen, and often does happen, that even wicked men prophesy in the name of Jesus Christ, and bring forward the opinion of the church: but those who teach things quite different from what Christ taught, though they may be in the church, yet if they are tainted with error, and do not present the voice of the shepherd, the church, Christ's bride, cannot,

why they must not be heard in his name, for Christ's sheep do not follow a strange voice. This is the doctrine of ours of the church, which is based on the passages quoted and others.

Cap. 16.

Of the Sacraments.

Because the church walks in the flesh, though not according to the flesh, it pleased the Lord to teach, remind and admonish it also by the outward word. And that this might be done the more conveniently, he willed that his own should also keep an outward company among themselves. Therefore also the holy signs, which we call sacraments, are given to them, among which the most distinguished are baptism and the Lord's Supper. These, we believe, were called sacraments by the ancients, not only because they are visible signs of invisible grace (as St. Augustine says), but also because through them, as it were, the profession of faith is made.

Cap. 17.

From baptism.

They therefore confess about baptism what the Scriptures say about it from time to time: namely, that by it we are buried in the death of Christ, that we are united into one body, that we put on Christ, that it is a bath of regeneration, washes away sins, and makes us blessed, Rom. 6, 1 Cor. 12, Gal. 3, Titus 3, Acts 21, 1 Petr. 3, 1 Petr. 3. 21. 1 Petr. 3.

But we understand all this in the measure in which St. Peter interpreted it when he speaks: "With whose example baptism coincides, and now also makes us blessed, not as a putting away of the filthiness of the flesh, but as a confession of a good conscience toward GOD." For "without faith it is impossible to please God." And we are made blessed by grace, but not by our works. But since baptism is a sacrament of the covenant which God makes with his own, promising to be God and avenger to them and their seed, and to have them for his people; likewise, it is a sign of the renewal of the Spirit, which takes place through Christ, ours teach that it is also to be administered to the children, just as they were formerly circumcised under Moses. But we are truly Abraham's children. Therefore the promise of God applies to us as well as to the ancients, when it was said, "I will be God to you and to your seed." Gal. 3.

Cap. 18.

From the Lord's Supper.

Of this most holy sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, ours teach everything that the evangelists, St. Paul and the holy fathers have left in writing in the most faithful manner, praising and inculcating it everywhere. And therefore they always praise this incomparable goodness of Christ towards His own with great diligence, that even today, as well as in the Last Supper, He truly gives His true body and His true blood as food and drink for souls to all who heartily join His disciples, at the repetition of this supper after its institution, by which they are nourished unto eternal life, to eat and to drink by the sacraments to give Himself in grace, that now He Himself may live and abide in them, and they in Him, and be raised up with Him to a new and eternal life at the last day, according to His, the eternal truth, words: "Take, eat, this is my body, and all of you drink from it, for this cup is my blood." 2c. But especially do our ministers diligently lead men's minds away from all quarreling, as well as from rash and vain brooding, so that what alone is profitable, and what has been chiefly looked to by Christ our Saviour, may be that, when we are fed with him, we live in him and through him, namely, a godly, holy, and therefore eternal and blessed life, and we all become One Bread, his Body, as we all become partakers of One Bread in the holy supper. In this way, the divine sacraments are distributed and received with great devotion and reverence in the most holy supper of Christ.

From this, which is truly so, your most holy majesty, most gracious emperor, recognizes how falsely our adversaries spout, as if ours changed the words of the testament and tore them apart with human glosses (interpretations), and nothing but pure bread and wine is distributed in our Lord's Supper, and on the other hand the true Lord's Supper of Christ is despised and rejected by us. For ours teach and exhort with all diligence that each one accept these words in bad faith, without all human conceit and false interpretation, and pay proper attention to their understanding, without any doubt, and receive the sacraments themselves with all devotion and holiness as a life-giving food for his soul and a grateful remembrance of such benefits. This is now done much more often and more sacredly than before. At the same time

But our clergy have always offered and still offer to give an account of their faith and doctrine with all modesty and truth in all matters which they believe and teach, both of these sacraments and of other things. And this not only to Your Imperial Majesty, but also to anyone who demands reason from them.

Cap. 19.

From the Mass.

And since Christ instituted his Lord's Supper, which afterwards began to be called Mass, so that the faithful might be fed with his body and blood, and thus praise his death, by which they were redeemed, and so not only give thanks for it themselves, but also praise the same to others: Our clergy have necessarily had to condemn the omission of such masses, and on the other hand, those who celebrate masses undertake to sacrifice Christ to the Father for the living and the dead, and make such a work out of the mass, by which God's grace and blessedness would almost alone be procured, otherwise people may believe and live as they wish. That is why the shameful and most ungodly huckstering of this sacred act has broken down and happened, so that today nothing is more profitable than the mass.

They have therefore rejected the silent masses, because the Lord commands this sacrament to his disciples as a whole (or together). Therefore also Paul 1 Cor. 11. commanded the Corinthians to wait for each other for the holy supper, and denied that they were keeping the Lord's supper, when each one went off to eat his own supper. That they also intend to offer the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, ours have condemned because the Epistle to the Hebrews [Cap. 9, 27. 28.] clearly testifies that "as men die once, so Christ was sacrificed once, that he might take away many sins"; and could as little be sacrificed again as now continue to die. And "since therefore one sacrifice for sin has been made, he now sits always at the right hand of God, waiting for what is yet to come, that his enemies may be made the footstool of his feet. For with one sacrifice he hath perfected for ever all them that are justified," Heb. 10:11-14. But that they have made the mass a good work, whereby all things might be obtained of God: so have our brethren taught that it is contrary to all that the Scriptures everywhere say, that as we are justified by the Spirit of Christ and faith, and receive the grace of God, so we are justified by the Spirit of Christ and faith.

It is contrary to the fact that Christ commanded these sacraments to be taken in remembrance of him; likewise, St. Paul, "that the death of Christ be proclaimed until he comes.

But the fact that now, without some godly devotion, the mass is generally kept by many, merely to feed the belly: this is what our people have presented to God as so abominable and displeasing that, if the mass in itself contained nothing ungodly, it would nevertheless be just and according to God's command to be abolished, which can be seen from Isaiah Cap. 1 alone. For our God is a spirit and the truth, therefore He does not suffer that one serves Him other than in spirit and in truth. But how vexatious to the Lord was the hawking introduced here, they thought it easy to conclude, because buyers and sellers were chased out of the temple with such fury and vengeance, which he accepted against his custom, since they seemed to be doing their trade only for the promotion of the sacrifices, which were done according to the law.

Since the custom of the mass, as it is generally held, is in so many ways contrary to Scripture, and is also quite different from that which the holy fathers observed, it has been seriously condemned in our country from the pulpit, and thus made hateful by the word of God, that many have left it of their own free will, but others have abolished it by order of the authorities. Which we have undertaken for no other reason than because in all of Scripture the Spirit of God so rejects nothing and gives nothing so serious a reason to reject it as a 1) self-invented and false worship. Now anyone who asks only a little about religion knows what an unavoidable necessity is immediately incumbent upon the one who fears God, when he knows that God wants something. For everyone can easily see beforehand how many would take it if something were changed by us in the holy use of the Mass. And, of course, there was no one who would not have preferred to become offensive, not only to Your Imperial Majesty, but also to the most respected prince. Since, however, he was at the same time assured that by such a common custom of the Mass God would be so angered and His honor, for which one should also leave one's life, would be obscured, he had to be necessarily dismissed, lest, if one were to indulge in such a thing, one would also be guilty of the injured and diminished honor of God. And if one were to praise God above all

1) "one" of us put instead of: "his".

If he is to love and honor the pious, then the pious must suffer nothing less than what he detests and cannot suffer. But that this was the only reason why we changed something in these matters, therefore we refer to him as a witness, from whom no secrecy can be hidden.

Cap. 20.

From confession.

But because the confession of sins, which one intends to make out of a godly mind, cannot be made by anyone who is not driven to it by his repentance and true contrition, it cannot be forced by any commandment. That is why neither Christ nor the apostles themselves wanted to command it. For these reasons our ministers do indeed exhort to confess sins, and show the fruit of it, 1) if one secretly seeks counsel, comfort, teaching and admonition for himself from a Christian and prudent man; but with commandments they force no one. Rather, they say that such commandments are a hindrance to godliness. For such a regulation, to confess sins to the priest, has plunged innumerable souls into grave despair, and has other faults more in itself, that it should have been abolished long ago. And it would undoubtedly have been abolished long ago if the rulers of the churches had had the same zeal in the near future that St. Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, had in the past, when he abolished auricular confession from his church because it was found that a noble woman, since she often came to church as if to do the works of penance, had often lain with the deacon. Such innumerable incidents have occurred from time to time.

In addition, the laws of the popes dictate that such a confessor and judge must be so holy, learned, wise, and compassionate that very few can find such a confessor, especially among those who are generally appointed to hear such confessions. Now the school teachers also hold that it is better to confess to a layman than to the priest, from whom one has no edification of godliness to expect. In short, confession that does not come from true repentance and newness about sin will do more harm than good. And since God alone can make us truly repent of sin and make us heartily sorry for having sinned, nothing salutary can be accomplished by commandments, which experience has so far shown more than too clearly.

1) namely, confession.

Cap. 21.

From the spiritual chants and prayers.

For this very reason, namely, not to be silent about God's insult, which could be done under the pretext of His service, and which is most repugnant to Him, our people have also condemned many things in the spiritual songs and prayers. For it is evident that they have departed entirely from the first institution of the fathers and its proper use. For everyone who has read the ancient Scriptures knows that it was customary for them to devoutly recite a few psalms with some chapter (or piece) of Scripture, and at the same time to interpret them, since now many psalms (or hymns) are sung, but without any understanding, and from the reading of Scripture only the beginning of such chapters (or pieces) is left. But innumerable things are mixed with one another, which are more conducive to superstition than to godliness, so our people 1) first detested the fact that in the holy prayers and hymns many things were added that are contrary to Scripture, since the saints are given what belongs to Christ alone, namely, that they are saved from sins and misfortune; that they not only ask for God's grace and all other good things, but give them. 2) Afterwards, that they have become such a large group that it is impossible to sing and recite them with devotion. Now this is nothing but a mockery of God, if one does something without understanding. 3) Finally, that meritorious works are made of them, and they are sold at a high price. Not to mention, 4) that everything is said and sung against the express commandment of the Holy Spirit in a language that not only the people do not understand, but also often not those who live from such songs and prayers.

Cap. 22.

From pictures and paintings.

But our people have also fought against the erected images (pillars) and paintings, especially because they have begun to honor and worship them obviously, and vain expenses are applied to them, which are due to the hungry, thirsty and naked Christ; and because even in such service and expense, which is nevertheless contrary to God's word, merit is still sought. Against such defenders of religion they have also cited the use of the ancient church, since nothing was so detestable as to see any painted or carved image in the church; which is sufficiently illustrated with the deed of Epiphani, bishop of

Salamis in Cyprus, as he testifies about himself. For when he once saw Christ's or another saint's image (for he writes that he himself does not really know anymore) painted on a curtain of a church, he became so angry about it, because he saw a man's image hanging in the church against the commandment of the Scriptures and our faith and religion, that he immediately tore the curtain and ordered that one should cover a poor dead person in it. This letter, in which this man of God reports such things about himself, writing to John, bishop in Jerusalem, was translated into Latin by Jerome as orthodox, and he did not reprove this opinion of Epiphanius about images as erroneous in the least. From this one can sufficiently assume that neither St. Jerome, nor John, bishop in Jerusalem, had a different opinion about the images.

For the fact that it is generally said that the people are instructed and reminded by pictures and paintings will not be enough to make them, especially since the rabble worships them. The ancient people (the Jews) were much more ignorant, so that they had to be taught with many ceremonies; nevertheless, God did not consider that images served to teach and move the ignorant, but rather forbade them to be made. If one were to say that God has forbidden the making of such images that might be worshipped, it follows immediately that, because they have all long since begun to be worshipped, they must also be completely removed from the churches for the sake of the aversion. For in the church everything must be arranged for certain edification, let alone that one should suffer something that could certainly cause a fall and offense, but could have no benefit.

And what is stated: that they served as a reminder, St. Athanasius already rejected in his refutation of the pagans, who excused the idols with just the same pretext, thus: "You may say, how God is known through the images? Whether through the matter that is around them? or through the form (and shape) that is brought into matter? If through matter, then what need is there for form? Since God has already appeared before through all matter, before those come to it, and everything bears witness to His glory? But if the formation brought into it makes God more recognizable, what need is there of the painting and the other matter? Is not God then better known through the living creatures, whose form are the images? For surely God's glory would be known more if they were to be

by sensible and unreasonable animals than by inanimate and immovable images. Therefore, if you engrave or prepare images to understand God by them, you do something quite unreasonable". So far Athanasius.

Lactantius also speaks 11b. 2. div. instit. much against such a futile pretext. For to him who can be reminded of God with benefit, besides the word of exhortation, the living and true works of God serve best for this purpose, rather than those vain images that men prepare. Since God has amply testified in so many passages of Scripture that this is His opinion of images, it will not do for us to seek benefit from them, from which God has commanded us to avoid danger, especially since we ourselves have experienced how much they hinder godliness. Our people admit that the use of images is free in itself, but even though it is free, a Christian must see what is pious and edifying, and have the images in the place and manner in which they will not offend anyone. For Paul would never eat and drink meat and wine if he saw that other people's salvation would be hindered in any way.

Cap. 23.

From the authorities.

Above we have testified that our churches place obedience, which one owes to the authorities, among the noblest good works, and teach that the more he is a righteous Christian and has more faith, the more he should endeavor to be subject to the common laws. Next, they teach that an authority is a more holy office than any that can befall man; hence it is that those who have such a public office are called gods in the Scriptures. For if they administer their office properly, both the doctrine and the life of the subjects are well, because God also governs our affairs in such a way that the welfare of the subjects depends in good part on those who have the rule. For this reason, no one is better able to govern than he who is most Christian and holy. Hence it is without doubt that the bishops and ecclesiastics before this were dragged along by godly emperors and kings to secular offices and external government. In this they have indeed acted very wisely, but it has nevertheless been provided in such a way that they cannot be capable of both offices and they must have lacked either the word in the church or the government in the common being.

End with short repetition.

It is this, most invincible, most blessed Emperor, in which our people, who are instructed only by the Scriptures, which are superior to all other long-established doctrines and human statutes, deviate a little from the common teaching of the clergy. We have, as much as can be done in brevity, presented this to Your Imperial Majesty, so that we can give an account of our faith to you, whom we honor and value next to God, as well as to show how necessary it is to think at times and seriously about ways and means how such an important matter may be recognized, considered and discussed, as it is only required by the worship of God, in whose cause one must always proceed with fear and trembling; Then it also befits Your Imperial Majesty, who is highly praised for her goodness and godliness at all times, and it itself brings that peace which Your Imperial Majesty seeks, namely, as a certain and firm peace, which without faith and religion is only a discord, and therefore cannot be attained otherwise than when the minds have first been properly informed of the truth.

However, we would perhaps not have needed to present so much to Your Imperial Majesty in this case, since the most noble Duke and Elector of Saxony, as well as others, have already thoroughly and extensively presented to Your Imperial Majesty 1) what is disputed in our holy religion today. However, since Your Imperial Majesty has demanded that all those who are involved in such trade should give their opinion, we have also considered it our duty to confess before Your Imperial Majesty what is taught in our country. Although so much is involved in this matter and connected with it, that what we have declared on both sides is still too little and much shorter than that a certain verdict in these disputes, so that not all, but only at least a good part of the Christians can be satisfied, can be reached for now, because there are so few who now agree with the truth.

Since this trade is so important, so diverse and manifold, that it cannot be decided with benefit unless many recognize and examine it, we most humbly entreat Your Imperial Majesty, and implore them for the sake of God and our Savior, whose honor they undoubtedly have before them.

The Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire seeks to have a common, free and rightly Christian concilium (or church meeting) called, which has seemed so necessary for the settlement of the church affairs of both Your Imperial Majesty and the other princes of the Holy Roman Empire, that almost in all imperial assemblies held after this religious discord, both Your Imperial Majesty's Commissars and the other princes of the empire have publicly testified that nothing salutary can be accomplished in any other way. Therefore, at the next Imperial Diet held at Speier, Your Imperial Majesty also expressed the hope that the Pope of Rome would not object to such a council being held in the future.

And if the opportunity for a general concilio should not arise in time, then let Your Imperial Majesty at least have a meeting of the teachers of every place and state in a single country (or empire), for which 2) all who have to be present may come freely and safely, all may be heard, and everything may be considered and judged by such men, of whom one is assured that they are God-fearing, and consequently seek to promote His honor above all else. For it is well known how seriously and diligently both emperors and bishops formerly acted in settling religious disputes, which are often not so important as those now raised in Germany; how they often did not consider it indecent or repugnant to take up and consider the same things anew and probably for the third time. And whoever considers the present state of things a little, will not doubt that it now needs much more earnestness, faithfulness, gentleness and skill to restore the Christian religion to its proper state than ever before. If there is truth with us (or we are right), which we most certainly believe, what trouble and time will it take for them also to recognize those whose consent or agreement at least is required to make an efficient and lasting peace? But if we are wrong, which we can never believe, it will again take great diligence and no less time to set so many thousands of people right. Which diligence and time Your Imperial Majesty will not regard as lost or indecent, since it is due to her to show us the very sense in whose place she rules over us, namely JEsu Christ, the Savior of us all. Who, since he came in the sense of seeking and

2) Here we have deleted "itself" because it is too much.

1) On June 25, 1830, the Augsburg Confession was publicly read.

to save that which was lost, that he also gave life for their If they cannot be persuaded that the points of the contract restoration, which were lost: Your imperial majesty, even are just and equitable, how, when there is a dispute in if she firmly believed that we had departed from the truth, religion, will a true peace and a sure tranquillity, which would not be opposed to leaving the ninety and ninety Your Imperial Majesty certainly seeks to establish, be sheep in the wilderness and going after the hundredth, found and expected of us, if it is not recognized on both seeking it and bringing it back into Christ's sheepfold, that sides what God wants and what accords with Scripture? is, to leave everything else against this matter, so that For just as religion is preferred to all other things, even Christ's opinion of all that is now being disputed, though among the pagans, so also no dispute among men tends small and few in number, may nevertheless be clearly and to be more violent and fierce than that which is raised for certainly presented to us from the Scriptures. religion (or for altars and deities). But since Your Imperial

We will at least gladly let ourselves be instructed; there Majesty has shown such indescribable kindness to her will be no stubbornness and obstinacy among us if we can enemies, and indeed to those who have omitted nothing only hear the voice of our shepherd Jesus Christ and hostile, to say nothing of other things: so we justly draw everything to which we are called is based on the from her the firm hope that she will, also in this matter, Scriptures, which teach everything that is good. For if it order and arrange everything in such a way that she may should happen that we were not in the least concerned to seem to have been much more intent on us, who have be instructed, but only to proceed briefly with commands, always been at most eager for her welfare and honor which, if the matter were only in the hands of Ew. For if it (which we have indeed shown, and further always heartily were the case that they were not in the least concerned to desire to show), to make the praise of her goodness and instruct us, but only wanted to proceed briefly with orders, grace great. For we have arranged everything in this which we would by no means do if the matter remained in matter in such a way that we have made it sufficiently the hands of Your Imperial Majesty, then countless known to all righteous people how we will never let it occur thousands of people would find themselves in extremity to us to offend anyone, or to chase away our advantage distress, namely, in the certain opinion that God must be and our estate with other mischiefs. We have taken on heard first and foremost, and that the teachings they follow enough danger in this matter and have dared to incur are based on undoubted passages of the divine word, great costs, but we have not gained the least, except for which is why they are always frightened by the words of this, that we have been better instructed by the grace of our Savior: "Do not be afraid of those who kill the body" God, which He offers us in Christ, and thus have learned (Matth. 10. Luc. 12.). Likewise: "He who loses his life will to hope more confidently for the future (beloved God!). find it"; item: "He who does not hate his father and mother, But we value this so highly that we do not seem to have even his own life, cannot be my disciple"; item: "But suffered or done enough for it, because it is inestimable whoever will be ashamed of me before this perverse and and far superior to all that is in heaven and on earth. At wicked generation, I will also be ashamed of him before least we have not pursued the clergy's goods at all, but my Father and his angels", and the like. By these rather protected them ourselves at great risk and expense thundering voices many, awakened, would rather during the peasant uprising. The gospel of our Lord Jesus confidently suffer the hardest, and some would probably Christ, as much as he should love us, is the only thing that be silent for fear of death, but only until some occasion, penetrates us and has brought us to all that we have when in this trade before with commandment as doctrine, undertaken, as it is written, 1). Let then Your Imperial with force as indication of error would be dealt with them. Majesty rather follow the example of the 2) most powerful For what a firm assurance in matters of religion is capable and quite happy Emperor Con-

of, and how it not only makes one put his goods but also his life in the redoubt, one has, that I say nothing of old times, already seen enough in these ten years in many

who rather endured not only banishment and misery, but also imprisonment, torture and death themselves, than that they abandoned the opinion they held to be true and let themselves be driven away from it. If there is any dispute about trifles (in temporal matters), little will be done.

1) "as you can see, have undertaken" is set by us instead of "seem to have undertaken" in the old edition.

2) "the" put by us instead of "the" in the old edition. Latin: *xotisntssiiLoruiL*.

The following are those who, first of all, with all the doctrine and gentleness that the most holy and faithful bishops had given them, and likewise with the appointment of proper councils and mature consideration of all things, wanted to act on the erring and try everything before they decreed something harsher against them; as those who had counselors who were not at all like such ancient and holy fathers, and therefore also had such an outcome that did not at all agree with that godliness. Your Imperial Majesty does not want to be turned away from this, because most of what is being disputed now was decided long ago in ancient times, 1) and especially at the Costnitz Concilio. And this primarily because she sees that the clergy do not keep a hair of countless, both holy and necessary conciliar agreements of former times, and everything has become so wild among them that there is no one of common sense left who does not cry out that a concilium should be held to restore religion and the sanctity of the clergy. But if what was decreed at Costnitz is so pleasing to them, how did it happen that in the meantime it could not be maintained in any way that Christian concilia were held every ten years, as was decided at that time? For in this way much of godliness and faith could have been regained or retained.

But who would deny that, as often as the disease sets in again, so often is the medicine to be used, and that those who have the truth right never refrain from teaching it to the pious, as well as defending it against the wicked, wherever it can be promised that some benefit may be gained by it? Since so many thousands of souls are so doubtful and distressed in the teachings of our religion, who would not believe that there is very rich fruit to be hoped for, that all those whom the Spirit of God drives should therefore be justified in putting all other things aside and disregarding all toil and labor, and to undertake and seek that which is certain with all their might, so that Christ's teachings, from which all righteousness and blessedness come, be duly investigated and cleansed of all errors, and be offered in its true natural form to all those who have a heartfelt desire for godliness and the right service of God, so that a holy and eternal peace, and a true calming of all things (in that the sheep of Christ, for whom he shed his blood, only unfortunately! have been too much disturbed and troubled) like-

Who will be brought and confirmed? which cannot be restored to them in any other way, as we have already said, than those who are sure that in other matters they will gladly yield and give way, but in the matter of godliness they must hold and remain so firm to the words of God that, if they had a thousand lives, they would rather lay them all on the slaughter and sacrifice them than give one jot or tittle of them, if they were assured that it was a piece of the divine commandment. Since one soul is worth more than the whole world, what should not be done for the salvation of so many thousands of souls?

Since there is so much hope for this, and those who are accused of error by your sacred imperial majesty ask nothing else than that they may be instructed, so that they may completely abandon themselves to the holy Scriptures, which are sufficient to refute all errors; and since Christ our Saviour so gloriously promises that wherever two or three are gathered together in his name, he will be in the midst of them, and that they shall obtain all things through him, concerning which they have been united in asking: We, most blessed Emperor, have not wanted to do this for any other reason than that Your Imperial Majesty, who has demanded that we also give our opinion as to how religion might be helped again, might see this, and that we might prove our most humble obedience. For we should live in the certain hope and confidence that Your Imperial Majesty has long since recognized and seen for Himself what a need drives to this, what a fruit, which thereby inspires hope, and how much this is suitable for Your Imperial Majesty's highly praised godliness and grace, that she let the men most endowed with learning and godliness come together and duly judge from the holy Scriptures what is to be held of every doctrine that is now being disputed, so that this may then be proclaimed and explained with all gentleness and fidelity by capable servants of Christ to all those who are believed to be in error.

It is to be feared, however, that there will be no lack of those who would endeavor to bring Your Imperial Majesty to a different mind; we have found it necessary to answer you, Most Gracious Emperor, in this way.

May Your Imperial Majesty, then, both the same and all the other things that we do not intend to change here, as the honor of JEsu Chxisti, our

1) "is" put by us instead of "be".

We have, to the best of our ability and to the best of our ability and to the best of our ability and to the best of our ability, brought forward and confessed to Your Imperial Majesty, and, in accordance with Your most excellent and highly praised grace, accept and interpret them for the best, and most graciously count ourselves among those who, no less than our forefathers, seek to show themselves obedient to Your Imperial Majesty with the utmost loyalty and devotion, who, no less than our forefathers, seek to show themselves obedient, faithful and devoted to Your Imperial Majesty with the highest degree of subservience, and who, to this end, are willing to use our possessions and goods as much as possible. May the King of kings, Jesus Christ, grant to Your Imperial Majesty that in this and all other affairs she may do and perform all things well in His honor, and may she

live long with all salvation and high welfare for the general good of all Christendom, and always be crowned with many happiness and blessings! Amen!

1) Your most sacred Majesty's most humbled

Deputies of the cities

Strasbourg, Constance,
Memmingen, Lindau.

1) This signature is found in the Latin copy, the variants of which Förstemann has included in his "Urkundenbuch zu der Geschichte des Reichstages zu Augsburg", Vol. II, p. 70.

6. of Luther's writings concerning the leftover bread and wine in Holy Communion, against
Simon wolferinus.

29. D. Martin Luther's two letters to M. Simon Wolferinus, pastor at St. Andreä in Eisleben, concerning the leftover bread and wine in Holy Communion.*)

Translated from Latin.

First letter.

July 4, 1543.

To the venerable man in the Lord, M. Simon Wolferinus, pastor at St. Andreä in Eisleben, his brother in the Lord and faithful fellow servant!

Grace and peace in the Lord. In addition to so many miseries of my old age, you, my dear Simon, and Mr. Friedrich, 2) pastor of St. Peter in my fatherland, have caused me distress. It is nothing that you can foresee.

2) D. Fridericus is, as reported by Seckendorf, Hist. Initt. III, p. 467, Friedrich is a robber. - De Wette, VI, 690 is said to be "Pastor zu St. Andreas in Eisleben", but Luther writes here that he is "Pastor zu St. Peter".

test, as if that one alone had been given a hearing in your absence. I have seen your disputations and letters, in which you revenge yourself in such a bitter way, as if he were the most damned of the papists, although you are both of one city and shepherds of one people, indeed to very great annoyance. Well then, if he has offended you in public, which he denies, and of which I do not judge, why have you not dealt with him either according to the law or according to love? but, inflamed with rage, you have avenged yourself and set yourself up as a judge with the most terrifying words, which any drunkard 3) would find more offensive.

3) Bacclius - Bacchant.

*) These two letters of Luther are found in Latin in Buddeus, x. 277 and x. 279; in the Jena edition, Dorn. IV, fol. 585 and fol. 585d; transcribed in 6o6. eUart. Ootli. 399; also in De Wette, vol. V, p. 572 and p. 577; the first letter according to the "Fortgesetzte Sammlung" 1732, p. 868, in I. Hachenbrg's "Nöthige Unterrichtung" u. s. w. (Burkhardt, p. 427.) German in the Leipzig edition, vol. XXI, p. 435 and p. 436, and in the Hall volume p. 461 and p. 462. We have retranslated according to De Wette.

than a preacher would stand against his fellow preacher. For he is neither a heretic nor an enemy of the doctrine whom you treat with such hostility. Or is there no one of understanding among us or among you to whom you could have reported your anger before you raged in such a way?

2 But to the matter. Not we have it from you, but you have it without doubt from us, that the sacraments are actions (actiones), not continuing holy things (stantes factiones). But what strange audacity is this of yours, that you do not avoid such an evil appearance, which you should know to be annoying, namely, that you mix what remains of wine and bread with the previous bread and wine? After what example do you do this? Surely you do not see how dangerous questions you will bring on the way, if you insist on your sense and claim that with the cessation of the action the sacrament also ceases. Perhaps you want it to be said of you that you are a Zwinglian, and I would like to believe that you suffer from Zwingli's nonsense, since you incite with your peculiar and boastful wisdom in such a proud and contemptuous manner. Was there no other way, so that the simple and the adversaries would not suspect that you are a despiser of the sacrament, than that you caused offence through evil appearances, by mixing what was left over from the sacrament and pouring it together with the previous wine? Why do you not follow the other churches? Why do you alone want to be considered the author of new and dangerous things? I write this so painfully that you may know that you have given me trouble and grieved my spirit. You yourself say that these are trifles, and you are so angry about trifles? Yes, they are very serious trifles. But you may not care who is angered, if only you come out victorious in these trifles. But the Lord, whom you resist, will resist you again.

3 Therefore I exhort you, since you know, or should know, how to walk in the church, that you should communicate with Mr. Frederick.

and that you are unanimously of the same opinion and speak the same language. For you may thus, as we do here, drink and eat up what is left of the sacrament with the communicants, so that there will be no need to raise these vexatious and dangerous questions of the cessation of the sacramental action, which you will choke on if you do not repent. For with this reason you will abolish the whole Sacrament, and have nothing to answer the slanderers, who will say that under the action the Sacrament ceases more than it is practiced. Finally we shall arrive at the monstrosities of the Cratylus, that we shall be compelled to have the Sacrament only in the actione, and not in the intermissione accidentium, and at last the time and the moment will become the cause of the Sacrament, and many other inconsistencies will follow. Therefore, conform yourself to more arid churches and do not start a war against them, lest you fall with disgrace. I will certainly oppose, as much as I can, your peculiarity and your offensive and annoying presumption, and will not allow my last hour to be burdened with your annoyances. Fare well in the Lord; in the Lord, I say, and restrain your desire for revenge and arrogance, especially against a brother who is not heretical, nor sets himself against our doctrine. Wednesday after Peter and Paul in the year 1543.

Martin Luther, Doctor.

I, Johann Bugenhagen from Pomerania, Doctor, subscribe to the opinion of our venerable father Luther.

Second letter.

July 20, 1543.

1. grace and peace. Dear Simon Wolferinus! Should I not be justly saddened and grieved to see that you, preachers of one city and of the people in one church, who are united in all doctrine, have clashed with one another in such a contentious spirit because of a matter that is not sufficiently clear to you, nor is it of such high importance to you?

Meaning, if it were clear? See for yourself your sentences, whether such horrible shouting rhymes with love and brotherly behavior. I see that the devil tempts you to make a beam out of a splinter, rather a great fire out of a spark. You could have settled this by a friendly conversation, since you did not have to argue against the fury of the papists, but with a comrade in office and in Christianity.

2 Admittedly, Mr. Philip has written correctly that there is no sacrament apart from the sacramental act, but you take the sacramental act too hastily and briefly. In this way you will bring about that you seem to have no sacrament at all. For if this hasty cutting off of the action should endure, it will follow that after the utterance of the words, which is the most excellent and principal action in the Sacrament, no one would receive the Body and Blood of Christ, because the action would have ceased. This is certainly not what Mr. Philip wants. And this explanation (definitio) of the action would generate innumerable conscientious doubts and endless questions, just as among the papists it was disputed whether during the first, middle or last syllables the Body and Blood of Christ were present. Therefore, one must not only look at this movement of the instantaneous or present action, but also at the duration of time (tempus), not in mathematical, but in physical extension, that is, one must give this action a period of time (mors), and indeed a period of time in right extension, as one says, öv [according to the width].

3 We will therefore declare (definiemus) the time or sacramental action in such a way that it begins with the beginning of the Holy Prayer of the Father and lasts until all have communicated, drunk the chalice, eaten the Hosts, and celebrated the Eucharist.

People have been dismissed, and one has departed from the altar. Thus, we will be safe and free from conscience concerns and aergernissen of endless questions. Mr. Philip explains the sacramental action with reference to external things (ad extra ----- outwardly), that is, against the enclosure and circumambulation of the Sacrament; he does not divide it into himself (intra se ipsam), nor does he explain it against himself. Therefore, if there is anything left over from the Sacrament, you will see to it that either some communicants or the priest himself and the preacher receive it, not that the deacon alone or only one other drinks the rest in the cup, but that he gives it to others who have also partaken of the body, so that you do not seem to share the Sacrament by an evil example, or to treat the sacramental act dishonorably. This is my opinion, and I know that it is also Philip's.

I further exhort you to harmony and peace, and that you forgive and reconcile among yourselves, as you have the commandment of the Lord, otherwise you will not be able to be servants of the church without danger and trouble, yes, without severe wrath of God. You could (if you were afraid to talk to each other in the beginning) make use of other and suitable persons who would be mediators among you. What I write to you, I want to be regarded as if I had also written it to Vigelius and Mr. Friedrich. May the Lord guide your hearts in the love and patience of Christ. Take this, which I have had to dictate, for the best, for I have not been able to write myself because I suffered from my head. Therefore, pray for me and rejoice my heart. This you will do when I receive the news that you are reconciled in the Lord; in him you are well. Given at Wittenberg, July 20, 1543.

Martin Luther.

Second Section.

Luther's Writings Against Other Enthusiasts.

I. Luther's Writings Against the

▲ ◌ •

30. D. Martin Luther's writing "against the antinomians", to D. Caspar Güttel, preacher at Eisleben.*) January 1539.

To the worthy and highly learned Mr. Caspar Güttel, doctor and preacher at Eisleben, my special good friend in Christ.

1. grace and peace in Christ. Dear Doctor! I am well aware that the disputations against the new spirits have long since come to you, who have dared to expel the law of God or the Ten Commandments from the church and to send them to the town hall. I would never have thought of soft spirits that it should occur to a man to be silent, but God warns us through such cases that we should be careful and not imagine the devil to be so far away from us as such safe, insolent spirits presume to be. Truly, with fear, humility and earnest prayer, God must be constantly invoked for help and protection, otherwise it will truly soon happen that the devil will raise a specter before our eyes, so that we will swear that it is the right holy one.

This is how the spirit itself warns us, not only the ancient heretics, but also the examples of our time, which have been and still are great and terrible.

Now I might well have forgotten everything that has hurt me in this, where I could have had peace of mind in the hope that I would have shown and protected myself sufficiently with such disputation; but Satan did not want to suffer that, he always wants to mix me in, as if things are not so bad between me and them. And if I had remained in death in Schmalkalden, I would have had to be called the patron of such spirits forever, because they refer to my books, and yet played all this behind me, without knowledge and against my will, and also did not look at me that they would have shown me a word or letter of it, or would have asked me about such a thing. So I am forced to take M. Johann Agricola to task (about what he learned in the disputation)

*This writing appeared in a single edition at Wittenberg by Joseph Klug in 1539 under the title: "Wider die Antinomer. D. Mar. Luther." Further, in the same year in Nuremberg by Kunea and Hergotin. In the collections: in the Wittenberg (1553), vol. VI, p. 458; in the Jena (1568), vol. VII, p. 285d; in the Altenburg, vol. VII, p. 310; in the Leipzig, vol. XXI, p. 344; in the Erlangen, vol. 32, p. 1 and in De Wette, vol. V, p. 147. We give the text according to the Erlangen edition, which brings the first-mentioned original print, comparing the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

more than once, and in front of our doctors, theologians told him everything that had to be cut, because he is such a game beginner and master, so that he had to grasp what he would have done to me and my spirit (which I also consider good).

(3) So he humbly surrendered (as his words and actions showed) and promised to refrain from doing too much and to be like us. So I had to believe this and be satisfied. But as this is still interpreted, yes, also praised (as writings have come from), that D. Martinus and Magister Eisleben were on good terms with each other, I further urged him to let a public contradiction go out by printing, otherwise there would be no council in Eisleben and in the countries around to eradicate such poison. He also willingly surrendered and offered to do so. But because he was concerned that he would not be able to do it in such a way that it would be sufficiently respected, he confronted me with it, and also asked that I do it as I could; he would be well satisfied with it, which I accepted (and hereby want to have done), mostly so that after my death neither Magister Eisleben himself nor anyone else could pretend that I had done nothing to it, and let everything go on like this and be good.

(4) Namely, that he has recanted what Magister Johannes Eisleben has taught or written against the Law or the Ten Commandments, and with us (as we do here in Wittenberg), as well as in Augsburg before the Emperor, he will keep the Confessio and Apologia, and whether he would keep or teach otherwise hereafter, it shall be nothing and condemned. I would have praised him for humbling himself in this way, but since it is obvious that he has been one of my best and closest friends, I will save it for another, so that the matter will not be suspected as if I were not serious. If he remains in such humility, God can and will exalt him; if he rises above it, God can bring him down again.

5 Therefore I ask you, dear Doctor, not to leave such things written to you alone.

1) In the Wittenberg and in the Jena: it would.

but that you announce and show it to all where you can, especially to those who cannot read; for it is also for this reason that it is printed in the day, so that whoever will or can read it may read it, so that it is not written to you alone, because I cannot defend myself against Satan in any other way; he always wants to carry me out in other ways through writings, neither I am nor I hold.

(6) And I am very much surprised how I can be accused of rejecting the Law or the Ten Commandments, when there is so much, and not one, of my interpretation of the Ten Commandments, which are also preached and practiced daily in our churches; (I am silent about the Confession and Apologia) (2) and other books of ours; (3) in addition, two different ways are sung, about which they are also painted, printed, carved, even by the children early in the morning. They are spoken at noon and in the evening, so that I no longer know any way in which they are not practiced, without us (unfortunately!) not practicing them with action and life, nor painting them, as we are obliged to do, and I myself, how old and learned I am, speak them daily like a child from word to word. That if someone had understood something different from my writings, and yet saw and grasped that I was so vehement in my Catechismum, he should have spoken to me and said: "Dear Doctor Luther! How can you be so vehement about the Ten Commandments when your teaching is that they should be rejected? They should have done this, and not secretly dig behind me and wait for my death, then do what they want with me. Well, let them be forgiven who desist from it.

(7) Of course, I have taught, and still teach, that sinners should be provoked to repentance by the preaching or contemplation of the Passion of Christ, so that they may see how great the wrath of God is against sin, that there is no other remedy, except that the Son of God must die for it. Which teaching is not mine, but Saint Bernard's. What is Sanct Bernhard's? It is the sermon of all Christianity, of all prophets and apostles. But how does it follow from this that the law is therefore

2) The brackets are set by us.

3) Erlanger and De Wette: Bucher.

should do away with? I cannot find such a consequence in my *Dialectica*; I would also like to see and hear the master who could prove it.

(8) When Isaiah says Cap. 53:8: I have smitten him for the sins of my people, beloved, tell me, Christ's suffering is preached here, that he is smitten for our sins; but is the law thrown away by this? What then does "for my people's sin" mean? Does it not mean as much as because my people sinned against my law and did not keep my law? Or can anyone think that sin is something where there is no law? He that putteth away the law must put away the sins also. If he wants to leave sins behind, he must leave the law behind much more. For Rom. 5, 13: Where there is no law, there is no sin [Cap. 4, 15]; where there is no sin, Christ is nothing. For why does he die, if there is neither law nor sin, for which he must die? From this it can be seen that the devil does not mean to take away the law, but Christ, the fulfiller of the law (Matth. 5, 17.).

9 For he knows that Christ can be taken away quickly and easily, but the law is written in the heart, which cannot be taken away, as you can see in the Psalms of lamentation, where the dear saints cannot bear the wrath of God [Ps. 38, 143, 2c.], which can be nothing else than the sensitive preaching of the law in the conscience. And the devil also knows well that it is not possible to take away the law from the hearts, as St. Paul testifies Rom. 2, 14. 15. that the Gentiles, who did not receive the law through Moses and therefore have no law, are nevertheless their law themselves, as they must testify that the work of the law is written in their hearts 2c. But he goes about making the people secure, and teaches them to pay no attention to both law and sin, so that if they are suddenly overtaken with death or an evil conscience, having previously been accustomed to sweet security, they would sink to hell without all counsel, as having nothing else taught 1) in Christ but sweet security,

so that such terror would be a sure sign that Christ (who must be sweetness itself) had rejected and forsaken them; this is what the devil seeks and wants.

(10) But it seems to me that such spirits are of the opinion that all those who listen to the sermon are true Christians who are without sin, when they are true sorrowful, miserable hearts that feel their sin and fear God, for which reason they are to be comforted; for such people can never make dear Jesus sweet enough, but they can do it much more, as I have experienced in many (I will keep my own mouth shut). But such spirits are not such Christians themselves, because they are so sure and of good cheer; just as little are their hearers, who are also sure and of good cheer. In one place, a beautiful little girl of the Inn, an excellent singer, sings thus: "He feeds the hungry, that they may rejoice; and he makes the rich to be poor; he brings low the high, and exalts the low; and his mercy is upon them that fear him." [If the *Magnificat* is otherwise, God must be hostile to the secure spirits who do not fear, just as such spirits must be who take away law and sin.

(11) Therefore I beseech you, my dear doctor, to continue as you have done hitherto in the pure doctrine, and to preach that sinners ought and ought to be provoked to repentance, not only by the sweet grace and suffering of Christ, that he died for us, but also by the terror of the law. For the fact that they pretend that one must preach repentance in one way only, namely that Christ suffered for us, otherwise Christianity would be led astray as to what the right and only way is, is nothing; but one should preach all kinds of ways, as God's providence, promise, punishment, help, and whatever one can, so that we may be brought to repentance, that is, to the knowledge of sins and the law with all the examples of Scripture, as all the prophets, apostles, and St. Paul have done. Paul, Rom. 2, 4: "Do you not know that God's goodness prompts you to repentance?"

12 But I suppose that I would have taught or said that the law should not be taught in the church, as all my writings do.

1) "Taught" here is as much as "learned".

show otherwise, and from the beginning always pushed the Catechismum: should one therefore cling to me so stiffly, and [not rather] 1) resist myself, if I have always taught much differently, and thus become disparaging of myself, as I have done in the Pope's teaching? For this I will and may boast with truth, that at the present time no pope is a pope with such conscience and earnestness as I have been. For what is papal now is not for the fear of God, as I had to be a poor wretch, but seeks another, as one can well see and they themselves know. I had to learn St. Peter's saying [2.²] Epist. 3, 18.]: *Crescite in cognitione Domini*. So I see no doctor, no concilium nor fathers, if I should distill their books, and make quintam essentiam out of it, that they could have done the *crescite* in the beginning, and *crescite* as much as *perfectum esse*. As a sign, St. Peter himself had to learn his own *crescite* from St. Paul, Gal. 2, 11, and St. Paul from Christ himself, who had to say to him: *Sufficit tibi gratia mea etc.* [2 Cor. 12, 9. [2 Cor. 12, 9.]

Dear God, can we not suffer that the Holy Church recognizes herself as a sinner, believes in forgiveness of sins, and asks for forgiveness of sins in the Lord's Prayer? But how does one know what sin is, where the law and conscience are not? [And where will we learn what Christ is, what he has done for us, if we are not to know what the law is (which he fulfills for us), or what sin is, for which he has done enough? And even if we are not allowed to preach the law for ourselves and tear it out of our hearts, which is impossible, we must preach it for Christ's sake (as is done and must be done), so that people may know what he has done and suffered for us. For who could know what Christ suffered for us and why Christ suffered for us, if no one should know what sin or law is? That is why the law must be preached, where

one wants to preach Christ. Even if one does not want to call the word law, the conscience is nevertheless frightened by the law, when the sermon says that Christ had to fulfill the law for us so dear [Matth. 5, 17. Gal. 3, 13.], why then does one want to do away with it, which cannot be done away with, yes, by doing away it is strengthened all the more? For the law is more terrifying when I hear that Christ, the Son of God, had to bear it for me, neither if it were preached to me apart from Christ and without such great suffering on the part of the Son of God, but only with thieves. For in the Son of God I see, as in fact, the wrath of God, which the law shows me with words and small works.

14 Oh, I should have peace before the mines, it would be enough for the papists. Someone would almost like to say with Job [3, 3] and Jeremiah [20, 14]: "I wish that I had never been born"; so I would almost like to say: I wish that I had not come with my books; I would not ask anything about them, I would suffer that they would all already be destroyed, and such high spirits would sell their writings in all bookstores, as they would like, so that they would be satisfied with the beautiful honor. Again, I do not have to respect myself better than our dear Lord Jesus Christ, who also complains from time to time: "In vain have I labored, and my toil is wasted" [Is. 49,³) The devil is Lord in the world, and I myself could never believe that the devil should be Lord and God of the world [Jn. 14, 30. 2 Cor. 4, 4? until I now quite learned that it is also an article of faith: *Princeps mundi, deus hujus saeculi*. But (praise God!) it remains unbelieved among the children of men, and I myself also believe weakly; for each one likes his way well, and all hope that the devil is beyond the sea, and God is in our pocket.

(15) But for the sake of the pious who want to be saved, we must live, preach, write, do everything and suffer; otherwise the devils and false brothers will be attacked.

1) Such an insertion seems to us to be commanded here by the sense. Only De Wette has a question mark at the end of this sentence.

2) De Wette has reprinted here from Walch's old edition: 1. Epist.

3) De Wette has reprinted here from Walch's old edition: Esa. 66.

If we could see that it would be better not to have and yet teach wrath, which only the law must do. So they preached, written or done anything, but only to have died do nothing more than throw away these poor letters and been buried soon, for they pervert and blaspheme all "law"; but confirm the wrath of God, which is interpreted things and make a vain mischief out of them, as the devil and understood by these letters, without wanting to turn rides and leads them. It must be fought and suffered; we the neck of St. Paul and put the foremost at the back. cannot be better than the dear prophets and apostles who Shouldn't this be a high art, before which all the world also suffered [Matth. 5, 12]. would have to wonder? But that is enough for now, for I

(16) They conspire to invent a new method, that grace hope that because Magister Eisleben has converted and should be preached first, and then the revelation of wrath, recanted, the others who have it from him will also desist; so that the word "law" should not be heard or spoken. This God help them, amen.

is a fine cat's paw, pleases them splendidly well, and they 18. 1) From all this we see, and if we wanted to, we think they want to pull the whole Scripture in and out, and could well understand the histories from the beginning of the church, that it has always been like this, when God's thus become lux munāi. This is what St. Paul should and word has gone out, and his people have been read must give, Rom. 1. But do not see how St. Paul teaches together, the devil has become aware of the light, and just contrary to sense, first of all showing the wrath of God has blown against it from all angles, and has blown and from heaven, and making all the world sinners and guilty stormed with strong great winds, to extinguish such before God; then, when they have become sinners, he divine light. And whether one or two winds have been teaches them how to obtain grace and become righteous, controlled or resisted, he has always blown and stormed as the first three chapters show powerfully and clearly. against the light from one hole to the other, and there has And is this also a strange blindness and foolishness, that been no cessation nor end, nor will there be before the they think that revelation of wrath is something else, last day.

neither the law, which is not possible, because revelation (19) I think that I alone have suffered more than twenty of wrath is the law, where it is recognized and felt, as Paul tempests and storms blown by the devil. First of all, there says [Rom. 4:15]: Lex iram operatur operatur. Have they was the Pabstthum; yes, I think all the world should know not then finely hit it, that they do away with the law, and with how many storm winds, bulls and books the devil yet teach it, when they teach the revelation of wrath? But raged against me through them, how miserably they tore they turn the shoe, and teach us the law according to the me apart, devoured me and destroyed me, even though gospel, and wrath according to grace. But what shameful I breathed on them a little at times, but that did nothing, errors the devil means by this little cat's paw, I see quite a except that they became angrier and more furious, few of them, but I cannot deal with them this time; also blowing and spraying, to this day without ceasing. And because I hope it will stop, it is not necessary. since I was almost afraid of such spraying of the devil.

It has been a strange hope and presumption that they also want to bring something new and strange to light, so that people should say: I mean, this is a man, he is another Paul; do only those in Wittenberg have to know it all? Yes, certainly a head that seeks its own honor and is confident in its wisdom. For they want the law

1) The following, from here to the end, of this writing, is used for the spurious preface of D. Martin Luther, vor seinem Abschied gestellet", which first appeared in the 2nd volume of the Wittenberg edition and from there passed into all other editions, with the exception of the Jena edition. The alleged proof in the Erlangen edition, vol. 63, p. 407: "Jen. I, 1." is fictitious. In Walch, this section is in the old edition, vol. XIV, 475-480, §§ 1-13.

The devil breaks through another hole for me, through the coiner and the riot, so that he almost blows out the light for me. But when Christ also almost blocked the hole, he tore several panes out of my window through Carlstadt, roaring and hissing, so that I thought he wanted to lead away light, wax and night with each other. But God also helped his wretched lantern here, and kept it from going out. After that the Anabaptists came, 1) pushed open the door and windows (as they thought) to extinguish the light; they made everything dangerous, but did not accomplish their will.

20. Some have also raged against the old teachers, Pabst and Luther, as Servetus, 2) Campanus, and the like; The others, who did not publicly rage in print against me, which poisonous evil scripture and word I personally had to suffer, I will not tell now, but indicate so much that I also had to learn from my own experience (since I did not respect the histories), that the church for the sake of the dear word, yes, for the sake of the happy blessed light, cannot have rest, but must always wait for new and new storms of the devil, as it has happened from the beginning, as you may read in *ecclesiastica* and *trihistoria*, also in the holy fathers books.

(21) And if I were to live another hundred years, and had not only laid down the previous and present storms and tempests (by God's grace), but could also lay down all future ones in this way, I can well see that this would not give our descendants peace, because the devil lives and reigns; therefore I also ask for a merciful hour, and no longer desire the being. You, our descendants, also pray, and diligently drive God's word, keep the poor lantern of God, be warned and prepared, as they must wait for all the hour, when the devil may throw out a pane or window, tear open a door or roof, to extinguish the light; for he does not die before the last day. I and you must die, and if

we are dead, he nevertheless remains the same as he always was, and cannot cease his storming.

(22) I see there from afar how he blows up his cheeks so violently that he immediately turns red, wants to blow and storm. But as our Lord Christ from the beginning (even in his own person) struck his chubby cheeks with his fist, so that they became like the devil's farts, even though they almost stank; so he will do now and always. For he cannot lie, since he says: "I am with you until the end of the world" [Matth. 28, 20], "and the gates of the cloisters shall not prevail against the church" [Matth. 16, 18], nevertheless we are also commanded to watch, and to keep the light as much as is in us. It is called vigilate; for the devil is called *lev rugiens*, who goes about and wants to devour, not only in the time of the apostles, when St. Peter spoke such things [1 Petr. 5, 8], but until the end of the world; then we may comply. May God help us, as He helped our forefathers, and will also help our descendants, to praise and honor His divine name forever. For it is not we who can preserve the church; nor was it our forefathers; nor will it be our descendants; but it was, is, and will be He who says, "I am with you to the end of the age," as Heb. 13:8 says, "Jesus Christ *et hodie et in saecula*," and Revelation 1:4: "He who was, he who is, he who will be." Yes, that is the name of the man, and no other man is called that, nor shall any be called that.

(23) For you and I were nothing a thousand years ago, when yet the church was preserved without us, and he that is called *qui erat* and *hert* [Heb. 13:8] must do it. Neither are we now in our lives; for the church is not preserved by us, because we cannot ward off the devil in the pope, mobs, and evil men, and because of this the church before our eyes, and we with it, would have to perish (as we experience daily), if there were not another man who would seemingly preserve both the church and us; that we might grasp it and feel it, if we did not want to believe it, and must let him do it who is called *qui est*,

1) Jenaer: Sacramentirer und Wiedertäufer.

2) In the old editions: "Serveto". Michael Servetus (Lsrvsäs) was burned as a blasphemer in Geneva on October 27, 1533 (on Calvin's charge). Cf. Guericke, Church History (7th ed.) Vol. III, p. 697 ff.

and *hodie*. Likewise, 1) we will do nothing to preserve the church when we are dead; but he will do it who is called: Qui venturus est and: iu saecula. And what we now say of ourselves in this matter, our ancestors also had to say of themselves, as the Psalms and Scriptures testify; and our descendants will also experience it in such a way that they will sing with us and the whole church the 124th Psalm: "If God were not with us this time, Israel shall say" 2c.

(24) It is a pitiful thing that we have so many terrible examples before us of those who have allowed themselves to think that they must hold the church as if the church were founded on them, [who] have so shamefully perished in the end; and yet such cruel judgment of God cannot break nor humble nor defend our pride and iniquity. What has happened to the: Coiners in our time? (will be silent about the old and previous ones) who let himself think that the church could not be without him, that he had to carry and govern it; and recently

1) So the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: but likewise.

The Anabaptists warned us terribly that we should remember how powerful and close to us the beautiful devil is and how dangerous our pretty thoughts are, that we should look into our hand first, according to Isaiah's advice [Cap. 44, 19], when we undertake something, whether it is God or idol, whether it is gold or glue. But it does not help, but we are safe, without fear and worry, the devil is far from us, and is not in us such flesh, which was in St. Paul, about which he complains, he can not fight him (as he would like to do), but would be caught [Rom. 7, 23.]. But we are the heroes, who* must not be afraid of our flesh and thoughts, but we are vain spirits, and have our flesh together with the devil completely captive, so that everything that occurs to us, or [we] may think, that is certainly and surely the Holy Spirit, how can it be lacking? That is why in the end it goes out so finely that horse and man break their necks. This time enough of such lamentations. May our dear Lord Christ be and remain our dear Lord Christ, praised forever and ever, amen.

31 D. Martin Luther's refutation of the "false and seductive" teaching of the antinomians against the law,

written in 6 disputations.*)

The first disputation December 1537; the following January 12, 1538; the third and fourth (without date) 1538; the fifth September 13, 1538; the sixth September 10, 1540.

Translated from Latin.

Some "theses disseminated among brothers" (this was the title) have come into my hands, whose author is not known for sure (iincerto autore). So that I do not seem to approve them by my silence, I have wanted to publish them as such, which must be rejected, in order to give a testimony to all those to whom I could,

that we absolutely abhor such monstrosities, which we want to make clear immediately afterwards by counter-disputations (God willing). 2)

2) In the original, the date "In 1538" is missing, which is found in the editions. Luther had these theses printed and published on December 1, 1537. Cf. Förstemann's "Neues Urkundenbuch," p. 313, No. 6.

*) The first five of these disputations are found in Latin in the Wittenberg Thesensammlungen of 1538 and 1558; the sixth alone in the 1558 edition, of which there is also an original print. (Cf. Förstemann's Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 344.) Then in the Wittenberg edition (1550), Dom. I, toi. 399k; in the Jena one (1579), Dorn. I, toi 516, and in the Erlanger, or>r>. var. urA, vol. IV, p. 420. German in the Wittenberg edition, vol. XII, p. 228; in the Jenaer (1568), vol. VII, p. 290; in the Altenburger, vol. VII, p. 314, and in the Leipziger, vol. XXI, p. 349. We have retranslated according to the Erlanger edition, comparing the Jenaer and the Wittenberger. The text, however, has been improved by us according to the variants given by Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 313, No. 6, from the original.

1) (Sentences of a certain antinomian [law striker].)

1) Repentance is to be taught not from the Ten Commandments or any law of Moses, but from the ungodly falling away from the Son (of God] 2) through the gospel.

2. for Christ speaks Luke 24:26, 46, 47:

1) This caption is missing in the original.

2) ex violatione ülii is not quite correctly rendered in the old translation as: "from the suffering and death of the Son of God". From the letter of Wendelin Faber, preacher at Seeburg, to O. Caspar Güttel, preacher at Eisleben, dated April 24 and 26, 1540 (Fürstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 332 ff. with the wrong date "April 20". Cf. Kawerau, p. 166), we can see what Agricola meant by these words. Agricola had, to prove his false doctrine, formed a syllogism from these three sentences: 1. repentance, knowledge of sin and fear of God must not be taught from the law, but from the Gospel, through the name of Christ. 2. 2) In the New Testament, it is not a question of whether someone has behaved ungodly in relation to the law (äs violations legm), but only whether he has behaved ungodly against the Son of God (äs violations ülii Osi). From this follows 3. that the law must not be preached in the church of Christ, but only the gospel. - The way to bring this doctrine to the people should be this: 1. God's grace and mercy in Christ should be preached to the people in the sweetest way possible. This is the major (propositio). Then the people are to be asked to examine themselves whether they also fully believe this in poverty, sickness, disgrace, fear of death and other misfortunes. This is the minor, the main thing, which is not followed by the gospel, but by the fact that Christ is a true Moses. "The minor is followed by: conclusio in hunc moaurü": 3. "Whoever now knows himself guilty, let him call upon GOtt" 2c. This is finally summarized thus: "This was the syllogism: I. The doctrine of Martm fLuthers is Eisleben's major. II. Martin's confession is Eisleben's minor. III. the prayer is the sonslusio." Because Agricola was all about his minor, his followers called themselves: Minorss, Minor isch or Minorrsten. From the above it is clear that the words sx violations ülii do not allow any other translation than the one we have given. In Agricola's syllogism above violatio ls'is contrasted with violatio ülii, therefore violntio must be translated in the same way in both cases, and both lssis and ülii must be oenitivu8 osijsstivns. Köstlm, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 465, correctly states, "from the consciousness of how much we have sinned toward her sthe message of salvation from Christ] true repentance must then arise." Agricola himself in the "Summaries on the Evangelia" explains: "violationsm ülii, who for the sake of the kingdom of heaven does not willingly leave what he should leave, and does not do what he should do, crucifies Christ anew." Fürstemann, 1. s., p. 302. The same expression per violationsm ülii is also found in Luther's sermon, which he held soon after Agricola's theses became known on the fifth Sunday after Trinity (July 1) 1537. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XI, 1328, § 42.

So Christ had to die and in this way enter into His glory, that repentance and forgiveness of sin might be preached in His name.

3 Christ also says in John (16:8) that the Spirit punishes the world for sin, not the law.

4) The same 3) teaches the last sermon of Christ: Go, preach the gospel to every creature [Marc. 16, 15].

5 Since St. Paul speaks Phil. 2, 5. 12.: "Let every man be of the same mind as Christ Jesus was, 2c. that ye obtain your salvation with fear and trembling", he has clearly ordered that repentance (which he calls fear and trembling) is to be taught from the memory of Christ and not from the law.

From the sermons of Paul and Barnabas it is absolutely clear that the law is not necessary for any part of justification. (Rom. 3, 20. ff. Apost. 13, 38. ff.)

7. any thing without which the Holy Spirit is given, and without which men are justified, need not be taught, neither the beginning, nor the means, nor the end of justification.

But now is the time before, and the Holy Ghost is given continually, and men are justified without the law, through the gospel of Christ only [Rom. 3:28].

(9) Therefore it is not necessary that the law of Moses be taught, neither the beginning, nor the means, nor the end of justification.

10 The *major clause* is certainly from the experience that Paul and Barnabas cite.

(11) In the same way, the lower part (minore) will be judged, because the Holy Spirit has fallen on the Gentiles in a visible form.

(12) What then do some, without the word, even against Christ's word, against the apostles' example, make the law the first and necessary part of the doctrine of justification?

13) So that the Christian doctrine may be preserved pure, 4) they must be resisted.

3) We have followed the reading of the Wittenberg and Jena editions: iäsm, instead of item in the Erlanger.

4) To this, Luther wrote in the original [to Weimar's] own hand in the margin: "da ist die gisst heraus." With these words Luther wants to say: By the fact that Agricola pretends that he must, in order to keep the Christian doctrine pure, resist those 2c., his poison comes to light, namely, that he blames me that my doctrine is false, impure and not suitable to teach, so that Agricola alone would be praised as the master of pure doctrine. Compare the writing No. 32 in this volume.

who teach that the gospel is to be preached only to those whose hearts have been previously frightened and crushed by the law.

(14) For those who speak the words of Christ in this clumsy manner, teaching that the law must be taught first and then the gospel, pervert the words of Christ, for they do not abide in the simple understanding of the words of Christ.

For as we must hold fast the simple understanding of these words, "This is my body," so we must also hold fast the simple mind of these words, "Go preach the gospel, and baptize them." 2c.

16 The law alone punishes sins, and that without the Holy Spirit; therefore it punishes to damnation.

(17) Now there is need of such a doctrine, which with great power not only condemns, but also at the same time saves; but such a doctrine is the gospel, which at the same time teaches repentance and forgiveness of sins.

18. for the gospel of Christ teaches the zorn of God from heaven and at the same time also the righteousness that is valid before God, Rom. 1, 17. for it is a sermon of repentance of the promise anaehānat, which the. Reason by nature does not understand, but by divine revelation.

The interpretations (Commentaria) of the newer ones agree very little with each other, because in some places they teach the way of justification purely, in others not purely. 1)

The few who are pure out of many [not pure] are these:

Luther says in the preface to the epistle to the Romans: "God's wrath from heaven is revealed through the gospel against all men because of their ungodly nature and unrighteousness.

2 Likewise, in the preface to the epistle of Jacob: "Will do with lawfulness that which the apostles do with charms of love", therefore this epistle is also rejected as not being of the apostle Jacob.

In the epistle to the Romans, Philip [Melanchthon] constantly urges that the main emphasis in the New Testament be placed on ungodly behavior against the Son of God, not on ungodly behavior against the Law.

Luther, in the Summaries on the Psalter, says about the Psalm [19] "The heavens tell the glory of God": 2) "And with this he raises the

old law, which" 2c., and in the notes to it he compares the honor of the law with that of the gospel and carefully considers why the heavens tell God's glory. And among other things he says: "Because the teaching of the Law works rather the honor of men and dishonor to God, and in that by the works of the Law either the hopeful are measured, or those who despair of giving glory to God, the heavens tell such glory."

5 And Isa. 40: The law is to be the disciplinarian of the body, but those who seek righteousness through it make the law the disciplinarian of the conscience. But as far as heaven is from earth, so far shall we separate the law from the conscience. Likewise, the law is to be directed to the body and the outward members, that it may govern the outward works; this is the true and proper use of the law; but those who need the law for justification abuse it to their condemnation.

These are impure [in doctrine]:

1. in the Saxon visitation: because Christ commands us to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins in his name, the ten commandments must be taught.

2. likewise, to take upon himself from the cross: Therefore the gospel teaches that the law is given to humble us, that we may seek Christ 2c.

(3) In the explanation of the epistle to the Galatians, Luther says, "That the office of the law is to afflict and terrify the conscience, that it may the more easily know Christ. There are many such passages in the same interpretation, which we reject as erroneous, so that the doctrine may be kept pure.

Likewise, others [teach antinomials]: ³⁾

1. the law is not worthy to be called the word of God.

(2) If thou be a fornicator, a knave, an adulterer, or any other sinner, believing, thou art in the way of salvation.

3. if you are in the midst of sin to the utmost, and if you believe, you are "in the midst of blessedness. 4)

3) That the Latin of the original: Item alii must be understood in this way, shows the immediately following remark of Luther.

4) Regarding the second and third articles, Luther himself noted in the original: "These two he may deny, but I do not know. They are also

1) Luther's own marginal gloss in the original: "Ja, das verstehestu wol, du Narr."

2) The words "the glory of GOD" are missing in the original.

The ten commandments belong on the town hall, not on the sermon seat.

5. all who deal with Moses must go to the devil; to gallows with Moses.

(6) We are not to prepare men for the gospel by the preaching of the law; God must do it, His work be it.

7. in the gospel, one should not deal with the ungodly behavior (*violatione*) against the law, but with the ungodly behavior (*violatione*) against the Son [of God].

8. hearing the word and living by it is the consequence of the law.

Hearing the word and feeling it in the heart is the very essence (*proprium*) of the Gospel, of which in our 1) Methodus.

10 Peter 2) has not known Christian freedom;

11. his saying: *Certam facientes vocationem vestram per bona opera* [that is, do the more diligently to establish your calling and election by good works, is no good (*non valet*). [2 Pet. 1, 10.]

(12) As soon as you think that Christianity should be like this and like this, that it should be fine, honorable, chaste, holy people, you have already missed the Gospel. [Of it further in my comment about the 3) 6. chapter Lucä.

The first disputation of D. Martin Luther against certain antinomians.

Of repentance.

[Held in December 1537.] 4)

1. repentance is, according to all teachers' testimony, which is true, sorrow (*dolor*) over sin, combined with the intention to amend one's life.

This suffering is actually, and can be nothing else, than the feeling or sensation of the law in the heart or conscience.

not imposed on Eisleben, but on others, as his students, as the title indicates. All others are M. Grickels, as is proved from other [writings]." (In the original, this remark is in Latin.) Melancthon reports in the opinion of the Wittenberg theologians to the Elector of April 5, 1540 (Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 326) that "one from the city of Lüneburg wrote such a thing to him in many names."

1) nostra is missing in the Erlanger.

2) In the above mentioned letter of Wendelin Faber to Güttel, Förstemanns Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 333 d, it should read: "Petrus had still learned the *Minorem non*", instead of: "Paulus " 2c.

3) The bracketed words are in the old translations, but are missing in the Latin editions.

4) Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 467.

3 For many hear the law, but because they do not feel the effect (*sensum*) or power of the law in their hearts, they remain without suffering and repentance.

The first part of repentance, namely suffering, is from the law alone; the other part, namely the good intention [to improve one's life], cannot be from the law.

(5) For the man who is terrified in the face of sin cannot put anything good before himself by his own efforts, because he cannot do so [even when] he is satisfied and secure [without challenge]:

(6) But when he is disgraced and overcome by the power of sin, he falls into despair and hatred against God, or goes to hell, as the Scripture says.

(7) Therefore the promise [of Christ] or the gospel must be added to the law, which satisfies and straightens the troubled conscience, so that man may make a resolution for good.

8 The atonement which the law alone works is a half atonement, or a beginning of atonement, or an atonement *by synecdoche*, for it has no good intention.

9. and if it remains so, Cain's, Saul's, Judah's repentance will come out of it and of all who doubt and despair of God's mercy, that is, of those who perish. [Gen. 4, 13. 1 Sam. 26, 21. Cap. 31, 4. Matth. 27, 4. f.]

10 The school theologians (*sophistae*) have taken the definition of repentance, that it is sorrow [for sin] and a good resolution [to amend one's life] 2c., from the ancient teachers and taught it after them,

11. but have not understood nor been able to teach the pieces of the definition, namely rene, sin, intent.

(12) Of repentance they have invented that it is an action produced by the power of free will, which hates sin as often as it wants or does not want.

13. while this repentance is a suffering or torture which the conscience is forced to suffer, willingly or unwillingly, when it is rightly struck or urged by the law.

(14) They have said that sin is a transgression that is contrary to the ordinances of men, but they have seldom said sin is a transgression.

The term "moral law" is understood to mean that which is contrary to the moral law.

(15) But of original sin after baptism they had such thoughts that it was not even sin, especially not against the first table.

16) Against this doctrine of chaffing (paleas¹ 1) comes the law, which (as Jeremiah 23:29 says) is God's hammer that shatters rocks, and resolves all men under sin.

17 A good resolution, they thought, would be a self-chosen thought to avoid sin from now on by human strength,

18. whereas, according to the Gospel, it is a movement in the heart, awakened by the Holy Spirit, to hate sin from now on, out of [God's] love; although sin in the flesh still fights hard against it.

19 And it is no wonder that they understood so little of it, because they did not use the Bible and therefore could not know what either the Law or the Gospel is,

20. but have been so drowned in human commandments and statutes that they have judged holy divine things only in dreams.

(21) Against such useless teachers of despair, the gospel began to teach that repentance need not be despair alone,

22. but that the repentant should also have a hope, and thus hate sin out of love for God, which is a truly good resolution.

(23) There are some who do not consider the reason for speaking this way or the thing being done, that it is contrary to the law of God.

(24) And they teach that it is harmful to remove the law of God from the church altogether, which is blasphemous and usurping God.

25, For all Scripture teaches that repentance is to be begun from the law, as the order of this thing itself and experience prove.

For thus says the Scripture: "Alas! that the wicked should be turned to hell, all (Gentiles) who forget God" (Ps. 9:18.).

Likewise [v. 21.], "Set over them, O Lord, a teacher, that they may know that they are men."

27. "Make their faces full of shame, that they, O LORD, may have to inquire after thy name" [Ps. 83:17.]; and [Ps. 9:17.], "The wicked is entangled in the work of his hands."

It is a matter of order that death and sin are in [human] nature rather than life and righteousness.

29. for we are not to be given over to sin or death, as righteous or living; but we, who are already sinners by nature and dead through Adam, must be justified and made alive through Christ.

30 Therefore the teaching of Adam must precede (that is, of sin and death), who is an image of the Christ to come [1 Cor. 15:47], of whom [Christ] is to be taught hereafter.

(31) Now sin and death must necessarily be denounced by the law, not by the word of grace and comfort.

This is also testified by experience: for Adam is punished beforehand as a transgressor of the law, and afterwards he is raised up by the promised seed of the woman 2c. [Gen. 3, 15.]

33. David also is first killed by the law, since Nathan said to him, "You are the man" 2c. After that he is preserved by the gospel, since Nathan says, "You will not die" 2c. [2 Sam. 12:7, 13.]

34. Paul is first struck down by the law, and hears, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" afterward he is made alive by the gospel, "Arise." 2c. [Acts 9:4, 6.]

35 And Christ Himself says, Marc. 1, 15: "Repent, and believe in the gospel: for the kingdom of God is at hand."

36 And again [Luc. 24, 46. f.]: "Christus had to suffer 2c. and have repentance and forgiveness of sins preached in his name."

So also the Spirit first punishes the world for sin [John 16:8], so that he can teach faith in Christ, that is, forgiveness of sins.

38. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans

1) Ueber psts vergliche Walch, St. Louiser Ausgabe, Bd, XVIII, 754, Anm.

This is the way he teaches, first that all men are sinners, then that they alone must be justified through Christ. [Rom. 3, 23. 28.]

(39) St. Lucas also testifies in the Acts of the Apostles that Paul taught both Jews and Gentiles that no one can be justified except through Christ alone. [Acts 13:38.]

The second disputation of D. Martin Luther against the antinomians.

From the law.

[Held on January 12, 1538.] 1)

1. the law is not only unnecessary for justification, but completely useless and utterly impossible.

(2) But those who think that they will be justified by the law, to them the law is a poison and a pestilence to righteousness.

(3) In speaking of justification, it is not possible to speak sufficiently against the inability of the law and against the exceedingly harmful reliance on the law.

4 For the law was not given to make righteous or alive, or to help anything to righteousness [Gal. 3:21].

(5) But to show sin, and to work wrath [Rom. 3:20, 4:15], that is, to make the conscience guilty.

6. death was not laid upon us that we should live by it, nor sin inherent in us that we should be innocent by it.

7 So also the law is not given that we should be justified by it, because it is not able to give either righteousness or life.

8. summa, as high as heaven is above the earth, so far shall the law be separated from justification.

(9) And nothing is to be taught, said, or remembered in the article of justification, but only the word of the grace shown to us in Christ.

(10) But it does not follow that the law is to be abrogated and taken away from the preaching of the church.

1) Kawerau, Agricola, p. 194.

(11) Yes, for this very reason it is all the more necessary to teach it and insist on it, because it is not only not necessary, but also impossible for justification.

(12) So that the arrogant man who relies on his strength may be taught that he cannot be justified by the law.

(13) For sin and death are to be denounced to man primarily for this reason, not because they are necessary for life and innocence,

14. but that man may know his unrighteousness and condemnation, and so be humbled.

When sin remains unrecognized, man is presumptuous of his imagined innocence, as can be seen in the pagans and subsequently in the Pelagians.

16. When death remains unrecognized, one becomes presumptuous and thinks that this life is the [right] life, and that there is no other life in the future.

17 Since only the law teaches both, it is sufficiently evident that the law is very necessary and useful.

(18) Whatever indicates sin, wrath or death, that exercises the ministry of the law, whether in the Old or New Testament.

(19) For the manifestation of sin is nothing else, nor can it be anything else, than the law, or the proper work and effect of the law.

20. law and indication of sin, or revelation of wrath, are such words, one of which can be used for the other (termini convertibiles); like [these words] man, and creature, which can laugh (risibilis²⁾), or reasonable creature.

(21) To abolish the law and yet retain the revelation of wrath is as much as if you were to deny that Peter was a man and yet claim that he was a creature that could laugh, or that he was a rational creature.

(22) It is just such wisdom to take away the law and yet teach that sin must be forgiven,

2) The ability to laugh is not inherent in any other creature than man.

While the Scripture of the Holy Spirit says that sin is dead without the law and that where there is no law, there is no transgression [Rom. 4:15].

(24) So that it is impossible for sin to be, or to be known without the law, either by that which is written, or by that which is given (insculpta) (into the heart). 1)

(25) It further follows that since there is no sin (after the law is abolished), there is no Christ to save from sin. For Christ himself says: "The healthy do not need a physician" [Matth. 9, 12].

Since Christ did not come to abolish the law, but to fulfill it (Matth. 5, 17.), He would have come in vain if there was no law to be fulfilled in us.

27. And because God's law requires our obedience to God, these lawbreakers also abrogate obedience to God.

28 From this it is evident that Satan teaches through these his instruments only with words of sin, repentance and Christ;

But in doing so, he takes away Christ, repentance, sin and all Scripture, as well as the author of Scripture, God Himself.

30. and think of the most damaging security, contempt of God, unpunished willfulness, and eternal impenitence more than Epicurus himself.

31 Their word testifies to this: the law punishes sin without the Holy Spirit, only to condemnation.

(32) Here it appears that they want to teach about such a sin that does not condemn, but perhaps even without Christ makes one blessed.

For if sin does not condemn, all that remains is that Christ did not redeem us from damnable sin, that is, from the wrath of God.

34 For sin that does not condemn is a better sin than righteousness and life itself.

35 For what is more blessed than to have sin that does not condemn, that is, which is not sin?

1) That this translation is correct can be seen from the last thesis of the third disputation.

Therefore, when the law is done, we are so redeemed from sin and blessed that we do not need Christ as our mediator. 2c.

But this is also wrong, that the law without the Holy Spirit punishes sin: Holy Spirit punishes sin, because the law is written with the finger of God (Ex. 31, 18.).

38. and all truth, where it is, is of the Holy Spirit; and to forbid the law is to forbid the truth of God.

39. to abolish the law for the sake of this office, that it punishes sin to condemnation, is a manifest frenzied nonsense.

40 For the power of sin is this, as St. Paul (1 Cor. 15, 56.) says that sin is the sting of death, and the law the power of sin.

41. Therefore let us eat and drink and sing among these teachers: Away with him (pereat) who provides for the other morning!

(42) For since the law, which is the power of sin, is abolished, consequently, since the power of sin is gone, death and hell are also destroyed,

43. not by the blood of the Son of God, who keeps and fulfills the law, but by denying that there is any law of God that must be fulfilled.

44) All their doctrine of sin, repentance, Christ and forgiveness of sin is vain filth and lies worthy of the devil 2). -

45 For as the law was before Christ, it certainly accused us; but under Christ it is satisfied by the forgiveness of sins, and now to be fulfilled henceforth by the Spirit:

46 Therefore, after Christ, it will remain fulfilled in the life to come, because then the creature will have become new (as the law required in the meantime).

47 Therefore the law will never be abolished for eternity, but will remain, either to be fulfilled in the damned, or to have been fulfilled in the blessed.

48 But these, Satan's disciples, have these thoughts, as it seems that the law lasted only for a time, and under Christ it ceased, like circumcision.

2) Instead of *Satanae* in the editions, read *Satana*.

The third disputation of D. Martin Luther against the antinomians.

Of repentance.

[January (?) 1538.]

1. the repentance of the Papists, Turks, Jews and all unbelievers and hypocrites is absolutely the same in all things.

2. the same is that they have sorrow for one or some real sins, and are sufficient for them; after that they are safe because of the other sins or original sin.

3 But this repentance of theirs is piecemeal, and temporary, only because of some sins, and that during some [small] part of the life.

(4) Such must be the opinion of those who do not understand that the whole of human nature is horribly damaged and corrupted by original sin.

5) The repentance of believers in Christ is not only directed to actual sins, but is continuous throughout life, even unto death.

(6) For it behooves believers to abhor and hate the pestilence or sin of nature to its end.

7 For Christ says rightly to all His own, "Repent," [Matt. 4:17] for He wants the whole life of His own to be a repentance.

8. for sin in our flesh endures as long as we live, contending against the spirit that resists it [Rom. 7:23].

(9) Therefore all works after justification are nothing else than a constant repentance or a good resolution against sin.

(10) For there is nothing else to be done, but that the sin which was indicated by the law, "not forgiven in Christ, may be purged out.

(11) Just as it was the duty of the children of Israel, after they had conquered the land of Canaan, to drive out the Jebusites who dwelt within its borders [Deut. 7:1];

012 And how it cost no less labor to drive the rest of the Jebusites out of the borders than to fall into the land at first:

(13) Thus it is not much easier to expose the rest of sin by constant repentance than to become its enemy at first.

(14) Hence, the saints and the righteous (when God so ordains them through the Law) are often sorrowful in heart and lament over their sins;

15) Whereas they are in grace because their sins are forgiven (Rom. 5, 1. 8, 1.), and therefore should rejoice in the Lord.

(16) Yes, they admit no real sin, and yet they cry out piteously, asking for God's mercy, as seen in the Psalms.

The Lord's Prayer, prescribed by the Lord Himself to His saints and believers [Matt. 6:9], is a piece of repentance and a teaching that contains much of the Law.

(18) For he who prays the Lord's Prayer rightly confesses with his own mouth that he has sinned against the law, and that he is sorry for it.

19 For whoever asks that God's name be sanctified confesses that God's name is not yet fully sanctified.

20 And whoever asks that God's kingdom come, confesses that he is still partly in the devil's kingdom, which is opposed to God's kingdom.

(21) He who asks that God's will be done confesses that he is largely disobedient to God's will and that he is sorry for it.

22. But zero teaches God's law that the name of God should be sanctified; the one who asks for it confesses that he has not fulfilled this law.

(23) And he that abhorreth that which is left of the kingdom of Satan in him, the same germinateth that he hath not fulfilled the law, especially the law of the first table.

(24) And whoever asks that God's will be done in him confesses that he is not obedient to God's will.

25 Now this prayer must be prayed by the whole Church until the end of the world, and by every saint until death.

26 For the whole church is holy, recognizing that it has sin and must repent without ceasing.

For this reason, the Lord's Prayer itself teaches that the law is before, under, and after the gospel, and that repentance must begin with the law.

28 For he that asketh confesseth beforehand that he hath not what he asketh, and expecteth that it shall be given him.

29 Now it is the law that shows us beforehand what we do not have, and yet must necessarily have.

30 From this it follows that these enemies of the law must also renounce the Lord's Prayer where they renounce the law.

(31) Yes, they must also take away most of the preaching of our Lord Christ Himself from evangelical history.

32 For he himself, Matth. 5, 17. ff., not only states the law of Moses, but also fully interprets it and teaches that it should not be dissolved,

33 And instructing the Pharisee of the noblest and greatest commandment of the law, he confirmed the law, saying, "Do this, and thou shalt live." [Luc. 10:28.]

34 The Lord also punishes, reproves, threatens, terrifies everywhere in the Gospel and exercises the same office of the law,

(35) So that there have never been, nor will there ever be, more insolent men than these who teach that the law must be abolished.

36 Namely, the wretched people are ashamed to teach and do what the Lord Himself has done and taught.

(37) Suppose sin could be recognized by something other than the law, which is impossible:

(38) Should we therefore reject the law if it has the same effect that we could have elsewhere, namely, the knowledge of sin?

39 And although the law could be done away with according to grammar or the dead letter (materialiter) (for this must necessarily be their opinion),

40. But who will eradicate the living law, which is written in the hearts, and the handwriting, which was made by statutes, and is contrary to us, which is the same as the law of Moses? [Col. 2, 14.]

The fourth disputation of D. Martin Luther against the antinomians.

[January (?) 1538.]

Every Christian should beware of the papist doctrine of repentance; but much more of the doctrine of the antinomians, who allow no repentance at all in the church.

1) There has not been a more pernicious doctrine against penance in the Church (except the Sadducian and Epicurean) than that of the Papists.

(2) For it has taken away the whole and true repentance, not allowing the forgiveness of sins to be sure.

For they have taught that man (even he who repents) must be uncertain whether he is in God's grace and whether his sins are forgiven.

4. but have directed the poor man to the merit of his renege, confession, pardon, and finally to purgatory.

(5) And yet they have determined neither the measure nor the end of repentance, confession, atonement, nor even of purgatory.

(6) But why do you want to repent for a long time, if you are not sure whether your sins are kept or forgiven?

(7) In this way, the impenitent and secure are not taught that they must begin to repent.

(8) But those who are frightened and have begun to repent must fall into final impenitence.

(9) Christ is of no use to those who repent in this way, because they must doubt whether Christ died for their sin.

(10) Even the finite impenitence of those who despair is more dangerous than the impenitence of those who are sure.

The impenitence of the secure is a contempt of God; the final impenitence is a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

(12) Therefore, one must beware of the papist doctrine of repentance, as of hell and the devil himself.

(13) But much more must one beware of those who allow no repentance at all to remain in the church.

014 For they that say that the law ought not to be taught, intend that there should be no repentance at all and in fact.

15 This proof: "What is not necessary for justification, neither in the beginning, nor the means, nor the end, is not to be taught" 2c. is of no use at all.

First of all, if you were to ask what these lofty words: beginning, middle, end, mean? you will find that they themselves do not understand.

(17) As if you were to conclude thus: That a man is dead in sins is not necessary to justification, neither in the beginning, nor in the means, nor in the end; therefore this is not to be taught.

18. to honor parents, to live chastely, to abstain from murder, adultery, theft is not necessary for justification, therefore such things should not be taught.

(19) The fact that man is obliged to serve in the municipal and domestic regimes is not necessary for justification; therefore such a law must be abolished.

20 Such conclusions have been ridiculed and mockingly called by the Sophists in former times: A' baculo ad angulum. 1)

If this is the opinion of the syllogism, that this should not be taught as necessary for justification, then what is new?

(22) It does not follow that the law should be abolished or not taught, although it is of no use for justification.

23. in the subordinate clause (minore) the experience of Paul and Barnabas is falsely attracted, by whose ministry the Gentiles were justified without law. [Acts 13.]

(24) For Paul proves that all men are sinners (which is the office of the law) by the very fact that he teaches that they must be justified by Christ alone. (Apost. 13, 38.)

(25) Now he that is yet to be justified is a sinner without qualification, and not yet justified, and is convicted by the law alone that he is a sinner.

26. "Without law" is to become dust everywhere with Paul, as Augustine rightly interprets it: without the help of the law; which we have always followed.

(27) For the law does not help it [the law] to be fulfilled, but requires us to fulfill it.

28 And it demands even with such severity that, as Christ himself testifies, he will not let even a useless word go unpunished.

29. and, as the Lord again testifies, "not the smallest letter, nor one tittle, of the law can pass away until all is done." [Matth. 5, 18.]

In short, the debt must be paid to the last penny [Matth. 5, 26], if Christ is not set against this strict admonisher, the law.

The grace and forgiveness of sins do not make people safe from sin, death and the law, as if they were nothing anymore,

(32) But rather make us diligent and careful to overcome them daily through Christ our Savior.

For the law is not with us by any necessity on our part (nulla nostra necessitate), but is with us in fact, even without our will, before we are justified, and in the beginning, means, and end of justification, and after it.

34. for from the beginning of the sin which Adam committed, it wants to be taught, to be known and to reign, until it is fulfilled through Christ as the victor.

But faith in Christ alone justifies [Rom. 3:28], it alone fulfills the law, it alone does good works without the law,

For he alone receives forgiveness of sins and voluntarily does good works through love.

(37) It is true that after justification good works follow voluntarily without law, that is, without the help nor constraint of the law.

38 In sum, the law is not useful nor necessary for justification, nor for any good works, much less for salvation;

39 But vice versa: the justification,

1) This expression: Imeulo aä anAulum is used by an unrhymed conclusion: That fits like a glove. Cf. Walch, old edition, vol. VIII, 1662, § 152.

Good works and blessedness are necessary for the fulfillment of the law. 1)

For "Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost" [Luc. 19, 10.], and "to bring all things again", as St. Peter [Apost. 3, 21.] speaks.

(41) Therefore the law is not abolished by Christ, but restored, that Adam may be as he was, and even better.

The fifth disputation of D. M. Luther against the antinomians.

In the month of September [Sept. 13] 2) 1538.

1. "The law rules over man as long as he lives" [Rom. 7, 1.).

(2) But he shall be loosed from the law when he dieth.

Therefore, it is necessary for man to die if he wants to get rid of the law.

4 If the law rules over a man as long as he lives, sin also rules over him as long as he lives.

Therefore, if man wants to be free from sin, he must die.

For "the power of sin is the law, but the sting of death is sin" [1 Cor. 15:56].

These three, law, sin and death, are inseparable.

8 Therefore, as far as death is still in man, so far is sin and the law also in man.

(9) Apart from Christ, we receive the law, that is, the letter, which has not yet been fulfilled, and yet must necessarily be fulfilled by us.

(10) In Christ the law is fulfilled, sin is destroyed, death is destroyed,

(11) That is, if we have been crucified and have died in Christ through faith, these things [those mentioned in Thesis 10] are also truly with us.

1) Marginal gloss of the German Jena edition: Here the Christian reader sees publicly what M. Luther thinks of the Majoristic proposition, as if good works should be necessary for salvation, which testimony the Adiaphorists always boast of.

2) This date is derived from the Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 86, Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1062.

(12) But if we live, we are not yet in Christ, but live apart from Christ under the law, sin and death.

(13) Now the matter itself and experience testify that even the righteous are still daily delivered to death,

14 Therefore, if they are under death, they must also still be under the law and sin.

15. they are definitely inexperienced people and deceivers of souls who want to take away the law from the church.

16 For this is not only foolish and ungodly, but also utterly impossible.

17 For if you want to take away the law, you must also take away sin and death at the same time.

For death and sin are present through the law, as Paul says: "The law kills" [2 Cor. 3, 6.] and: "The law is the power of sin" [1 Cor. 15, 56.).

19 But because you see before your eyes that the righteous are dying daily, it is very great foolishness to think that they are without law.

20 For if there were no law, there would be neither sin nor death.

(21) Therefore they should first prove that the righteous are without all sin and death,

(22) Or that they were no longer in the flesh, but had been taken out of the world altogether.

(23) Then it would be rightly taught that even the law should be abolished for them, and should not be taught in any way.

24 Because they cannot prove this, but experience shows them the opposite,

(25) So these teachers are exceedingly insolent, that they would put away the law from the church.

(26) But this is much more impertinent, or rather nonsense, that they pretend that even the ungodly are to be delivered from the law, and that the same is not to be preached to them.

27 For if the saints and the righteous must be reproached for their sin and death, that is, for the law, to whom it was not given;

28. how much more should and must the law

be presented to the wicked and evil, as to whom it is actually and primarily given?

(29) But where they say that their church or audience are all godly and Christians without law:

(30) So it is in the daytime that they are completely frantic, not knowing what to say or what to put.

31 For this is nothing else than to think that all their listeners have been taken away from this life.

(32) But to have such thoughts is as if one were to dream that games were taking place in an empty arena, and he were watching,

For in this world, both the righteous, who live in the flesh, and the wicked, who are always greater in number, are continually mixed together.

34 As therefore the law is given, without doubt, not that it should be rejected, but that it should be taught, that by it men might know sin and death, or the wrath of God:

(35) So it is also given to the godly, provided they have not yet died and are still alive in the flesh.

(36) In Christ, who was raised from death, there is certainly no sin, no death, no law, to which he was subject in life.

37 But the same Christ is not yet fully raised in His believers, even beginning to rise from death in them as the firstfruits.

38. but in the ungodly, who are mixed in with the church, and whose number is greater [than that of the pious], he is still quite dead; indeed, he is nothing at all in them.

39. they are under the law par excellence, and must be frightened by the law, even, where possible, with bodily thunderbolts.

(40) Therefore, as far as Christ is raised in us, so far are we without law, sin and death.

41. But as far as he is not yet raised up in us, so far are we under the law, sin and death.

Therefore, the law (as well as the gospel) must be preached without distinction to both the righteous and the wicked.

(43) To the wicked, so that they, frightened by it, may recognize their sin, the death and inevitable wrath of God, by which they shall be humbled.

44. to the godly, so that they may be reminded to crucify their flesh together with their lusts and desires, so that they do not become secure [Gal. 5:24].

45. because security takes away faith and the fear of God, and makes the last worse than the first was [2 Petr 2:20].

46 It is quite clear that the lawyers think that sin is essential (for- maliter) and as reason understands it (philosophice) or as the jurists judge it (juridice) is taken away by Christ,

47. and that they do not even understand that sin alone is taken away in such a way that God does not impute it [Ps. 32, 2.) and forgives it out of mercy.

(48) For only respectively (relative) saus graces, not essentially (formaliter) or according to its substance (substantialiter), is sin abolished, the law done away with, death destroyed.

49. And all this for Christ's sake, in this life, "until we come to be a perfect man, to the measure of the perfect age of Christ" [Eph. 4:3.).

50 We know it, and they have learned it of us, that Christ is made unto us a mystery (sacramentum) and an example.

This very beautiful written) thought is not ours, much less theirs, but of Augustine,

52) Since he says: Christ with his one agrees with our twofold, and makes a perfect number. 1)

(53) But neither Augustine, from whom this saying originated, nor we, his disciples, invented this conclusion that the law should therefore be abolished.

(54) They have added this inference from their head, that they might also invent something new and be held up before others, from the input of their master, the devil.

1) How this saying of Augustin is to be understood, compare Table Talks, Cap. 7, § 44. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 299.

The Holy Scripture shows us four ways of preaching 69) To abolish the law and let sin and death remain is and teaching people to salvation, which are taken from nothing else than to hide the plague of sin and death from four works of God. men to their destruction.

For God scares with threats, comforts with promises, When death and sin are abolished (as Christ did [2 admonishes with tribulations, entices with benefits. Tim. 1, 10. Rom. 8, 3.]), the law can be blessedly

57 But these four pieces do not abolish the law when abolished, even established (stabiliretur), Rom. 3, [v. they are taught, but reinforce the law. 31.].

58. "God's goodness leads you to repentance" [Rom. 2:4], that is, that you may realize that the law is the power of sin [1 Cor. 15:56].

(59) The reason why the law frightens and kills is that it directs man to himself or drives him to self-knowledge.

(60) But these enthusiasts go about taking away Christ Himself through the mystery (sacramentum) and example of Christ.

For when the law is taken away, no one knows what Christ is or what he did when he fulfilled the law for us.

For if I want to know the fulfillment of the law, that is, Christ, I must necessarily know what the law and its fulfillment are.

(63) This cannot be taught, unless it is taught that the law is not fulfilled in us, and that therefore we are guilty of sin and death.

64 When this is taught, we learn that we are all debtors to the law and children of wrath,

(65) The ungodly, either in the flesh and spirit, or wholly; but the godly, if they be yet in the flesh, and alive.

(66) Therefore, the doctrine of the law is necessary in the church and must be kept in it, because Christ cannot be kept without it.

67 For what keepest thou of Christ, if the law which he fulfilled be abolished, and thou knowest not what he fulfilled?

68 Finally, the law is so fulfilled in Christ that you cannot teach it in such a way unless you also teach that the law is not fulfilled in us.

The Sixth Disputation of D. M. Luther against the Antinomians

[10 Sept.] Anno 1540. 1)

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Martin Luther, Doctor of Theology, Magister Joachim Mörlin from Wittenberg will defend these theses next Friday in order to be admitted to the doctorate.

This conclusion of St. Paul - "where there is no law, there is no transgression" [Rom. 4, 15] - is not only spiritually (theologice), but also worldly (politice) and naturally (naturaliter) good.

2 Similarly, where there is no sin, there is no punishment, nor forgiveness of sin.

3 Likewise also these, where there is neither punishment nor forgiveness, there is neither wrath nor mercy.

4 Likewise, where there is neither wrath nor mercy, there is neither divine nor human government.

(5) Likewise, where there is neither divine nor human government, there is neither God nor man.

(6) Likewise, where there is neither God nor man,

there is nothing but perhaps the devil.

7 Therefore the antinomians, the enemies of the law, are certainly either devils themselves or the devil's brothers.

8 And it does not help the antinomians at all that they boast that they teach very much about God, about Christ, about grace, about law 2c.

1) This caption in the old Allsgaben is missing in the original print, which offers the caption we have placed immediately below. Mörlin was creirt to Doctor of Theology on September 16, 1540. The disputation therefore probably took place shortly before, on Friday, September 10. (Förstemann's New Book of Documents, p. 344.)

It is not new nor strange that the name of God is uselessly used, even by the devils themselves.

10 The Antinomian confession is like the one where the devils cry out: "You are the son of the living God", Luc. 4, 34, 8, 28.

(11) And the oath of those false prophets, "As the Lord lives," when they took a false oath, as Isaiah and Jeremiah testify.

(12) He who says that the law, which condemns, should not be taught, is in fact denying the law.

13. and when he teaches something of the law, he teaches the cover of Moses, not his clear and true face, 2 Cor. 3, 13. that is, he teaches the law, carnally understood.

The law which does not condemn is a fictitious and painted law, like the chimera 1) or Tragelaphus.

1) About Chimaera compare Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XVIII, 21, note - Tragelaphus --Bockhirsch, klinius 8, 50; with the Greeks only m fantastic images known.

Even the worldly or natural law is nothing if it does not frighten and condemn the transgressors, Rom. 13, 1. 5. 1 Petr. 2, 13. ff.

16 Therefore it is rightly spoken: From evil customs come good laws.

17. what the lawbreakers speak of god, of Christ, of faith, law, grace 2c. they speak without understanding, as a parrot speaks its xxxxx [good day].

18 Therefore, it is impossible to learn from the antinomians right godliness (theologiam) or right worldly life (politiam).

(19) Therefore, they should be shunned as the most harmful teachers of licentiousness, who give permission for all deeds of shame.

20 For "they serve not Christ, but their belly," [Rom. 16:18] seeking, as senseless men, to please men, that they in turn may obtain honor from them, as from a human day.

32 D. Matt. Luther's report [to D. Brück] of M. Joh. Eisleben's false teaching and shameful deed; in addition, answer to his void and unfounded complaint against Luther. *)

He"- Helps- June 1540.

In response to M. Eisleben's complaint, I hereby submit his proposition and a piece of his postill (which I have beaten down for him), 2) in addition to the

2) This breaks down to the confiscation and destruction of Agricola's book: "Das ander teil der Summarien, von dem ersten-Sontag nach Trinitatis anzufahren, bis auff den ersten Sontag des Aduents. Ivan, Agricola Eisleben. Wittenberg 1537." sBei Hans Luft.] This writing is found in Förstemann's Neuem Urkundenbuche, Vol. I, pp. 296-311, from the only remaining copy in the archives at Weimar.

pious gentlemen, D. Caspar's [Güttel] and Wendelin's 3) testimony, from which E. A. to hear what M. Eisleben has worked against us and our doctrine at Eisleben so many years ago. And such everything backwards and maliciously, uuvermahliet and urüber-

3) Wendelin Faber, preacher at Seeburg. - This refers to the testimony that Faber sent to Caspar Güttel on 2V. April 1540 to Caspar Güttel. (Förstemann's "Neues Urkundenbuch", p. 332 ff., No. 20.).

*) This writing appeared in 1549 in a single edition, without indication of printer and place, under the title: "Ein Schrifft des Achtbarn und Ehrwürdigen Herren seliger gedechtnis, Doctoris Martini Lutheri, Wider den Eisleben, kurtz vor seinem end geschriebe, vormals aber nie im Druck außgangen"; then it is found in the Wittenberg edition, vol. XII, p. 236p; in the Jenaer (1568), vol. VII, p. 299p; in the Altenburger, vol. VII, p. 324; in the Leipziger, vol. XXI, p. 360, and in the Erlanger, vol. 32, p. 64. (The proofs which the Erlanger edition provides for the Wittenberg and Jenaer editions are incorrect. Seidemann-De Wette, vol. VI, 246, has reprinted them from the Erlangen edition.) Further, from Luther's own handwriting, in Förstemann's Neuem Urkundenbuche, vol. I, p. 321, and from it in De Wette, vol. VI, p. 246. We give the text according to Förstemann. In all complete editions of Luther's works, this writing is given the year 1539; however, it belongs to the year

In this he did not act as a pious man, let alone as a pious Christian or theologian. For before we knew it, he founded a sect against us and our doctrine, which is called Minor 1), and condemned and disgraced our doctrine, which is false and impure and not to be taught, together with us and our school in Wittenberg. Which also the count 2) complained against me, but at that time I could not believe that M. Eisleben, such a false man and lying mouth, should so despise his faithful friends and dear preceptors and blaspheme and disparage them until, alas! the faith came into my hands.

Now E. A. can easily notice what our most gracious Lord and our whole congregation would like to see, that our doctrine should be accused of being false, impure and not at all acceptable to teach (because with that we would be accused of being impure, false disciples), especially if M. Eisleben has done such a thing to us in the back and does not prove it under his own eyes, as he also cannot do. And what a disgrace that would be, if we should have presented and confessed a false, impure, unpleasant doctrine before the emperor and the whole empire, when our dear princes and lords have placed and dared to place their country and people, body and goods, as well as their souls, together with us, on this doctrine, so sure that we have so far praised it as the pure right divine doctrine, and also (as it is true) so in grace. And the impotent, wretched tit-head 3) alone blasphemes against it and makes it unclean.

1) Perhaps: Minorists. In the original "Minorist".

2) Albrecht von Mansfeld.

3) In the original: "Meyssenkopf"; in the Wittenberg and Jena editions: "Meiskopff". In the Erlangen edition, which supposedly gives the text "according to the Wittenberg edition": "Mäiskopf", reprinted from the old Walch scheu edition. This passage seems to us to prove what we have already expressed several times as a conjecture, that the Erlangen edition often uses the

He desecrates us in a treacherous and deceitful way before he warns us or admonishes us about it. In addition, he lets himself be dragged along to the imperial diets and to Vienna, 4) pretends to be on our side, preaches and teaches like us; nevertheless, in his heart and behind our backs he drives such enmity, reviles and disparages the theologians of Wittenberg as he is able to do to the highest degree, in writing and orally, as his letter (here) well testifies, and here in the city of his spitting has done much against us.

And summa, Eisleben is our enemy, and has reviled our doctrine, desecrated our theologians: this proves his sect, which he founded at Eisleben, and cannot deny it. For if he were with us and not against us, or if he did not condemn our doctrine, he would not have broken up our assembly nor created a sect against us, just as Amsdorf of Magdeburg and others did not create sects against us, nor condemn our doctrine or denigrate theologians, as Eisleben did.

About this, since he founded and poisoned his sect in Eisleben, he comes back to Wittenberg, and again behind me in a murderous way, intends to poison and turn away this school and church as well. Gives his postilion into print, behind the knowledge and will of the rector, against my most gracious lord's commandment that one should not print anything, the rector should see it beforehand,

Walch's text. - Förstemann remarks on the word: "probably more correctly: Mausekopf". Seckendorf, List. ImtL., Lid. III, p. 308 (9) offers: "mauskopff", "tsnedrio", i.e. a person who makes attacks in the dark. Seidemann, on the other hand, says: "I do think of carus and compare, e.g., nasmorä äs ßallo ü M-illo, nasrnoirs <ls Növr.".

4) Agricola was with Prince John at the imperial congresses at Sveher in 1526 and 1529, at Augsburg in 1530. Agricola made the trip to Wlen in November 1535 as a preacher to Prince John Frederick.

5) Förstemann: "It is probably the diminutive of Lorg." Seideinann: "Is Lecker and Schlecker."

1540. It is a letter from Luther to Chancellor Brück, prompted by Agricola's complaint against Luther to the Elector on March 31, 1540. The title is taken from the old editions. In determining the time, it has been completely overlooked until now that Luther refers in the last part of this writing to the declaration that Agricola gave to his complaint to the Elector, to the Commissars. This declaration is to be placed before June 8. On this day, the theologians consulted by the Commissars say (Förstemann, l. c. p. 3361, at the end): "But as far as his present declaration is concerned". In contrast, "Luther's Report" is already in the hands of the Elector on June 15, 1540 (Förstemann, 1, o. p. 339a, No. 231. Förstemann and Seidemann erroneously place our writing in April 1540; in Kawerau, 'Agricola, p. 204 f., and Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. I I, 471 f., a certain time determination cannot be clearly recognized, but it seems that they also place our writing in April 1540.

lind leuget dem godmen Hansen Lufft seine Postill in den Druck unter meinem Namen, als habe ich's überlesen und gefallen mir. And if I had not found out out of God's fate, Hans Lufft (who also still embroiders 1) such print half in the damage) should have come together with me against my most gracious Lord in all Nurngade. For with such a postilion Eisleben wanted to lay the first stone against our doctrine and us, that our doctrine must be unjust and impure, so that he alone might be praised as the master of pure doctrine. And finally, the foolish man has been too concerned about his honor, that the Wittenbergers would be nothing and Eisleben everything; just as his best friends confess that he has always had it in his mouth to say to Eisleben: It is *humanus this*; and has always hurt him, what one has said good things in Wittenberg, also let himself be heard here: *Ego perrumpem*.

In short, nothing distorts me so much as that he has let us be friends, 2) laughed with us, eaten with us, and so dishonestly, treacherously concealed his enmity against us: for if there were a good drop 3) in him, he should have come to light and confronted us, as we did to the pope and emperor at Augsburg, he would probably have received an answer. But he wanted honor, and wanted to find it deceitfully and treacherously; therefore, he is now doing what he deserves.

About this I wanted to serve him by settling this matter theologically, or (as it is called) doctrinaliter, so that it would not have to be judicialiter 4) judged, and against this publicly disputirt and written. For he does not think what an unpleasant thing this would be to my most gracious lord, if it were to be judicially conducted, that M. Eisleben should be 5) my most gracious lord's theologian.

1) In the original: according to.

2) For this, compare Luther's Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 33, paragraph 2. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1028.

3) In the original: "drip".

4) In Förstemann: "judicialiter".

5) "Should" is missing in Walch's old edition. This variant is not given in Förstemann. The listing of Walch's variants in Förstemann is generally very cursory and inaccurate. Without having looked for them particularly carefully, we have in this writing twenty-three such omissions of Va

The author of this book, who is a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, is a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor, and a member of the Church of the Holy Roman Emperor.

This is the thorough report of the matter, and the right principal article, from which my most gracious lord will well know to deal with M. Eisleben, that he either proves or makes true again with good reason his blasphemy against both our doctrine and theologians; if not, that he then publicly punishes his blasphemous tongue and writing, or his lying mouth, and restores to both our doctrine and theologians their honor, which he has maliciously and shamefully stolen and taken; 6) to atone for the trouble and damage he has caused in Jsleben and everywhere else, so that his blasphemy and division of our congregation may be restored, and so that hearts may again be brought into one mind and harmony, which he has turned away from us and against us with his venom and incited.

Now to his complaint.

He complains that I have interpreted to him that 7) he does not want to suffer the law and give leave to sin freely, to abolish Christ and the Holy Spirit, and to do no repentance, 2c.

So that's what I'm responding to:

Since M. Eisleben wanted to sue me, he should cheap with good evidence or probation

rianten, which are mostly also variants of the old editions. On the other hand, Förstemann has a whole number of useless notes by noting each time Walch has added the verse number to a chapter given in the text, while every theologian knows or should know that in Luther's time the verse divisions were not found in the Bibles, at least not in the New Testament.

6) Förstemann: "Hussen".

7) This refers to Agricola's letter, which he sent on March 31, 1540 to the Elector, who was then in Schmalkalden. It is found in Förstemann, Neues Urkundenbnch, p. 317 ff. The date there "March 1" is a printing error instead of: March 31.

I have written before, and do not count so badly what I have written or done against him. For I still confess now and forever that I have written so and so against him, and I am sorry that I have done it so kindly and cleanly. I will also, if God wills, do it differently after this interrogation, and do him his right. That he wrote a Kakismum or Geckismum 1) and many other things, and also preached them, I knew well (I wish he would have left it alone and preached Marcolfum or Ulenspiegel instead), but that it should be proven that I did him wrong, that I would like to see proven; for he is a sharp dialectician, he will perhaps know how to teach me such a consequence. I cannot understand them. This is how his scroll students wrote: I mean, the Wittenbergers have got a man at 21 Eisleben who will teach them the Theologia and Dialectica properly. Therefore, I would like to hear such new Dialectica. He whistles, and prove them well.

My Dialectica teaches thus: If one is accused of a thing and is convinced (as Eisleben is convinced in 21, that he forbids the law, that our teaching is impure and false, that we theologians are also false, impure teachers, even though they have been accused of it), and against this, he imposes the contradiction, he does not thereby prove that he has been wronged. Rather, where he proves something, he proves so much that he is either a mad fool who hits himself in the cheeks, or a two-faced traitor and Judas; just as the devil and all red spirits are also almost all liars, that 21 Eisleben, where he looked so deeply into the books, as perhaps into the beer cans, would probably have read or seen such things. Is the excellent man, who is to teach the Wittenbergers *dialecticam* and *theologiam*, so unlearned and coarse that he does not know how sheep's clothing can never turn the ravening wolves into sheep, and Judas' kiss cannot turn his treacherousness into a good work of love, whether he might have given the Lord the

Licks mouth, kisses, hugs and speaks dear rabbi (Matth. 26, 49.). M. Eisleben looks at himself, how he has acted against me, lets me trust an old, faithful friend and believe that he is of our part, works with us in the Gospel and gathers with us, kisses and caresses me in the most exquisite way in front, behind he is our enemy, breaks our work, scatters our gathering, and now boasts about the contradiction in his complaint, as if he had done right and I had done wrong, since I had touched his two-tongued malice.

Is it therefore still my request that he prove or make true his complaint against me, or do what he owes 2c.

Secondly, I answer that the pieces he complains about me are not laid on him by me. He himself is guilty of them, and they come from his own neck. For he has set the antecedent (which he still confesses in the complaint and bases on it): *Lex non est docenda*; or, as he now wants to clean it up: Law is a dangerous sermon *ut ministratio mortis*. From this antecedente follows that I have written: He who forbids to teach the law cannot teach of sin, and people must live freely, safely, without knowledge of sins. And this consequence is not mine, but St. Paul's to Romans [4, 15.]: *Ubi non est lex, nec praevaricatio; Sine lege peccatum mortuum est; Ubi venit lex, revixit peccatum*. Item 1 Cor. 15, 56: *Virtus peccati lex etc.*. For *lex et peccatum* are correlativa, *ponunt et tollunt se mutuo etc.*. Therefore M. Grickel should not sue and punish me Luther, but St. Paulum (as he does herewith in effectum and re ipsa). He may take issue with the latter, who will show him whether he may overturn or resist such a consequence with his gekismo 2) or Judas kiss.

Further follows from the same *antecedent* M. Grickels: Where sin is not taught nor preached, people cannot know what sin is. Therefore they cannot desire forgiveness and grace.

2) This word is written here differently from the previous "gekismum", in the original: "gekhsmo", probably intentionally, to allude to the cry of the jackdaws, "geken" or "gäken".

1) These expressions are mockingly used by Luther from Agricola's "Catechism". Kakismus (<cax6k) - bad machwerk; Geckismus (Geck) - silly stuff. Cf. De Wette, vol. I, p. 342: Okoious IloNurEk katuuna kiMiueut.

and then grace is of no use. For grace must win and prevail in us against the law and sin, so that we do not despair. Such a consequence is also not mine, but St. Paul's, 1 Cor. 15, 57: DEO gratia, who gives us the victory per JEsu[m] Christum, scilicet contra legem et peccatum et mortem, as the text stands there mightily v. 56: Stimulus mortis peccatum, virtus peccati lex etc.. And Christ [Matth. 9, 13.]: "I am not come to call the righteous to repentance, but sinners." Luc. 4,18. Matth. 11, 5.: Pauperibus misit me evangelisari.

Further, where grace is nothing nor does Christ nothing; item, no God, no repentance, no prayer, no good work 2c., and as my booklet and I still say: The most harmful teaching on earth is such M. Grickel's Antinomia. All such consequences are not mine, but of the Holy Spirit himself, and M. Isleben will not be able to deny them, because he himself sets the antecedent that one should not teach sin or law: And does not help him his jugglery de lege post vel cum evan- gelio, as hereafter. For, as I said, Judas' kiss does not make his traitorousness pious.

In fact, it can be seen in M. Jsleben's life that he teaches such antinomia, and the tree can be known by its fruits. He lives freely and securely as if he had neither law nor sin. First, he blasphemes and condemns our doctrine as impure and false (that is, the Holy Spirit himself in his holy law), reviles and disparages us Wittenbergers wherever he can in the most shameful way, and does all this deceitfully and maliciously, when we have done him no harm but all good, as he cannot say or prove otherwise. He is a good friend to me, his best friend and father, and makes me think he is our good friend. He does not warn me, but works behind us to turn people away from our doctrine and to hang them on himself, as a desperate, murderous knave; practices such ingratitude, pride and haughtiness against us, as I do not encounter much. In such abominable sins, therefore, he walks securely and defiantly, accuses us even without warning, does what he wills against us, as if he could not sin, or were not a law, of which he is a

conscience. Magister Jsleben would make such Christians for us, as his mob is also like-minded and lives against us and our teachings.

But that I come to the end, so I assume that it 1) is called: the principal article.

He still speaks unashamedly in the lament: The law without the gospel is preached yearly; for it is a ministerium mortis. Haec ille. See what the great fool does. God gave his law for this very reason, that it should bite, cut, slash, slaughter and sacrifice the old man. For it should frighten and punish the trusting, unwise, secure old Adam and show him his sin and death, so that he, humiliated, despairs of himself and thus becomes eager for grace, as St. Paul says: Virtus peccati lex, stimulus mortis peccatum est [1 Cor. 15, 56]. Therefore he calls it bonam, justam, sanctam. Item Jeremiah [23, 29.], "My word is like a hammer that shatters the rocks." Item: Ego ignis consumens etc.. Ps. 9, 21.: Constitue legislatorem super eos, ut sciant gentes, se esse homines, non deos, nec Deo similes. So does St. Paul, Rom. 1. et 2. et 3. makes all the world sinners through the law, casts them under God's wrath, and even strikes them dead before God. So here our dear M. Grickel goes on, and invents a new theology of his own from his mad, foolish head, and teaches that one should not kill, punish or slaughter people, that is, one should not preach the 2) law. Here he publicly confesses himself

1) In the original "it", and Förstemann remarks: "it" is clearly written"; in the original print and in all editions: "das er heißt den" etc. The latter seems to us to be the correct reading; we consider "it" to be a spelling mistake. What is meant is the declaration of läkelnrat[i]ol, which Agricola had handed over to the commissars appointed by the Elector on his complaint written on March 31. It is inscribed: "Principal article of trade, Eisleben's doctrine belsangend". The words cited here by Luther are right in the beginning of this writing. "Luther's Report", that is, our present writing, is of course later. This statement is to be placed shortly before June 8, 1540. It is found in Förstemann's "Neuem Urkundenbuche", p. 337 with the time determination: "about June 8, 1540" and with the erroneous heading: "Des M. Johann Agricola Vertheidigung seiner Lehre vom Gesetz gegen D. Luther." Compare the introduction.

2) In the original: des.

in the complaint that he had condemned and forbidden the preaching of the law. This is the reason why I wrote against him. For here he straightforwardly confesses the antecedents of what was said above, and yet he wants to complain and murmur against the consequence in my booklet. So his complaint is my excuse, my booklet's confirmation, and his own condemnation. For even we, who have now been made holy by grace, still live in a sinful body, and must allow ourselves to be punished, terrified, killed and sacrificed by the law for the sake of such remaining sin, even into the pit. That therefore the law in this life, before and after and forever, must be *lex occidens, damnans, accusans*, as St. Paul and our books teach so abundantly, if the proud fool could have humbled himself and read the same. For *lex non occidens non est lex nisi velata*, as Moses dicke 1) testifies. This is the hypocrite's false mind in the law.

Because the angry little devil, so Master Grickel rides, does not want to suffer *legem*, that is, *mortificationem irascentem, accusantem, terrentem, occidentem legem*, so it is easy to notice what he has in mind to cause by M. Grickels foolishness, since he nevertheless wants to be praised that he teaches *post vel sub evangelio legem*, as, thou shalt not kill, steal 2c., 2) as the Turk, Jews, philosophers, and papists teach, and regard nature as healthy, and M. Grickel does not see this, that his little spirit wants to go out there, with boasting and thumping, that he also preaches the law. Yes, if we were Adam in paradise before the fall, then the law would probably be

be taught rightly. But because Eisleben does not want the law to be taught *ad occidendum, damnandum, accusandum*, his little spirit seeks that the former and original sin should be left unpunished. Thus Christ and God are all in vain and lost.

And is this not blindness upon blindness, that he will not preach the law without and before the gospel? These are impossibilia. How is it possible to preach forgiveness of sins, if there are no sins first? How is it possible to preach life, if there is not death first? Or shall we preach to the angels of the forgiveness of sins, and salvation from death, which have neither sin nor death before? But how can we preach of sins, or know that sin is before, where it does not manifest the law? For the gospel, according to its proper function, does not say who and what sin is, but indicates that there must be great harm, that such a great remedy belongs to it, but does not say what sin is called, or what it is. The law must do this. Thus M. Eisleben *re ipsa* must leave the law before the Gospel to do its office, as *occidere* etc., as he almost denies it with words, only to the annoyance of the Wittenbergers, so that he, *novus autor*, also makes one of his own, and misleads the people, and separates the churches.

But there he seals his art finely, that he says: Gospel reveals wrath; how is the foolish so completely gone astray, does not understand what *lex* or *evangelion*, *neque usum neque vim eorum*; and sets up such clutter and secten on his foolishness and jugglery: The law shall not wrath nor kill: but the gospel shall wrath and kill; all for this reason, that he may not teach alike with the Wittenbergers: *evangelium* reveals grace, and *lex* wrath; that must M. Grickel must reverse this. So M. Grickel's complaint against me stands as he deserves.

_____ M. Luther.

3) In the original: "one".

1) d. i. often.
2) Luther wrote the sentence: 8ie ejus Iota Postilla aZit and immediately following the word plülosoxlū in the margin.

II. Wider Caspar Schwenkfeld, Wiedertäufer und andere Schwärmer.

33 D. Martin Luther's admonition to Caspar Schwenkfeld to desist from his error. *)

April 14, 1526.

Grace and peace in Christ. My dear lord and friend, we have been a long time in replying, so that you should notice how we have not read your thing beyond raps, and now we are sending it to you again by your messenger. But what shall I say? Perhaps God wants you to fall like this. You tell me that you want to try 1) how verba coenae rhymes with cap. VI. Ioannis, and would be the same; this has not happened, and will never happen. Now what is the use of teaching much de duplici esca imaginis et veritatis, and leaving out the probation[s] that are supposed to indicate such two escas in coena? You say it is so, but you do not prove it. Now we may not believe you and build our souls on your word. Is therefore

1) d. i. prove.

My friendly request, let go of the public error and do not add to the number of those who are now misleading the world so miserably. If not, then God's will be done, and I am heartily sorry, but I am clean from your blood and from all whom you deceive with it. 2) May God convert you. Amen. At Wittenberg, Tiburtii, 1526.

2) Schwenkfeld had been in Wittenberg at the end of 1525 and wrote to D. Z. (Zauch, Zoch) about it, Epistolar. II, Th. II, p. 24: "about two months he ^Lutheri sent me our booklet again with a sharp heated letter, we should stop seducing the people, whose blood, so we seduced, should be over our heads, and concluded fründlichl with these words: In short, either you or we must be serfs of the devil, because we boast on both sides of God's word." Therefore, Diburtii must be dissolved tverden with April 14, not August 11.

*) This letter is found in the Leipzig Supplement, p.45; in De Wette, vol. III, 123 and in the Erlangen edition, vol. 53, p. 383, everywhere with the wrong date: August 11, The correct time determination was given by Seidemann in De Wette, vol. VI, p. 596. The Tidurtii here is not Hdurtü st Lusannae, August 11, but Hburtli ValerianL st Naximi, April 14. We reproduce the text according to De Wette.

34. D. Martin Luther's judgment and answer to Caspar Schwenkfeld's letter and booklet, sent to him. *)

November 8, 1543.

Luther's verdict on Schwenkfeld. 1)

Caspar Schwenkfeld had Anno 1543 on the 8th day of Novembris D. M. Luther one of his books by his own messenger, which title was "von der Herrlichkeit". 2) There D. Luther: Schwenkfeld is a poor man, who has neither mind nor spirit, but ex is nonsensical (attonitus), as the enthusiasts all are, he does not know what he is babbling about, but this is his opinion and his main reason (principium): The creature is not to be worshipped, because it is written (Matth. 4, 10.): "You shall worship God, your Lord, and serve Him alone? Then he thinks, Christ is a creature, therefore I should not worship Christ as a man. And fingirt zwo Christus, sagt: Die Creatur sei nach der Auferstehung und Verherrlichung in die Gottheit verwandt, und deshalb worship, und bescheißt die Leute mit dem herrglichen Namen Christi, wie er dann schreibt: "zum Preis Christi".

But the children go through it badly, and say: I believe in Jesus Christ our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit.

1) This superscription is found in Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1593 and Erl. 65, 219. In the Tischreden, the superscription reads: "Wider Schwenkfelds Meinung von der Creatürlichkeit Christi." We have translated the Latin passages of this section.

2) In the other redaction: "of the holiness". According to the citation in Köstlin, Martin Luther, p. 684 aâ p. 590, 2): "Von der Herrlichkeit vel Heimlichkeit".

Spirit, born of Mary, the Virgin 2c. So the fool will make me two Christs; one who hangs on the cross and another who has gone to heaven and sits at the right hand of God, his heavenly Father. I shall not worship the Christ who hangs on the cross and walks on earth. He allowed himself to be worshipped when he fell down before him. So the Lord Christ himself says: "He who believes in me, believes in him who sent me". The phantom has stolen some vocabularies from my book "The Last Words of David", with which the idiot also wants to make himself beautiful, as the sharing of qualities and the independence (identitatem) of the person; thus he mixes it in, and then wants to say: I also meant it that way.

He wants to teach me what Christ is and how I should worship him. I have it, thank God, better than he, I know my Christ well, therefore he lets me unheeded. Then Magister Rörer said: 3) Well, dear doctor, that is too rough. He answered: "You teach me to be so rough. So one must talk to the devil. He revokes in a public writing the rapture with the Sacrament, and bring me testimonies of Doctor Joh. Hessen and Doctor Moibano from Breslau, otherwise I do not believe him, even if he swears to me and puts his fingers in the middle of the wounds.

3) In the other redaction: "Then the woman spoke."

*) The letter is found in the Wittenberg edition, vol. XII, p. 210d; in the Jena (1562), vol. VIII, p. 173d; in the Altenburg, vol. VIII, p. 344; in the Leipzig, vol. XXI, p. 437; in the Erlangen, vol. 56, p. 71 and vol. 58, 30. Further, in all editions of Luther's Tischreden (except the SI! Louiser, where this piece has been omitted), Cap. 7, § 25; in De Wette, V, p. 613 and in Erbkain, Geschichte der protestantischen Secten, p. 399. (De Wette has the wrong proof in this letter: "Witt. II, 210," which Erlanger, vol. 56, p. 71, reprinted). The closer time determination results from Luther's "Urtheil von Schwenkfeld", which we have inserted here from the Tischreden I. c.. The same is found twice in Walch's old edition, namely vol. XXI, 1593 and vol. XXII, 408; twice also in the Erlanger, vol. 58, p. 29 f. and vol. 65, p. 219. In Walch in the 21st volume and in the Erlanger in the 65th volume without time determination immediately before the "Zeugniß für einen Boten", in which Luther certifies that he is still alive. This "Urtheil" and the "Zeugniß" have nothing to do with each other, because the latter is to be put approximately in March of the year 1537. Compare Luther's letters to Melanchthon and to his housewife of February 27, 1537, De Wette, Vol. V, 57 ff. The latter letter is also found in Walch, XXI, 392. We have given preference to the redaction in the Tischreden as the more original.

And Doctor Luther had returned to the messenger an open letter, which had not been sealed, and was the superscription:

[Luther's reply to] Schwenkfeld's messenger.

My messenger, dear man! You shall tell your master, Caspar Schwenkfeld, in reply that I received the letter and the booklets from you. And would to God, he stopped. For he has previously lit a fire in Silesia against the Holy Sacrament, which has not yet been extinguished and will burn on it forever. Over this he continues with his eutychism and creatureliness, misleading the churches, when God has neither commanded nor sent him anything. And the nonsensical fool, possessed by the devil, understands nothing, does not know what he is saying.

But if he will not stop, let him leave me with his little books, which the devil has made of him.

I have given him my final judgment and answer: Increpet dominus in te, Satan [Zach. 3, 2.], et sit spiritus tuus, qui vocavit te, et cursus tuus, quo curris, et omnes, qui participant tibi, Sacramentarii et Eutychiani, tecum et cum vestris blasphemii in perditionem. Sicut scriptum est: Currebant et non mittebam eos: loquebantur, et nihil mandavi eis. [Jerem. 23, 21. The Lord rebuke thee, Satan, and let it be thy spirit that hath called thee, and the way in which thou walkest, and all that hold with thee, Sacramentarians and Eutychians, with thee and with your blasphemies, to damnation. As it is written, "They ran . and I did not send them; they talked and I did not command them."] 1543.

Martin Luther

with your own hand.

35. D. Martin Luther's letter to Eberhard von der Tannen, von den Schleichern und Winkelpredigern. *)

At the beginning of the year 1532.

To the strict and firm Eberhard von der Tannen, Amtmann zu Wartburg, my favorable lord and friend. Grace and peace in Christ, our Lord and Savior. Amen.

I have heard, my dear lord and friend, how the Anabaptists also like to sneak in and around you and want to throw their poison on ours. Although I now know that you have been sufficiently informed from Er Justus Menius' book 1), and

1) "Der Wiedertäufer Lehre und Geheimniß aus heiliger Schrift widerlegt." (The Anabaptist Doctrine and Mystery Refuted from Holy Scripture). Luther's preface to this is found in Walch, old edition, vol. XIV, 276.

But because the devil does not like to let go, and many are, if they have overlooked a book once, quickly go into a corner with it, and forget everything, because they are admonished, that probably needs a daily guardian, who admonishes constantly: I have with this letter to you all other officials, cities and lords again ask and want to admonish, such sneaks to defend, so that we do ours.

2 And first of all they are well and easily seized with it, if one asks them for

*) This writing appeared in the year 1532 in several single editions, namely to Wittenberg with Nickel Schirlentz; to Erfurt "to the black horn" and to Nürnberg with Friedrich Peypus. In the editions: in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 244; in the Jena (1566), vol. V, p. 490 b; in the Altenburg, vol. V, p. 966; in the Leipzig, vol. XX, p. 357 and in the Erlangen, vol. 31, p. 214. In the old edition of Walch with the wrong year 1531; in De Wette: "Perhaps in October 1532"; in the Erlangen: "October 1532". The closer determination of the time we have given after Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 325. We bring the text after the Erlanger, which reproduces the first original print, under comparison of the Wittenberger and the Jenaer. It should be noted that the Erlanger, as it seems from its original printing, offers after the title: "Anno 1531", which we have not printed, because the Wittenberg edition explicitly notes: "Im MDXXXII. Erstlich ausgangen."

If they have their orders, whoever they call to sneak or come and preach in the corner, they may not give an answer, nor indicate their order. And I say truly, if such creepers had otherwise no evil in them, and were true saints, yet this certain thing (that they creep without command and come unasked) may convince them for devil's messengers and teachers by force. For the Holy Spirit does not creep, but openly begs from heaven. The sly ones creep, but the doves fly: therefore such creeping is the right course of the devil, which is missing more and more.

(3) I have heard it said, how the creepers may be found preaching to the laborers in the harvest, and in the field under the work, so also to the charcoal burners and to some people in the woods, and sowing their seed everywhere, and blowing poison, turn the people away from their parish churches. Behold the devil's right footstep and grip, how he shuns the light and mews in the darkness. Who is so rude that could not notice that they are true messengers of the devil? If they were of God and righteous, they would first of all find their way to the priest and deal with him, declare their profession, and tell what they believed and whether he would allow them to preach publicly. If the priest would then not allow them, they would be excused before God, and then they would want to knock the dust off their feet 2c. For the pastor holds the chair of preaching, baptism, sacrament, and all pastoral care is commanded to him. But now they want to secretly bite out the pastor with all his command; and yet do not denounce their secret command; these are real thieves and murderers of souls, blasphemers and enemies of Christ and his church.

4 Now there is truly no other counsel than that both offices, ecclesiastical and secular, do this with all diligence. The ecclesiastical must indeed instruct the people always and with diligence, and these aforementioned pieces must be imagined, so that they do not allow a sneak and certainly recognize them as messengers of the devil, and let them ask: Where do you come from? Who has brought you

sand? Who told you to preach only? Where are your seals and letters that you were sent by men? Where are your miraculous signs that God sent you? Why do you not go to our priest? Why do you creep up to me so secretly and crawl into the corners? Why don't you appear in public? Are you a child of light, why do you shun the light?

5 With such questions (I respect) they should be easily resisted, because they cannot prove their profession. And if we could bring the people into such an understanding of the profession, then such lurkers could be well controlled. Item, that they are also always instructed and admonished to report such lurkers to the pastor, which they are also obliged to do, if they want to be Christians and become blessed. For, where they do not do so, they help the devil's messenger and sneak to the pastor (yes, God Himself) to steal his preaching ministry, baptism, sacrament and pastoral care, as well as to steal the parishioners secretly, and thus to devastate and destroy the parish (as God has ordered). If they heard such an admonition, and knew that it was in the opinion of the Berns, some pious hearts would probably denounce such angle preachers and assassins to the parish priest. For, as I said, with the Berns, where one insists, one can scare the devil. A pastor can boast that he holds the office of preaching, baptism, sacrament, and pastoral care publicly and rightly, and that he is commanded to seek and wait for such things; but the foreign sneaks and assassins cannot boast such things, and must confess that they are of foreign origin, and that they take hold of and fall into a foreign office. This cannot be the Holy Spirit, but must be the wretched devil.

The secular office must also see to it. For since such lurkers are the devil's messengers, preaching poison and lies, and the devil is not only a liar, but also a murderer, he cannot fail to intend, through such his messengers, to cause sedition and murder as well (even if he expresses himself of it for a time and pretends to be peaceful), and thus to overthrow both, spiritual and secular government, contrary to God's will. He can not be

1) d. i. teach.

For his way is to lie and murder; so his own, possessed by him, cannot be powerful themselves, must drive as he drives them.

7. Therefore, officials, judges, and those who have to govern should know and be certain that they must suspect such sneaks, not only of false doctrine, but also of murder and sedition, because they know that such people are ridden by the devil, and should also have their servants assemble the subjects, and warn them against such villains, and command in the highest way, with great punishment, that every subject must denounce such lurkers, as the subjects are obliged to do, if they themselves do not want to become guilty of all the murder and sedition that the devil has in mind 2c.

(8) And so, like the ministry, go to the professional, and ask the sneak, or his host, Whence comest thou? Who sent you? 2c., as above. And ask the host also: Who has called you this lurker? to listen to his sermon? How do you know that he has orders to teach you, and you to learn from him? Why didn't you tell the priest or us? Why do you leave your church, since you are done, taught, reported 1) and belong to it by God's order, and crawl into the corner? Why do you establish a new one, secretly and unauthorized? Who gave you the power to divide this parish and to set up divisions among us? Who commanded you to despise, to condemn, to condemn your parish priest in the back, before he is questioned or sued? From where did you become such a judge over your priest, even your own judge?

(9) For such a misdeed, and much more, is committed by anyone who attaches himself to the sneaks, and should be justly addressed for it. And I have good hope that if the authorities were diligent in this, it would be of great benefit, and many pious people would take care, and help to illuminate such boys, if they knew that there were such great

2) and that so much would be attached to the calling or command. Otherwise, where one does not stand firm and press on the calling or command, no church would remain anywhere in the end. For just as the insidious come among us and want to break up and destroy our churches, so afterwards other insidious would also come into their churches and break up and destroy them, and from then on there would never be an end to the insidiousness and separation, one over the other, or soon nothing would remain of any church on earth. This is also what the devil wanted and seeks through such spirits of the mob and sneaks.

10 Therefore it means: Either prove the profession and command to preach, or in short, keep quiet and forbid preaching. For it is called an office, yes, a preaching office. But no one can have an office except and without command and profession. Therefore also Christ speaks in the parable, Luc. 19, 13. that the master of the house did not give his servants the centner, so that they should act, he called them before, and commanded them to act. Vocatis servis (says the text) et negotiemi³) etc. He called his servants (says he) and commanded them to act with his money. Such a VOCATUS and command shall the creeper also bring, or shall leave the Lord's money with peace, or shall be found a thief and a rogue. Neither did the laborers go into the householder's vineyard, Matt. 20, until the householder commanded them to go, but stood before the command and labored idly all the day.

Thus God also speaks of such sneaks Jer. 23:21: "They run, and I have not sent them; they preach, and I have not commanded them. It still takes great effort and work for those to preach rightly and stick to right doctrine who have a certain calling and command from God Himself or through men in God's stead: what should it be then without God's command, yes, to preach against God's command and prohibition, out of nothing but driving and chasing the devil? There must be no other sermon, but out of giving in to the evil one.

1) i.e. communicated. - "reported" put by us instead of: "report".

2) Thus the Wittenberg and the Jena. In the old edition Walch's and in the Erlangen: "Schleichen".

3) So the editions. In the Vulgate: nsZotianlinl.

The spirit, and must be vain doctrine of the devil, let it glow as it will.

012 Who had greater and more certain profession than Aaron the first high priest? He still fell into idolatry and made the Jews make the golden calf [Ex 32:4]. And after that the whole Levitical priesthood fell into idolatry, and persecuted the word of God and all the true prophets. King Solomon was gloriously enough appointed and confirmed; yet he fell in his old age and caused much idolatry [1¹) Kings 11:4]. Have not the bishops and popes glorious calling and command? Do they not sit in the apostles' chair, and in Christ's stead? Nor are they all the worst enemies of the gospel; be silent, that they should teach rightly and maintain right worship.

(13) Can the devil deceive the teachers whom God himself has called, ordered and ordained, so that they teach falsely and persecute the truth; how then can he teach something good through the teachers whom he himself, without and against God's command, drives and ordains, and not rather teach vain devilish lies? I have often said it, and still say it, that I would not take the world's good for my doctorate. For I would truly have to despair in the end and despair in the great, difficult matter that lies upon me, where I, as a sneak, would have started it without profession and command. But now God and all the world must bear witness to me that I have publicly begun it in my doctorate and preaching ministry, and have led it to this point with God's grace and help.

(14) There are some who pretend. According to 1 Corinthians 14, St. Paul gave every man liberty to preach in the church, and also to bark against the regular preacher, saying [v. 30]: "If it be evident to him that sitteth, let the first hold his peace. Therefore, the lurkers think that in whichever church they come, there they have power and right to judge the preachers and to preach differently. But that is far, far wrong. The lurkers see

They don't really accept the text and take from it, even brew into it what they want. St. Paul speaks in that place of the prophets who are to teach, and not of the rabble who listen. Prophets are teachers who have the office of preaching in the church. Why else should one be called a prophet? Let the sneak prove that he is a prophet or teacher in the church where he comes, and who has commanded him such a ministry there, and then he will be heard according to the teachings of St. Paul. If he does not prove it, let him run away to the devil, who sent him and commanded him to rob a foreign ministry in a church, where he does not belong as a hearer or disciple, but as a prophet and master.

(15) What a fine example would it be to me if a priest preached, and each one had power to fall into his speech and scold himself with him? Further, another would fall into the speech of the two, and the other would also be called silent, and after that, a full beer blackbird would run out of a pitcher and fall into the speech of all three, and the third would also be called silent, and finally, the women would also have such a right as the sitters, and the men would be called silent, and after that, one woman would always call the other silent. O what a beautiful church fair, Kretschmer and fair shall there be! In which pigsty should it not be finer than in such a church? There the devil shall be preacher in my place. But the blind lurkers do not mean this, they think as if they were the only ones sitting, and do not see that everyone among the others should just as well have this right, and they could also be called silent, they themselves do not know what they are saying, what is sitting or speaking, what is called prophet or layman, in this place of St. Paul.

16 Let anyone who wishes read the whole chapter, and he will find it clear that St. Paul there speaks of prophesying, teaching and preaching in the congregation or church, and does not command the congregation to preach, but acts with the preachers who preach in the congregation or assembly; otherwise he would not have to forbid the women to preach, as they are also a part of the Christian congregation.

1) Here the Erlangen edition has again reprinted Walch's incorrect Bible quote: "2 Kings 11:4."

2) So the Jenaer. Wittenberg and Erlangen: "with".

And when the text is given, it will have been 1) such a way The prophets are to be ordered and remain in office, and that in the church among the people the prophets, as the they are to wait for the teaching, one after the other, and ordinary priests and preachers, sat, and one or two sang always help each other faithfully. The prophets should be or read the text; as still in our times on the high feasts two commanded to wait for the teaching, and teach one after another, and always help one another faithfully, so "that used to sing the gospel with each other in some churches.

(17) On such a text one of the prophets, on whom it it may be done honorably and properly," says St. Paul [1 Cor. 14:40]. But how can things be respectable or orderly, has been done, has spoken and interpreted, as the when every one takes hold of another's office, which he homilies have been done in the Roman church. When he spoke, another one might speak, confirm, or explain is not commanded to do, and every layman wants to something about it. Just as St. James, Apost. 15, 13 ff, stand up in the church and preach?

also did to St. Peter's speech, confirming and explaining 20 But I marvel, because they are so learned in the Spirit, why they "bring forth the examples, where also it. Just as St. Paul did in the synagogues, especially in women prophesied, and therewith governed men, the Antioch Pisidia, where Lucas says: "After the teaching of land, and the people; as Deborah in the book of Judges, the law, the rulers of the synagogues also let Paul speak. chap. 4, who smote king Jabin and Sissera, and governed Then Paul stood up and spoke, but as a sent apostle, Israel; and the prophetess in Avelah, which was in the about the fact that he was demanded by the school ruler days of David. 4, who smote king Jabin and Sissera, and 2) and did not act as a sneak. It seems that sitting is a ruled Israel; and the prophetess of Avelah, which was in matter for the appointed prophets or preachers alone; David's days, 2 Sam. 20:16; and Huldah the prophetess whoever among them should have spoken stood up or in the days of Josiah, 2 Kings 22:14. And long before that remained sitting, according to the importance of the Sarah, who taught her lord and husband, Abraham, that matter.

(18) Just as when a prince sits in council with his he should cast out Ishmael with the mother Hagar, and councilors, or a mayor with his councilors, one stands up God told Abraham to obey her [Gen. 21, 10. 12.], and the and makes his speech, and then another follows, and at like, as the widow Hannah, Luc. 2, 36. and the virgin last they follow in unison the one who has given the best Mary, Luc. 1, 46. 3) 2c. Here they could adorn themselves, and also give the women power to preach in the church; how much more would the men like to preach according to the examples, where and when they wanted!

(21) Now we will leave aside what right such women had in the Old Testament to teach and rule. Of course, they did not do it as lurkers, unappointed, nor out of their own devotion and thirst; otherwise God would not have confirmed their office and work with miracles and great deeds. But in the New Testament, the Holy Spirit decrees through St. Paul that the women should be silent in the church or congregation, and says: it is the Lord's commandment, 1 Cor. 14, 34; and yet he knew well that Joel had previously proclaimed that God would also put his Spirit upon his women.

1) Walch and the Erlanger: that's how it's going to be.
2) Wittenberger: pupils; Jenaer: of schoolmasters.

3) Here, the Erlanger has reprinted from Walch's old edition: "Luc. 2", although the Wittenberg and the Jena, thus probably also the original print, offer "Luc. 1".

The four daughters of Philippi were seen prophesying, Acts 21:9. 21:9. 1) But in the congregation or church, where the ministry is, they shall keep silence, and not preach. Otherwise they may pray, sing, praise and say amen, and read at home and teach, admonish and comfort one another, and also interpret the Scriptures as best they can.

22 In sum, St. Paul does not want to suffer the offense and the will of one to take hold of another's office, but each one should take care of his command and profession and wait for it, so that he may leave another's profession unhindered and in peace. Otherwise he may be wise, teach, sing, read, interpret, as he has right and reason, until he has had enough and is satisfied. If God wants to do something more solid and vain, besides and above such order of offices and appointments, He will prove it with signs and deeds; as He let the donkey speak and punished the prophet Balaam, her master [Mos. 22, 28]. If he does not do this, then we should keep it and leave it in the orderly offices and commandments. If they do not teach rightly, what is that to you? you must not give an account for it.

For this reason St. Paul often uses the word "congregation" in this chapter, so that he makes a certain distinction between the prophets and the people. The prophets speak, the congregation listens. For thus he says [1 Cor. 14:4], "He that knoweth maketh the church better." And again [v. 12], "Seek to amend the church, that ye may have full sufficiency." Who are the ones who are to correct the community? Are they not the prophets, and (as he calls them) "those who speak with tongues," that is, who read or sing the text as the congregation listens, and the prophets, who are to interpret the text for the correction of the congregation? This is clear enough, that here he commands the congregation to listen and to be corrected, and not to teach or to preach. Then he makes a clearer distinction and calls the congregation laymen and says [v. 16, 17] "When you bless in the

Spirit, how can he who stands in place of the layman say Amen, since he does not know what you say? You say fine thanks, but the other is not improved by it. There is a difference between the preacher and the layman. But what is necessary to go on about it; the text is there, and also gives the reason that there is no foreign office to reach into.

24 For thus saith St. Paul [v. 29], "Let the prophets speak, two or three, and let the others judge. 2c. This is not spoken otherwise than of the prophets, which one or two shall speak, and the rest shall judge. What do others mean here? Is it to be called the rabble? By no means; but it is to be called: the other prophets or prophets who are to help preach in the church 2) and improve the congregation, who are to judge and help to see that the preaching is right. And if it come to pass that one of the prophets or preachers do the best, then the first shall be instructed, and say, Yea, thou art right, I understood it not so well; as it is done over tables, or in other matters, that one shall judge another (even in worldly matters): so also shall one yield much more to another in this matter.

25 From this you can see how finely and diligently the lurkers have looked at St. Paul's words, with which they presume to prove themselves to be saints in all churches, that is, to attack, judge and blaspheme all the preachers of all Christendom, and to appoint themselves and make themselves judges over other people's preaching seats. These are called right thieves and murderers, who take hold of other people's offices with sacrilege and violence, against which St. Peter teaches in 1 Epistle 4:15: "Let no one suffer as an evildoer, or as one who takes hold of another's 3) office.

26 Although such a consecration has now ceased, that the prophets or preachers sit in the church and talk around each other (as St. Paul says here), a small sign and footstool has remained of it, namely, that one sings around each other in the choir and does one lesson after the other and then all sing a

1) Here the Erlanger asked to reprint from the old edition of Walch: Apost. 21, 19.

2) "help" is missing in the Wittenberger.

3) So the Wittenberg and the Jena. In Walch's old edition and in the Erlangen one, "a" is missing.

antiphons, hymn or responsory. And if one preacher interpreted another's lection and another interpreted it or preached from it, it would be just the right way to teach in the church, which St. Paul calls. For one would sing or read with tongues, another would prophesy or translate it, the third would interpret it, and another would confirm or improve it with sayings and examples, as St. James did in Acts 15 and St. Paul in Acts 13. And it would be better than to read or sing the mere lection in Latin, unknown language, like the nuns read the Psalter, although St. Paul does not condemn such speaking in tongues by himself, but does not praise or command it in the church without interpretation.

27 But whether this way should now be set up again and the preachers' chairs removed, I will not advise, but help to defend. For the people are now too wild and too forward, and a devil might mingle between pastor, preacher and chaplain, so that one would want to be above the other, and thus quarrel and bite each other in front of the people, and each would want to be the best. Therefore it is better to keep the preaching chair, for there, as St. Paul teaches here, things are done honestly. And it is enough that in a parish the preachers preach one day after the other and, where they want, in one place after the other, and one interprets after midday or before midday what the other has sung and read early or in the mass, as it happens now and then with the gospel and epistle. For St. Paul does not insist so hard that one must keep such a way; rather, he insists that it should be done properly and honorably, and gives such an order.

Wise as an example. Because our way of preaching is more proper among our people than theirs, we should keep it.

In the time of the apostles, such a manner of sitting prophets was well kept, for it was an old, daily, practiced custom among a well-mannered people from the Levitical priesthood, kept from Moses, which now would not be well brought into pregnancy among such wild, naughty, impudent people.

29 Let this be said of the saying of St. Paul. And summa, the insidious and the false preachers are the devil's apostles, since St. Paul complains everywhere about "how they walk through the houses, and the same traffic, always teaching, and yet do not know what they say, or what they set" [2 Tim. 3, 6.]. Therefore be warned and exhorted spiritual ministry, be warned and exhorted worldly ministry, be warned all things Christian and subject, that they beware of them, and hear them not. Or whoever suffers them and hears them, let him know that he hears the afflicted devil himself in the flesh, nothing else than as he speaks out of a possessed man. I have done my part, and have also spoken of the eighty-second Psalm 1); I am excused. Let the blood of any man who does not follow good and faithful counsel be on his head. Command you and yours, my dear Lord and friend, in God's grace and mercy; to whom be praise and thanksgiving, honor and glory forever in Christ our Lord and Savior, Amen.

1) The interpretation of this psalm is found in Walch, alte Ausgabe, Vol. V, 1020 ff.

36 D. Martin Luther's letter to Margrave Albrecht of Brandenburg, Duke of Prussia. *)

Perhaps April 1532.

Grace and peace in Christ our Lord and Savior.

1 Sublime Highborn Prince! I have received and heard E. F. G.'s writing on the Sacrament and the 6th Chapter of John, and should E. F. G. have answered it long ago, but the weakness of my head has prevented it, 1) and still does, for which reason I humbly ask E. F. G. to graciously grant me such a delay, since I have had to write it even now, and let someone else write it. However, I wanted to let it go out through the printing process to indicate to the enthusiasts once again that I no longer intend to deal with them about the matter, in addition to the fact that I was worried that it would come into print, and because it is not my pen, but my poetry, and therefore perhaps not equal to my previous writings, it would be even worse and omitted more industriously 2).

2 And that I answer E. F. G. in the shortest way, it is true that John 6. Christ does not speak of the Lord's Supper, nor does he act with his hands, nor does he give bread to his disciples, as he does in the Lord's Supper, but preaches freely both to the disciples and unbelievers at Capernaum about faith in him, which faith believes him to be true man, to have flesh and blood, and to have given them both for us; which actually means to eat his body spiritually and to drink his blood spiritually. And is also called spiritual bread, which gives life to the world. Such

Eating and drinking can take place apart from baptism and sacrament, but only in faith and through the preached word of the gospel, and no godless person can eat in this way, just as little as a godless person can believe and remain godless at the same time. For he says there [Cap. 6, 51.] "He that eateth this bread hath life." And again [v. 53] "Unless ye eat of the flesh, and drink of the blood of the Son of man, ye shall have no life in you." Therefore they must be true believers who eat John 6. for they shall have life, says Christ.

3) And the summa 3) is said: "He who believes in Christ will be saved. But in the Lord's Supper both worthy and unworthy can eat, as St. Paul clearly indicates 1 Cor. 11, 27-29: "He who eats the Lord's bread unworthily, and drinks the cup unworthily, eats and drinks judgment." Therefore they cannot all eat life, as they must eat John on the 6th. Therefore there is a great difference between St. John's Day on the 6th and the Lord's Supper. For the latter is a spiritual meal, without the bodily meal; but here in the Lord's Supper there is 4) a spiritual meal, but only for believers, and besides it a bodily meal, both common to believers and unbelievers. As believing and hearing the gospel is a spiritual baptism, since we are baptized spiritually by the Spirit and fire, susceptible only to believers; but bodily baptism is common to both believers and unbelievers, and yet a true baptism in both, without being of any use to unbelievers.

1) The Jena edition has the conjecture in the margin that "so far" would like to be omitted here.

2) The Wittenberg has instead of "omitted" the words: "in print an Tag geben".

3) Instead of "the summa" in the Wittenberg: "in summa so much".

4) Wittenberger: is.

*) This letter was published in 1532 in a single edition by Nickel Schirlenz in Wittenberg. In the "Gesammtausgabe": Wittenberger (1551), vol. II, p. 241; Jenaer (1566), vol. V, p. 488; Altenburger, vol. V, p. 963; Leipziger, vol. XX, p. 354; Erlanger, vol. 54, p. 281 and in De Wette, vol. IV, p. 348. The latter places the writing in April because Luther calls himself ill and speaks of Zwingli's death and the defeat of the Zurichers as having happened recently. We give the text according to De Wette.

but condemnable. Just as the name of God in the other commandment is the only right name of God, but still harmful to the one who misuses it, and beneficial to the one who calls on it in right faith.

(4) And even though some people confirm the text of John 6:6 concerning the sacrament, and insist on the word *dabo*, *when* he says, "My flesh which I will give," and think that it should be a promise of the sacrament which he afterwards instituted, yet it is not so; for by *dabo* or promise he means that he will give up his body to death for us, and will shed his blood for our sins. Further, nothing can be forced out, for the aforementioned reason, since no godless person can spiritually eat Christ's flesh or drink his blood, that is, believe; as he may well do in the Lord's Supper and without all faith receive the body and blood of Christ verbally.

(5) But herewith we do not condemn the fathers and teachers who have used and led the sixth chapter of John 1) on the Lord's Supper, as they often lead more sayings in an uneven way; for their opinion is right and good, that they testify that it is truly the flesh and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Therefore it is to be considered good for them, if they do not hit the sayings right away, because they nevertheless indicate their opinion powerfully and clearly. But to preserve the articles of faith, one must certainly have the sayings in the right simple sense, which is not necessary where one preaches or exhorts plainly.

Now I have said above and more before that I will henceforth leave the fanciers idle and let them be commanded to the judgment of God. For I and many others have pursued this matter of the Sacrament so thoroughly and violently, and have so clearly mislaid their idle chatter that they themselves have had to concede and concede many sayings and pieces, on which they insisted quite stiff-necked at first. This proves, as from experience, that they have made their case from uncertain grounds and their own fictitious stories.

They are always pondering and looking for another one, and direct their cause to "not being silent". Just as the devil, their master, if he cannot overcome a holy man with art, writing or force, so he makes him tired with his incessant 2) stopping, whether he could thus win.

(7) So they also think that they want to engage in perpetual disputation, and drive the people with chatter and sounds, so that in the meantime one should not see nor hear how unfounded things they pretend, and no one should notice how many sayings and pieces they have lost. Even as many books as they have written in all places, and have cried out excellently about spiritual food, none of them has been found among them all who could properly and clearly define or say what spiritual food is, or how it has a shape with faith; but they are always chattering about spiritual food, "and know neither what they say nor what they put," as St. Paul says. Paul says 1 Tim. 1, 6. 7. For they are inexperienced, untried people in the spirit, that it is impossible for them to understand what spirit, spiritual food, or faith is. Therefore there is no further dealing with them, and whoever wants to be undeceived by them has so much instruction from our books that he can well avoid their chatter.

8 Therefore my faithful Christian councilor, E. F. G., is also idle with them; for there is no end of disputing and chattering, they do not let them say anything and hear nothing, nor do they know anything to say and teach anything. And E. F. G. do not let such be my counsel, as grown out of me, but of the Holy Spirit, who knows all hearts and all things better than we do; he has given us such counsel by his "chosen instrument" 3) St. Paul Titus 3:10, 11, where he says: "A heretical man thou shalt avoid, when he is once or twice admonished; and thou shalt know (says he) that he is perverse, and hast his judgment."

1) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. De Wette: "Johannis am sechsten Capitel".

2) De Wette: "incessant".

3) Thus in all editions. De Wette according to the original print: "stuff".

(9) Now they have not been admonished once or twice, but have been overcome in many things and sayings, and yet will not cease. Therefore it is certain, as St. Paul says, "that they are wrong," and no more exhortation helps, much less much disputing and chatting with them without ceasing. And again St. Paul says 2 Tim. 2:14: "Teach them not to quarrel about words, which is not profitable without turning away the hearers." This is saying so much: that much disputing with the mobs is not only unfruitful for them, but also harmful to the hearers, who, even if they are not seduced, are nevertheless annoyed and deterred by it.

(10) Such counsel of the Holy Spirit we must not despise, nor turn to her glory, but always let her go, and avoid her. He who has so counseled us will surely find them and put their glory to shame, as he has already set out to prove and prove by deed. For we have seen how he has destroyed Muenzer and his companions, and made them a terrible example to all the enthusiasts and the spirits of the mob. For with them there was also vain boasting of the spirit and contempt of the sacraments, but it was not found in the evidence what kind of spirit it was. Likewise Carlstadt, since the time he began the game, has been chased to and fro in the world, leaving no place for his body nor rest in his heart, like a true Cain, marked and afflicted with trembling and fear. And now the poor people in Switzerland, Zwingeln and his own, have been punished noticeably enough, so that the spirits of the mob should be justly offended. But they are obdurate, perverse, and suo iudicio condemnati, 1) says St. Paul [Titus 3:11]. They all want to know, and none believe.

11) And although neither the Muenzerians nor the Zwinglians want to believe that they are punished by God, but consider them and preach them as martyrs, we, who know that they have hardly erred in this article and others, must recognize and consider such punishment by God.

Not that we rejoice in their misfortune, which we are heartily sorry for and have been all along, but that we cannot leave the testimony of God's truth. If they have been saved, as it is not impossible for God to convert a man at his last end in a moment, we grant and wish them that from the bottom of our hearts: but to make martyrs, there is more to it than to be badly saved, namely, a certain divine cause, for which they suffer and die; which is not found here. For we also do not condemn to hell the evildoers who are punished or put away by public judgment, but therefore do not make martyrs of them.

(12) And I am astonished that the rest of the Muenzerians and Zwinglians do not turn at all to such divine ruts, that they not only remain hardened in their error, but that they interpret such ruts for a rut of the martyrs, and still justify themselves and compare themselves to the holy martyrs. But it is the common example of all the wicked, of which the prophet Isaiah 9:13 and other prophets often say: Non est reversus populus ad percutientem se, "the people turn not to him that smiteth them." Just as the Jews have not believed for more than a thousand years that they are punished and disturbed by God because of Christ, whom they crucified, but always boast that they are the holy people of God. So also the Pope and his followers do not mind that they attack God with so many miracles, plagues and signs without ceasing, but continue with raging and blustering, blaspheming God and justifying themselves, wanting to be the holy Christian church, to be children of the Holy Spirit in their impenitent, shameful life, whether God likes it or not. These are called the right sins in the Holy Spirit, which one must let go, as Christ did to his Jews.

13) It is true that the victory of the Swiss against the Zwingler is not almost joyful nor worthy of such great glory, because they let the Zwinglian faith, as they call it, remain in their treaty 2) and such erroneous beliefs are not to be found.

2) "Contract" is Conjecture of the Jena edition. In the other editions: Fürtrag.

1) αὐτοκατάκριτοι.

They do not condemn anything at all, but let it go along with their old, undoubted faith, as they say, which the Sacramentans perhaps comfort and strengthen. But nevertheless one must grasp that [it] is a punishment of God, of which they cannot boast, but have thereby opened the mouth of their adversary and of all godless papists, and have given cause for boasting, which, I fear, will finally demand of both parts the vain right judgment of God. A martyr cannot boast of his punishment before the world, but because he can boast of his just cause before God, he can boast and rejoice in his innocent suffering for the sake of such a good cause.

(14) Since God so powerfully draws a line, and with punishment truly condemns such error, and confirms our faith, it is time to cease doubting and disputing, lest He be too greatly tempted, and last of all we also be made partakers of His punishment and chastisement. Moreover, this article is not a doctrine or a composition, invented out of Scripture by men, but clearly established and founded in the Gospel by the clear, pure, undoubted words of Christ, and from the beginning of the Christian Church in all the world until this hour it has been unanimously believed and held, as evidenced by the dear Fathers' books and Scriptures, both Greek and Latin, and by the daily practice and work of experience, until this hour. Which testimony of the whole holy Christian church (if we had nothing more) shall be sufficient for us alone to stick to this article and not to hear or suffer any red spirit about it. For it is dangerous and frightening to hear or believe anything contrary to the unanimous testimony, faith and teaching of the whole holy Christian church, which from the beginning has held unanimously in all the world for more than fifteen hundred years.

(15) If it were a new article, and not from the beginning of the holy Christian church, or if it were not held in such harmony in all churches, nor in all Christendom throughout the world, it would not be so dangerous nor

terrible to doubt or dispute whether it is right? But since it has been held in unison from the beginning and as far as the whole of Christendom is, whoever now doubts it, does as much as if he believed no Christian church, and thereby condemns not only the whole holy Christian church as a damned heretic, but also Christ Himself with all the apostles and prophets, who founded and powerfully testified to this article, when we say: "I believe a holy Christian church," namely Christ Matth. 28, 20.: 2) "Behold, I am with you unto the end of the world." And St. Paul 1 Tim. 3, 15.: "The Church of GOD is a pillar and foundation of the truth." Their own opiuiio also testifies against them, that they are so divided against one another about the text, and make almost seven or eight things, so much text, so many opinions, and can teach nothing certain, nor report any poor conscience constantly.

For this reason, I urge and request that the Foundation avoid such people and not suffer them in the country, according to the advice of St. Paul and the Holy Spirit, as indicated above. For the authorities must consider that if they were to allow and suffer such rotten spirits, if they were able to prevent it and if it were to occur, they would grievously burden their consciences and perhaps never be able to satisfy them again, not only for the sake of the souls that would be seduced and condemned by it, which the authorities could have preserved. F. G., but also for the sake of the whole holy church, against which so long established and universally held faith and unanimous testimony to form something, if one could well resist it, is an unbearable burden for the conscience. I would rather have the wisdom and justice of not only all the ruffians, but of all emperors, kings and princes testify against me, than to hear or see one iota or one jot of the whole holy, Christian church against me. For it is not so to jest with articles of faith, from the beginning and, as far as Christendom is, held in harmony, as

2) Here De Wette has reprinted Walch's false Bible quotation "Matth. 28,10.", which the Erlangen edition has also excepted, this time not from Walch, but from De Wette.

1) "demand" - be a promotion.

one may jest with papal or imperial rights, or other human traditions of the fathers or concilia. 17 I have recently replied to E. F. G. and humbly in good Christian faith. Christ, our faithful Savior,	May E. F. G. with His Holy Spirit abundantly enlighten and strengthen us to believe and do according to His dear holy Word, Amen. E. F. G. willing D. Martinus Luther.
--	--

37. D. Martin Luther's letter to the Counts of Schlick to keep Joachimsthal clean of enthusiasts. *)

s. October 1532.

Grace and peace in Christ. Gracious, gracious gentlemen! Even though my letter to the G. is presumptuous, I have been moved by M. Christoph Ering, and I have dared, and my humble request to the G. is, because the wicked devil sends spirits of the red and sneaks everywhere, and Jáchymov is just such a place (because of the various people), where they can nest and hedge: E. G. wanted to follow the praiseworthy example of the highly famous Mr. Stephan Schlick, E. G. of noble blood, to hold fast to the pure word of God, and to keep a diligent eye on such devil seeds. For a little spark makes a great fire and, as Saint Paul says: "A little leaven leaveneth the whole dough", and leprosy is an addictive and gluttonous plague. However, I hope to keep E. G. Christian in such matter without my request,	my superfluous concern has moved me to ask for this. For I would like to see, because in the valley the crowd is large, and from there it resounds far and wide what is taught and held there, that God's word would be pure and mighty in the swing, and all abuses and aversions, whether they be papal or red, would be done away with; as the daily masses and false chastity of the priests also are. Christ, our Lord, who enlightened our Lord's heart with His truth, would also give His spirit and power to our Lord to do and to leave what is pleasing to His gracious will, 1) Amen. At Wittenberg, October 9, 1532. E. G. willing Martinus Luther, D. 1) Both counts then issued a mandate against the swarmers. (Burkhardt I. o. p. 208.)
--	--

38: A number of propositions against the doctrine of the Anabaptists, made by Phil. Melanchthon.

First half 1535.

This writing is, as Walch notes in his introduction to the 20th volume, p. 80, "among others printed at Wittenberg in 1538 in quarto". Furthermore, a reprint appeared in 1535 at Hieronymus Formschneider in Nuremberg, and another print (without indication of the printer) together with the following writing (Erlanger, vol. 63, p. 336). They

*) This letter addressed to Counts Jerome and Loren; von Schlick (Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 208s is found in the Wittenberg edition (1569), vol. IX, p. 478; in the Jena (1566), vol. V, p. 509; in the Altenburg, vol. V, p. 985; in the Leipzig, vol. XXII, p. 560; in the Erlangen, vol. 54, p. 332 and in De Wette, vol. I V, 407. We give the text according to De Wette.

is found only in the Wittenberg edition (1551), vol. II, p. 281, with the year 1528. In the index to the Wittenberg and Jena editions by Sigismund Schwoh is "1538"; both dates are to be regarded as printing errors. The author of the book *Restitutio* (Neudecker, Actenstücke, 1. Abtheilung, p. 105) is the Münster preacher M. Bernhard Rothmann, who was still a preacher of the pure doctrine on December 23, 1532, as Luther's letter to him of this date testifies (De Wette, Vol. IV, p. 426). Therefore the book, consequently also our writing, which is directed against it, must belong to a later time. We would be inclined to assume the year 1535, because the individual editions belong to this year, namely the first half of the year, because Rothmann (probably) perished during the conquest of Münster. Because this writing is completely contained in No. 40, we have omitted it, especially since it is not written by Luther, but by Melancthon.

39 Neue Zeitung von den Wiedertäufern zu Münster. *)

Early 1535.

(1) In eight days after the storm had passed, the shittyHe had almost exquisite garments made of gold and silver prophet at Münster, called John of Leiden, a tailor'spieces from the temple's ornaments. And his stallions, servant, held out to the congregation there: He had aalso of the ornaments very colorful and deliciously command from God that he should be a king over Israel,dressed; in addition 1) gifted with golden rings; all like the and of righteousness; and in all measure set up hisqueen with her virgins and wives. kingdom and regiment like the kingdom of David 2c. No 4 When the king rides in the city in his majesty, he one was allowed to contradict this. And then one stoodwears a silver piece, cut in the fold, with red carmine up, called John of Warendorf, who was a goldsmith there,underneath, and bound together with gold. Likewise also and said: And that the other prophet should be a king oftwo boys; one of them carries after him on the right side righteousness, and rule over the whole earth; and that hethe crown and Bible, the other on the left side a mere should go forth with army strength, and slay all authorities,sword. spiritual or secular, without all mercy, and spare the (5) One of the boys is the son of my lord of Munster, subjects where they would do righteousness; and so thewho is imprisoned therein, and waits for the king's body in meek shall inherit the earth, and God's will be done onthe chamber.

earth as it is in heaven, Matthew 5 and 6. Thus the king in the triple crown, made very precious After that, the king accepted his regiment, andof ducat gold (since all his jewelry and coinage is made of appointed his court in all measure with offices, like ait), and on it precious jewelry (including a gold chain with secular prince, as with court masters, marshals,precious stone), has 2) the figure of the world with a gold gatekeepers, kitchen masters, foremen, chancellors,sword and pierced with a silver one. In the middle of the speakers, table servants and waiters; likewise from hisapple a golden cross, on it written: A king of justice over wives a beautiful noble woman from Holland (who hadthe world. The queen also keeps the same. previously had a prophet, who was slain before Münster, 007 With such ornaments the king goeth into the of which she is still pregnant) is now queen and also hasmarket three times a week, upon a high seat made for that her own court. purpose; and the governor, Knipper-

(3) The king also has thirty-one horses covered with gold cloths and several gold sacks.

1) This again refers to the king, not to the "stallion riders"; compare [28].

2) These brackets are set by us for the sake of understanding.

*) This writing is printed in 1535 in Wittenberg and also in Nuremberg (Von der Hardt, Autographa Luther. , Dova. I, r>. 310 and 320); then included in the Wittenberg edition (1551), vol. II, bl. 385 d. Luther provided it with a preface, which Walch has assigned to the 14th volume; in the old edition, Col. 328. From this preface we see that the abominable being at Münster was still in full swing. The events reported in this writing belong to the middle of October 1534. Therefore, we have to place this writing in the beginning of the year 1535. According to the Wittenberg edition, we give the text.

The place called dolling is one step below him, and after that the councilors. Whoever has to do something there must bow down twice and fall to the ground the third time, and then give his opinion.

8th They, the inhabitants of the city of Münster, held supper on a Tuesday in the Thumhof, sat at table by forty-two hundred, and gave three dishes, as: boiled meat, ham and roast; and the king and queen and all their servants served at table. After the meal, the king and queen took wheat cakes, broke them and gave them to the others, saying: Take and eat, and proclaim the death of the Lord. Likewise also a pitcher of wine, with the same words: Take, all of you, and drink from it, proclaiming the death of the Lord.

(9) And the congregation began to break one another's cakes, saying, Brother and sister. Take and eat of it! As Christ gave himself for me, so will I give myself for thee: and as the grains of wheat are baked one in another, and the grapes are pressed together, so are we in one. They did all these things at the table, warning that nothing useless but the law of the Lord should come out of their mouths, and then they gave thanks to the Lord, first with prayers, then with singing, especially singing: Glory to God in the highest! In the same way the king and queen sat at table with the servants and those who came from the guard.

010 After all these things the king said unto all the congregation, Whether they were all willing to do the Father's will, and to suffer? They all answered, "Yes. Then the prophet said, He had a command from God to send some of them to perform the miracles God had done for them. So the prophet John of Warendorf said, "This is the command of God, that some of those whom he would name should go to four cities in the kingdom and preach; and he called them by name from a piece of paper and said, "Let them leave all that they have. And they went out the same evening to Osnabrück, 1) six, six to Cosfeld, five to Warendorf, and eight to Soest, 2) among whom was the prophet himself. And they gave to each one a penny of nine gold florins, and a supply of other money.

11) On the evening of Galli 3) they appeared in the aforementioned 4) cities according to orders, shouting with a horrible cry: Convert and repent, for here is a short time that the Father may have mercy on you; for the axe is laid to the root of the tree; so, if the cities would not accept peace, they should perish in a short time. They also came before the council of the four cities, and spread their cloaks on the ground, and threw on them the pieces of gold written before them, with these words: they were therefore sent by the Father to proclaim peace to them. If they would accept it, then they should give their goods in common; but if they would not, then they would protest to God with the piece of gold that they had not accepted his peace, but had despised it. And they said: Now the time has come, of which all the prophets have spoken, that God will have nothing on earth but righteousness; and if the king uses his office in such a way that there is nothing on the face of the whole earth but righteousness, then Christ will hand over the kingdom to his Father.

12 Then they were taken into custody and, both kindly and painfully, interrogated about their faith, life, fortifications of the city, and provisions; whereupon they all gave the same account. Of their faith and life they confessed thus: If one rightly distinguishes the time with hunger and thirst of righteousness, if one rightly looks at the Scriptures, especially the prophets, the right way and doctrine alone is with them; and they are ready to confirm this with their blood with special graces.

(13) They have evidently confessed: From the time of the apostles, God's word was never preached rightly, and there was no righteousness. Item: There are four prophets: two righteous ones, as David and John of Leiden at Münster; two unrighteous ones, as the Pope and Luther; and Luther is even worse than the Pope. All other Anabaptists are also condemned by them, wherever they are.

(14) They were also asked, By what writing do they prove their righteousness, that they have driven the righteous people out of the city of Munster for no fault of their own, against their own promise and obligation, and have taken all their goods, wife, and children?

3) The "Abend Galli" is October 15, 1534. Because the city of Münster siel on June 25, 1535, we see that the events of the year 1584 are reported here. This is confirmed by the letter of Bishop Franciscus of Münster to the E^abishop of Cologne which follows this report. See below § 27.

4) Wittenbergers: the.

1) In the Wittenberg: "Osenbrück", in other places "Ossenbrück".

2) Wittenberger: Sosst.

(15) To which they answered that Christ said to the Jews, *Faciem coeli judicare nostis, signa autem temporum non potestis?* Matth. 16, 3. And now the time shall come, of which the Scripture says: *Beati mites, quoniam possidebunt terram.* Also, God has given your people of Israel the Egyppter property.

(16) They said that in the city of Munster there was still silver and gold, all of which was beaten into barrels, three times a hundred thousand florins, except all the goods that were still superfluous.

17) For this purpose they have appointed offices 1) which should buy and sell with the heathen, when that is consumed.

18. next to them they have set other craftsmen, as: Shoemakers, tailors, blacksmiths and the like. When food and clothing are needed for themselves and their household members, they are given enough.

(19) Among them in the city the men commonly have all five, six, seven, or eight wives, each according to his pleasure; except that he must sleep with one until she is with child; then he takes in heaps and takes one after another as he pleases. All virgins over twelve years of age must be free.

20.. In addition, there is such compulsion in the city: If one of the wives is regarded unkindly by another man, or one of her companions, he must immediately be mourned and die; likewise also the wives, where one becomes infamous with another. The old women choose a guardian, who must provide all their necessities.

The churches and places of worship completely disturb them and call them Baal's and Roman department stores and murder pits of the souls. There are also not more than eight thousand people with wife and child in Münster.

22) And the last command of the king was to the preachers when they went out: What they encounter should not be attributed to the congregation in Münster, but only to the prophet in Soest.

23) The people of Münster, Groningen, 3) and Holland would also be threatened; if this were to happen, the king would go out with all his might and seize the whole earth; and therefore they would kill and kill the authorities, so that no one would do them justice, nor would they have done them justice; nor would they appeal to the king.

1) i.e. officials.

2) Wittenbergers: the.

3) Wittenberger: Grünigen.

emperor or some scholars, but to GOD and His Word alone.

(24) They also confess that it is impossible to understand the Scriptures without prophets. If one also holds a discussion with them about the Scriptures and comes so far with them that they cannot excuse their presumption, then some answer, as butchers and other craftsmen, that it was not given to them by the Father. The others said: The prophet said it from God's command. No one was found who wanted to revoke, if grace was offered to him; but they sing and thank the Father that he has made them worthy to suffer for his name.

Item 25: Knowing that the bishop of Münster and Osnabrück had taken the city of Warendorf, had received the keys to the town hall and the city, because of their disobedience, that they had joined the Müsterian cause, the four prophets sent from Münster had answered him, along with three other citizens, and they had been judged. Eight other prophets from Münster came to Soest, wanted to cause a riot, were captured and then judged.

26 Item, at Osnabrück six of them are seized who were sent there from Münster; they are handed over to the bishop and are sitting at Summerburg; they will also be judged.

[Letter and report from the Bishop of Münster to the Archbishop of Cologne.]

To My Most Gracious Lord, the Archbishop of Cölln and Elector 2c.

27 Our friendly service before. Eight days ago today, a preacher belonging to the Anabaptist sect came to Warendorf from Münster with five of the most prominent ones, and made a clamor in the gaff that they were sent by the father to proclaim his command, which the council allowed them to do. And because they refused and rejected our request to stop the same preachers and to deliver them to us, this morning, in order to prevent further unrest and upheaval in other towns, we have presented ourselves before the town, and have also been prepared in earnest to conquer it by force. But when the townspeople and the community noticed this, they surrendered to our mercy and disgrace, and the town also put the prefects under our control. What we now learn from them, such as were delivered into our custody at Osnabrück, in hearing their confession, we will tell E. Love

conducive. 1) There are also eight such persons still imprisoned and kept in our town of Cosfeld, whom we have demanded to answer, but have so far refused to do so. Therefore, we will describe them again in the most serious way: In the event that they do not follow us, we will, with God's help, also strive for necessity in ways to bring those in Cosfeld to obedience. And send herewith to E. L. for news a piece of gold, which the predicant had with him, and reproached to the council to certify that they were sent by the Lord, which we did not want E. L. to keep. Date in our city Warendorf on Wednesday after Galli Abbatis [M. October], Anno etc 34. 2)

Franciscus,
Confirmirter at Münster.

28. 3) On Tuesday after Gereonis [October 13, 1534] an assembly took place in Münster in the Thumhofe, at ten o'clock before noon half of the two and forty hundred present in Münster at one assembly, men and women, all of them manly, and sat down, all of them dined at the table, first cooked meat, ham and roast meat; then a cake to begin the evening meal. Then the king came out of the church with his people, with thirty-one horses, with four attendants, dressed in velvet and gold. The king [was] clothed with a black pall skirt, on it a silver piece covered; and his crown; and a valiant ornament with a golden world, through it two swords; and the hands full of rings, and [he is] dismounted in his full armor, and in the clothing served to the table with his servants, harmless with threescore persons. And when the meal was done, he also sat with the servants, and those who came from the guard.

029 And when the round bread was set before and after upon the tables, the king said, Take, eat, and proclaim the death of the LORD. And afterward he gave the wine, saying, Take, drink, and proclaim the death of the Lord. When they had eaten and drunk, they sang *Gloria in excelsis DEO* in German. And the king took all the people together.

1) This was probably done in the report following this letter.

2) In the Wittenberg "24", a printing error.

3) The following is, as it seems to us, the report promised in the previous letters, which contains essentially the same as the previous one. In the Wittenberg edition, the signature of the letter "Franciscus confirmirter zu Münster" is printed in large letters as the superscription of the following.

And he put it before them, saying, Will they suffer and die a death for Christ's sake? They all said, "Yes. Therefore the prophet, John the goldsmith of Warendorf, got up on the throne, called some of them by name, and said, Go into the cities, and preach the word of God. They were willing, and said: Yes.

The same went out of four gates in the evening. One part from 4) St. Servatii Gate to Soest, known as this, the Prophet of Warendorf, and Schlachtschaf. The others from Our Lady's Gate, six to Cosfeld, of which one is Bernd Vocker, Henricus von Goge, Predicant to Warendorf; Pastor to Nunkirch of Warendorf, called Hermannus; Bartholomäus Nadler; two others are not known. From St. Mauricius Pforten five to Warendorf: Klop-. reis; the others are not known. From the Horst Gate six to Osnabrück, and are imprisoned at Iberg; and if they are not accepted at Osnabrück, they are said to have gone to Hervord 5).

31 After these had been named, King John of Sorrows ascended the throne again, saying to the common brethren, "Behold, brethren, are you also ready to go out against the enemy? They all said, "Yes. Then he said to the ambassadors who had been summoned: 6) Go ye, and prepare the place for us; we will follow you in a short time: so will we take the whole world. Decide that the opinion of the king and all those who still exist in Münster, together with those who come from outside the country, also from East and West Frisia, should completely take over the world; whoever does not want to adhere to their faith and judge them, to strangle them. In addition, the king has also said: All princes and lords, lords of the manor, [Drosten,] 7) officials and all authorities in such a day to exterminate and kill.

The opportunity in Münster.

Item, this one, who confessed this, as reported above, also said, as follows: That the citizens are ambivalent with the incoming people, as Frisians and Dutchmen 2c.

33 Item, St. Jacob's Church is still full of ground malt, which is ground sint the Shrovetide.

4) Wittenberger: auff.

5) In the Wittenberg: "Heuerde"; in the old edition of Walch (according to an old print): "Herverde", which probably means "Herford".

6) d. i. Emissaries.

7) We have taken "Drosten" from Walch's old edition.

34 Item, in Burckhart's Lord's house there are still well over a thousand malt of skirt, and in some still much more.

35 There is still plenty of barley there than can be used in two years.

36. item, bacon is still superfluous allda.

37 There is a small amount of salt and cheese, and about 14 or 15 barrels of butter.

Item, the Münsterische lay three strong Orthäuser: one before the Horster gate, the other before St. Mauritius, and the third before [the] Judenfelder gate, below with Meisekasten on the water.

39. item, there are still twenty hundred 1) strong men in it, and against one man six women.

040 And they shall watch every night with five hundred men, and the third night shall pass: and the king shall be free to watch with his people, as the people of the office.

41 Item, there are probably seventy tons of powder still available.

(42) Let each man take three, four, five, six, or more wives according to his pleasure.

43) The king said that if he had the people, Frisians and others, with him, he would start and destroy the blockhouse lying in Cosfeld.

Confession of the Butcher.

44 Item known: that their king should reign over all the earth. Knipperdolling sat in the king's chair and said: he wanted to die and recover; and promised: that the blind should receive their sight.

45 The king commanded them to go to Osnabrück, and there he told them that they should be converted, or else they should perish like Sodoma and Gomorrah; and they should go again to Hervord, and evenly proclaim the word of God.

46. item, the king has publicly said: that God has chosen him to go through the whole world, and to destroy the unrighteousness, also the

1) In Walch's old edition: two and twenty.

2) punish with the sword those who do not want to follow his sect; and those who do not want to follow his sect should die.

47. item, known that still in Münster are at six or seven thousand men and women.

48 Item, known that they had no knowledge of the gathering of the people in the Low Countries; but after that they were told by servants who had run to them that they were present. But Knipperdolling had written to brothers and sisters everywhere before the siege; he did not know what the writings reported.

Item: Before All Hallows' Day, or certainly around Easter, all the blockhouses shall be destroyed by God, and the warehouses shall be taken down without their doing, said the prophet who went to Soest.

(50) The prophet had prophesied against the storm, that they should meet with all things, when the storms should come on; and had commanded them three days to fast and pray before the storm.

51 The king has four wives and has now reached the fifth.

52 Item, [asked], 3) how would you have held yourself against imperial majesty, dukes and other princes and lords in the passage of the world? 2c. Answer: those who want to act according to the king's justice should be spared; otherwise their king means to punish them, as indicated above.

53) Item, he knows of no skilled persons, 4) who have been in Münster - from the city of Warendorf.

54 If they were imprisoned in Osnabrück or elsewhere, the prophet would have forbidden them not to write this in Münster, so that the brothers would not be in a state of gloom; but only to write to the prophet in Soest, and if they were happy, the king would leave in the most favorable way.

2) Walch: not so.

3) Walch: said.

4) So put by us instead of: "stories", which does not seem to us to be in the place here.

40 Against the blasphemous and shameful book, which recently went out in print in Münster, some propositions put forward by Phil. Melanchthon's

First halste 1535.

Preface.

(1) So many strange and wondrous things have been said about the Anabaptists, that many have thought that the poor people were being used by their adversaries without truth, in order to disparage them and make them hateful to everyone. Some of them still came and defended them, and neither rebels nor heretics wanted to ring the bell, and considered them to be pious, honest people and good Christians. But because the case with Münster has now come to pass, and they, as the head of these Anabaptist mobs, out of well-considered courage and counsel, have printed and publicly issued a book of fifteen sheets, in which they have written all kinds of shameful, blasphemous, annoying articles, both against the gospel and the police, in clear words, as some of them have understood in this: it is without any contradiction that nothing so bad can be said of such people, the Anabaptists, it is much worse in itself.

(2) For what more can the devil himself do, if he needs all his power and strength, than first to destroy and devastate the kingdom of our Lord Christ, and then to cause mischief, war, bloodshed, and all disorder in the temporal government? These two things the people of Münster have set forth in their letter without any hesitation, and teach that the kingdom of Christ here on earth is not to stand in faith, but is to go in works, and is to be a worldly kingdom, where the Christians (who want to be alone) alone are to rule and exterminate all the ungodly. But if this is true, where is Christ with his word, who so long before and in so many places faithfully warned his Christians that they should give themselves to it and send themselves to suffer; for nothing else would come of it, they should have tribulation and distress in the world, and peace in him alone? Where are other sayings more, so here are attracted

That one should be obedient to the authorities, even to the wicked and unrighteous, as Peter calls them; without where they have imposed something contrary to God's commandment, one should obey God more than the authorities?

But the wretched possessed people are so taken in by the devil and blinded that they neither hear nor see, and against God's command they have made unheard-of innovations, elected a tailor as a king, made prophets, and murdered a hundred men in the city who did not want to agree to this innovation with the king. Therefore, whoever has not yet seen enough of the Anabaptists' intentions and plots, let this Münsterian being be a counterfactual and painting for him, since all Anabaptists' hearts, opinions, and minds are conceived and painted in such a way that all their actions, wherever they may find room and place for them, are directed toward eradicating the gospel and awakening all disorder and disruption of all praiseworthy, just regimes and laws.

4 Do not think otherwise of any Anabaptist! For you must not regard them as people who are still in their right mind, but as people who are possessed, as they are in truth, who have been brought by the devil out of God's wrath, so that they do and want everything that the devil himself does and wants. For there is their book, which bears witness to both of them, without all shyness, that they desire to reverse church and worldly rule, and to cause all kinds of disorder. And it does not help to say: They are not all like that. But because the devil has torn them away from the right doctrine; as little is one devil more pious than the other, but all strive against God's kingdom and worldly discipline and rule every moment: so also one Anabaptist is like the other; and that they do not all make such noise and innovation, it is only because they do not have space and convenient time for it.

*This writing, an extension of the "Propositiones" (No. 38 in this volume), was first printed in Latin in 1535, as Melanchthon reports in his preface, but then also translated into German, probably by Melanchthon himself. Walch reports (introduction to the 20th volume, p. 81) that at Nuremberg in 1535 both redactions of the "Propositiones" were printed together and "the new newspaper of the Anabaptists at Münster" was prefixed with Luther's preface. Our writing also went out before the fall of Münster, that is, in the first half of 1535. It is found in the Wittenberg edition (1551), vol. II, p. 391 d; after that we give the text.

Therefore it would be necessary for the Christian authorities to have good regard for it and not to despise a small seed that the devil throws into the field. For this poison is of such a nature that before you know it, it has penetrated and damaged a whole field; so that it does not take long to wait and see, but quick and urgent counsel and help must be available to ward off such filth. But this help is not only in force and the sword, although it must also be there to control the rebellious leaders; but primarily in pure and righteous doctrine, which is the right preservative, so our Lord God has arranged by grace, from his heavenly pharmacy, to escape this pestilence. For one can also see that such terrible insanity has broken out most in those places where the authorities have not wanted to suffer God's word, and the preachers together with the poor Christians have been driven out, drowned and burned. It is not necessary to name such places, it is unfortunately in the daytime, and it is very much to be feared that such devil's play with Münster will not cease, because, after such horrible punishment, one shows oneself so ungrateful to the dear Gospel.

6 For our Lord God does not take away the rod before the child asks for mercy and stops sinning; otherwise he will always punish without any mercy. And especially this rod of error is bound to the sin of despising the gospel. For thus says St. Paul in 2 Thess. 2:11, 10: "They will not accept the love of the truth, that they may be saved; therefore God will send them strong error, that they may believe the lies; that they all may be judged who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness." There is the cause indicated by St. Paul, from where the mobs and such troubles originate; namely, not from the Gospel, as our adversaries may brazenly lie: but from God's wrath against the world, which will not accept His word for its benefit and salvation; therefore it must accept the devil's word to its harm and eternal damnation.

For (dear God!) how do they want to preserve and defend themselves? They see for themselves that their papist preaching and teaching is nothing but human sand and quicksand, since it is impossible for a conscience to stand or build upon it. And yet they do not want to give room to the Gospel, so they let the poor people go without God's word and Christian doctrine, which then accepts what comes before it, and goes, as Moses says in Deut. 29:19: that a full man comes to the Lord.

a thirsty man. He has them preach to him and believes what he hears, because he does not know any better and his authorities do not want to preach any better to him, until the country becomes full of ruffraff and the wrath of our Lord God comes upon it with force, so that no one can control it, and both teacher and student go down with each other with a whole country that must pay for such sin. Otherwise, it would be enough sin and bad manners in the world if people would humble themselves against the word of our Lord God and accept it with thanksgiving, and not rage against it so wantonly.

(8) Therefore let every man be warned that he may take care of his own welfare and that of his soul, that those who are in authority may faithfully provide for their country and people and what they have with the word of God; to prevent and control such harm and wrath as has already spread too far; and at the same time to pay diligent attention to the lurkers, the Anabaptists, and to deal with them as with public agitators and those who do no good in the community. For truly here we do not want to sleep, nor do we want to wait long. Then let the subjects also beware diligently of the poison, and let their right preachers, who hold forth the gospel to them pure and true, command them faithfully, and hear them diligently, even for the sake of their own souls' salvation. For there is no lack of the wicked devil's will; he would gladly entangle everyone, high and low, small and great, young and old, in these nets. And for the sake of these causes, these articles, which went out in print in Latin in Wittenberg this year, have been translated, so that, as much as possible, the devil's intentions may be resisted and Christ's (our God and Savior's) kingdom may be increased. Amen.

Against the blasphemous and shameful book, which recently went out in print in Münster, some propositions, put by

Philipp Melancthon at Wittenberg.

1. a book has gone out in Münster, full of blasphemies and sedition, against which I have wanted to place these following articles, so that everyone may see what shame, vice, and nonsense lie behind the Anabaptist revolt and doctrine, and may be able to guard and protect themselves all the better from such error.

2) First of all, they teach that before the last day the kingdom of Christ must be established in such a way that only the pious and elect (which they want to be) will reign and all the ungodly will be destroyed.

Regents who do not want to accept their faith should be exterminated and killed.

3. secondly, that the subjects shall take the rule from their overlords and depose them.

Thirdly, although the apostles had no command to arrogate to themselves the temporal regiment and ride with the sword, yet the present preachers are to take up the sword and establish a new regiment by force.

(5) Fourth, that no hypocrite, false Christian, or ungodly person be or be tolerated in the church.

6 These four pieces they clearly put in one article; and I have therefore wanted to tell them here, so that everyone may judge what kind of spirit it is that drives them; because they publicly confess such horrible lies and errors and let them go out in print.

Laying of the first piece.

(7) It is an unchristian error that Christ will establish such a kingdom before the last day, when only the godly shall reign and all the wicked shall be destroyed with the sword. For since the kingdom of Christ is a spiritual kingdom, where the poor consciences are to seek comfort and salvation through faith, against the horror of sins, death and misfortune, such a promise of God and exercise of faith would be completely wiped out, if one wanted to make the kingdom of Christ a temporal kingdom.

8. there is also enough testimony from the scriptures that the kingdom of Christ is not to be a worldly kingdom. For the Lord Christ Himself says Joh. 18, 36: "My kingdom is not of this world. And Joh. 20, 21: "As my Father has sent me, so I also send you." Since Christ was not a worldly ruler who ruled by force, but only a preacher who suffered violence, it follows that all those who are called to preach his word and are sent by him should renounce all worldly authority and in patience and suffering become accustomed to their Master Christ. But those whom the devil sends, as the Anabaptists now, may take the sword for the word, and preach lies and devilish errors for the truth; as they are now doing publicly at Münster, and will be subject to do more in other places, where the authorities of each place will not do so in time, and will control the possessed mad people by force.

(9) So also with clear words he reproves all violence and vengeance to the apostles and preachers, since

He says Matth. 20, 25. Marc. 10, 42. f.: "You know that the worldly rulers and the overlords have power, but among you it shall not be so." And Matth. 26, 52: "Whoever takes the sword shall perish by the sword." Item Matth. 5, 39.: "I tell you, 'you shall not resist evil.'" 2 Cor. 10, 3. f.: "Though we walk in the flesh, yet do we not contend carnally; for the weapons of our knighthood are not carnal, but mighty before God." 2c.

2 Cor. 3, 6. "We carry on the ministry of the new testament, not of the letter, but of the Spirit." Hebr. 8, 10.: "I will put my law in their hearts." Col. 2, 20: "If ye then be dead with Christ unto the statutes of the world, why are ye entangled with statutes, as though ye lived yet in the world?" And after that Col. 3, 8. 10. 11.: "Put away from you all anger, wrath, malice 2c., and put on the new man, who is being transformed into the knowledge in the image of Him who created him, not being Greek, Jew, circumcision, foreskin" 2c.

(10) These testimonies all teach that Christ's kingdom is separate from the worldly kingdom, and that Christians should not only refrain from violence, but also gladly suffer all violence for God's sake, and not do anything new in government or other civil and worldly affairs.

Interpretation of the second piece.

(11) This article is quite inflammatory, that the subjects should take the rule from their authorities and put themselves in their place. For so says St. Paul, Romans 13: "Let all men, every one, be obedient to his authority." And Matt. 26: "He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword."

12 Secondly. Since it is now evident that the Anabaptists are rebels, those who sit in regiments should punish them as public land robbers and defend themselves against them.

Transfer of the third piece.

(13) This is also an indication of a terrible delusion, that they hold and teach that preachers may use the sword without and against the command of Christ, even though Christ forbade it to his apostles. For the ministry of preaching shall be no different now than it was before; and this saying shall remain forever in the church of the preachers of the gospel, John 20:21: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

Relocation of the fourth piece.

14 This is also certain enough from the holy Scriptures that before the last day no such separation is to take place, that the pious are to be separated from the evil and false Christians; and that this separation belongs only to that life and is impossible here on earth. For thus Christ says Luc. 18, 8. about His last future: "Do you think that the Son of Man, when He comes, will also find faith on earth?" And Luc. 17, 34: "Two shall lie in one bed, and the one shall be accepted, but the other shall be forsaken." I think this is clear enough, that bad boys will remain among the pious Christians until the end of the world.

(15) So Matthew 13:40 and following, in the likeness Christ says: "The harvest is the end of the world; the reapers are the angels: the Son of man shall send his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. But it is very ridiculous that they say that they are the same angels who are supposed to do this, because they can only kill the body and not throw the soul into the hellish fire, as the text says.

16 But what may it much testify? For it is evident that Christ warns us and proclaims beforehand how the last days will be very perilous, and himself says: "If those days were not shortened, no man would be saved. And St. Peter in his other epistle testifies that the wicked will remain and reign until the last day, and the pious will have to suffer persecution from them. From this it is clear that the pious are not to reign. It is also to be noted here that it is impossible for men to separate all false Christians from the church. For the church will never be so pure here on earth; there will always be bad boys among them. But in that life it will become quite separate.

(17) Here you may say: How should one understand the prophets, who often speak of the kingdom of Christ as if it should become a worldly kingdom, therefore also the disciples in the Gospel [Matth. 20, 21. 24.], and the Jews to this day hope for a Messiah, who would establish a worldly reign and make them worldly rulers?

18 Answer. The gospel interprets the prophets correctly, therefore one must interpret such figures from the gospel and not follow the letter alone, because the text itself forces a different understanding than the words read. For the prophets themselves testify that

Christ shall die; therefore he shall not reign in the flesh. Item, they say: The Christians shall be comforted spiritually. But no man shall be comforted, except he that is in anguish and distress; therefore Christians shall not be worldly lords; as he saith Isaiah 61:1. f.: "He hath sent me to preach to the afflicted, to deliver them that are bound, to open them that are bound; to preach a pleasant year unto the Lord." Item, they prophesy how the true church must suffer persecution. Item, that Christ's kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom. All this cannot and may not be interpreted to the worldly kingdom.

19 About all this, Christ very often chastises the apostles in the Gospel for being under the delusion that Christ's kingdom should be a temporal kingdom, like other kingdoms on earth, saying: "Christ must suffer" and not "reign". And the apostles themselves afterwards point to a spiritual and eternal kingdom in the sayings of the prophets. Apost. 2. and 13.

[Relocation of the fifth piece.] 1)

Fifth, the Anabaptists of Münster conclude in their book: "Let no one be saved unless he has nothing of his own and gives away all his money and goods to the commonwealth.

This article is not only ungodly and contrary to the gospel, which leaves all civil order and law unchanged, and which Christians are commanded 2) to keep, but is also conducive to sedition.

[Relocation of the sixth piece.]

22) Sixthly, they allow and command that a man may and should have more than one wife. Yet Christ in the Gospel wants to keep marriage in clear words, according to the first institution in paradise. For he says: Erunt duo in carne una, 3) "Two shall be one flesh." There he wants that the marriage should be only of two persons, man and woman.

(23) Although it was forbidden for the Jews to have more than one wife in the Law, it is still against the natural law. For it is most like and according to nature that marriage be only between two persons, as God first instituted it in Paradise, if it is to be otherwise a kind, honest and chaste marriage. As the Greeks also spoke of it,

1) This and the following two headings are missing in the Wittenberg edition.

2) With Walch: "Peace".

3) So the Vulgate. Wittenberger: 1° oarnsva unaw.

and other barbarians as a special disgrace, that they take many wives.

(24) And here it is well to note that Lamech, who was of the ungodly lineage of Cain, 1) first began this, and Abraham did it afterward because his Sarah was barren. According to these examples, it was further torn down, and God allowed it to continue in patience.

[Relocation of the seventh piece.]

(25) Seventhly, this is a terrible blindness and blasphemy, that they may say without all shame: Christ did not take his flesh from

1) Wittenberger: "from the godless lineage of Cain".

The Bible testifies that he was born of the seed of Abrahah, and that he calls himself the Son of Man everywhere. But one senses here that the Anabaptists have even more in mind to blaspheme against Christ, the Son of God, and yet they are not yet allowed to do so.

Decision.

(26) These terrible errors and aversions are undoubtedly a punishment of the great certainty and blasphemy that is now everywhere in the world. Therefore, what devout God-fearing hearts there are that watch and pray, that they may persevere in the temptation and not also be deceived. Amen.

41 Phil. Melanchthon's displacement of some unchristian articles, which the Anabaptists pretend. *)

1535 (?). 1536 (?).

1. this short scripture is given for the instruction and remembrance of the simple, that they may be the more diligentlyware and know the better how to guard themselves against the cruel devilish sect of the Anabaptists. And although the whole doctrine of the Anabaptists is full of error and blindness, and they themselves are unequal, so that in some, as in the murderous mob that was at Münster in Westphalia, even more and crueler errors are found: nevertheless, here alone are mentioned several articles, which the Anabaptists almost all at the same time preached at first, and because of which some have recently been punished in these lands. And since their errors partly dispute against the spiritual essence, which concerns the soul alone, and partly also teach rebellion and destruction of the bodily regime and of the worldly estates and order, here are several articles of the bodily regime first told, and this is considered for two reasons:

The first cause is that the simple may clearly see and learn from these articles, which are easy to understand and judge, that the Anabaptist sect is unjust, against God, and of the devil.

For as Christ says that the false prophets go about in sheep's clothing, yet inwardly they are vain ravening wolves: so also the Anabaptists deceive the simple with the appearance of some works of their own invention, namely, with fictitious humility and other hypocrisy, that they may cover up the mischief. But it is necessary for the pious and cautious Christians to investigate the spirit of the Anabaptists and their own invented doctrine, that is, the most noble and special main part of their sect, and to uncover the sheep's clothing, and to get to know and notice the wolfish heart.

4 Now the right and certain test of all sects and spirits is to see whether they openly pretend to false and unchristian doctrine, and seriously and surely practice and defend it. Where this 2) flaw is noticed and found, Christians should be careful and shy away from such sects.

5 Thus St. Paul teaches about the false spirits, 1 Tim. 4, and says: "They will forbid food and marriage" and from such their works will make new righteousness and perfection.

2) Wittenberger: this one.

*This writing appeared in Wittenberg in a single edition under this title without indication of the year, and is therefore counted by some to the year 1535, by others to the year 1536. It is certain that it was written and published after the conquest of Münster (June 25, 1535). It is found in the Wittenberg edition (1551), vol. II, p. 282 d; we have reproduced the text thereafter.

212p. 1700

Similarly, the Anabaptists forbid all worldly rule and obedience, oaths and ownership of property, and tear up marriages, which are all God's ordinances, and pretend that such their fictitious works are the right high Christian nature and holiness; as the shameful heretics of Manichaei also held in former times, and equally made such a spectre before the people's eyes with the strange, whimsical holiness, as the Anabaptists do in our times.

Because so many noble articles and main points in the Anabaptist doctrine are public and not insignificant errors (for from this follows the disruption of all regiments and, in addition, spiritual blindness), there is no doubt that the Anabaptist sect is unjust and vain seduction aroused by the devil.

Therefore, the simple should look at and consider these gross articles and think that such gross errors are presented to everyone as a warning, so that one knows how to shun and beware of the Anabaptist sect all the more, and always keep the spiritual eye open, and do not pay attention to false humility and other hypocrisy, but notice the stain and the devilish poison hidden underneath, and clearly keep God's word against it; thus one can keep oneself from the devil's wiles.

8 For if one has noticed and felt the lying spirit in some clear and tangible articles, one knows that in other articles, of which the simple understand less, one should not believe the lying spirit, but wait and learn from God's words good constant report.

9 This is the one reason why these articles are first told about the secular regiment.

(10) The other reason is that men may understand from this that the authorities are obliged to defend the Anabaptist sect with severe punishment. For this is public and quite certain, that the authorities are obliged to ward off sedition. It is the duty of the authorities to maintain secular obedience and oath-taking, and to protect and administer the marriage state. Now the main part of the Anabaptist sect is against this, as its articles clearly prove. Therefore, the authorities are undoubtedly obliged to prevent and punish such shameful, murderous teachings.

(11) For what disruption would follow if these errors were to prevail, namely, that Christians should have no other authority than only the ministers of the gospel; item, that one should not swear an oath to the authorities; item, that no one should have property, but all goods should be given in common, just as if they were to be given to the church.

The law says that sackcloth must be made in all cities and regencies; item, that husbands and wives may leave each other solely on account of the inequality in faith! As we have also found some who have left their wives and children unawares and without cause, and have taken other wives for this shameful doctrine. It is easy to understand that these articles teach and plant sedition, robbery and murder, as well as fornication and adultery. On the other hand, there is no doubt that it is the duty of the authorities to inflict serious punishment, out of obedience, which they owe to God, to the praise of God, and to the benefit of their subjects, both in body and soul.

12 And although some poor people, who are otherwise not wanton and wicked, fall into these errors, it is nevertheless necessary to ward off the sect and its seed, and the authorities should not suffer such poisonous filth to spread further.

(13) Thus the terrible example at Münster proves that the humility and patience of the Anabaptists is vain and devilish hypocrisy. For at Münster, too, the beginning was vain great holiness, and they taught that a Christian should not wield the sword and should suffer everything; they also wanted first of all no authorities, but only prophets and preachers. After that they drove out their citizens and took away their goods, as the robbers; and made a king; and intended to bring the country around under themselves with the sword, as murderers; in addition they committed all kinds of fornication. So their spirit broke out, thinking it had room, and went, as it is said: The devil can otherwise disguise himself and make himself beautiful, but he cannot save his feet; that is: finally and in the exit one knows the devil's seduction.

14 But Christians should be careful, and perceive the cunning and seduction before they are caught. Just as it was necessary to defend and punish in Münster after the Anabaptists had committed public robbery and murder, so the authorities are obliged to defend and punish those who hold and spread such seditious articles and do not want to desist from them, as well as those who have drawn the sword, even if it has not yet come to the stroke. That is enough, why it is important to tell the articles of the physical regiment first.

(15) Let all Christians also consider in these articles that the devil's power is terrible and great, that he can blind human hearts and minds so severely in such gross articles that the very grossest sins and disgraces, as sedition, robbery, and adultery, shall be for the

The highest brightness is respected. This is a strong error, which the world deserves with its cruel certainty and contempt of the holy divine word, as St. Paul says, and the world mourns because of such contempt. This wrath and punishment has always been terrible in the world, and will be much greater in these last lines; for the defiance and contempt of God, iniquity and rashness will be greater; therefore cruel punishments must follow. Therefore, we should look at this terrible example of the Anabaptists, and fear this and similar punishments and mend our ways, and learn and love God's word with right earnestness and pray in the fear of God that he will not let us fall into temptation.

(16) The pious should also comfort themselves and consider that true faith must have temptation; therefore, they should be armed with God's word against all troubles. And although temptation remains in Christendom at all times in this world, it is to be hoped by God's grace that this poison of the Anabaptists will not remain for long, but will soon disappear again. For the Anabaptist sect is not unlike the Manichaeans, and looks as if the devil were the master of the Anabaptists, who a long time ago aroused the Manichaeans, who also preached such false holiness, with contempt for all worldly regiments and estates; and did not want to have any scripture and doctrine, but only wanted to keep what the spirit taught them, just as the Anabaptists speak now; they also condemned the marriage state, and besides that they committed great shameful fornication. Just as the Manichaei of the same time, although they were a great scandal, nevertheless perished after some years and died out completely: so, although the Anabaptist rage has a terrible reputation, it will not become more powerful, and will not remain for long, as we can hope by God's grace.

17 Now we want to talk about the articles mentioned. But at the beginning, it is necessary to note and consider these articles, from which the Anabaptist spirit can be judged; namely, that the Anabaptists are lacking in the most important part of Christian doctrine. For this is to be preached and practiced primarily in Christian doctrine, that Christian righteousness and holiness should be in the heart, right faith and trust in Christ, earnest fear of God and love; and that outward bodily regiments and states, ordered by God, should be taken for God's commandment and good works, in which God has set our bodily life; that in this we practice faith toward God and set good examples to others.

Also that we all serve one another, show and demonstrate love. These are the right high services of which the holy gospel preaches to us.

But the human heart does not like to stay with these services and with God's word, but always seeks other ways, and especially opens its eyes wide if it has not invented ordinary works, but something new and special. This holiness is so gentle to the human heart and is held in such high esteem that even in the old law people sacrificed and killed their children out of this false desire, hope and pleasure in their own invented works. Therefore it is no wonder that now and then the Anabaptists and their like esteem and love their works so highly that they give themselves up to death with great boldness. For thus they also completely reverse the doctrine. They know nothing of holiness in the heart, and aim at an outward new holiness, namely destruction of good order and morals, of the regiments, of the oath, of property and marital status. They consider this destruction and barbarism to be high and noble works, not only because it is something strange and unusual, but rather because the devil, who has possessed them, takes pleasure in leading people away from God's word and order to another road, and thus causes idolatry and all kinds of sin.

(19) From this it can be understood why the Anabaptist error of the bodily government comes, namely, that they lack the main part of Christian doctrine, and do not know what Christian righteousness is, and think it is only such an outward, unusual way. It is to be understood that these errors of the bodily government not only do harm outwardly, causing turmoil and destruction, which should be prevented with great earnestness, but also do harm in the spiritual being; for in addition to the murder and similar sins that follow from them, they also darken the right understanding of Christian righteousness, and point people away from Christ and from the faith to new great works, which in truth are all disorder, desolation, shame and vice.

20 It is terrible to hear that human hearts are so blinded. For the Anabaptists have not yet devised anything higher or different than this: One shall not baptize children, and shall have no authority, no regiment; shall not take oaths; shall not keep his own; and shall take wives, depending on their sect. Now every sensible person should consider these things for himself;

What holiness can this be? It is public that such is nothing else but a cruel desolation. They want to tear the church apart by forbidding baptism. The other articles are a destruction of the bodily life, of all discipline and good order, which are also God's commandment and work. Now the Anabaptists have no other holiness to set themselves apart from us than the beautiful articles that have been declared; what holiness can they boast of? Why should a Christian be afraid of them? Yes, a Christian should realize that the Anabaptist sect is a vain devilish deception; therefore he should be courageous in the faith and confidently despise the devil and resist him, each according to his profession and office.

(21) Let this be enough here for a common reminder of the following articles, so that the simple may consider all the more diligently what a Christian being actually stands for, and see that the Anabaptists are far short of the right goal. Now let us recount the articles one after the other and lay them out with good reason.

The first article of the Anabaptists.

(22) That Christians should not and cannot be in authority and office that wields the sword.

(23) That this article is unjust and unchristian is proved first of all by the examples in the holy Scriptures, in which it is seen that many holy men have been kings, princes, and officers, and have wielded the sword according to their station and office. Christ praised the centurion Matthew on the 8th and praised his faith so highly that he said: he would not have found such faith in Israel. This centurion was a Roman warrior, as he himself indicates; and yet he is praised by Christ as a great saint and child of God. Similarly, the centurion is praised in the book of the apostles' history, to which Saint Peter is sent. So Abraham, Joseph, David, Ezechias, Daniel and many other holy Christian people were, and nevertheless they wielded the sword. Item, in the Psalms it says of Christ, "Kings shall worship him." From this it is clear that some kings and princes will also be Christians.

24 Secondly. Luc. 3, when the warriors and officers asked John the Baptist what they should do, he answered, "Let them be content with their pay, and do no violence or wrong to anyone. Thus the office is confirmed and pledged, while he lets them remain in the pay and says: they shall have their settlement. For the pay belongs to the office.

25 Thirdly. The thorough opinion of the Anabaptists is this, that the ordinary punishment in the regiment is vain sin and tyranny; for revenge is forbidden to Christians, as it is written Rom. 12: "Ye shall not avenge yourselves" 2c. This is the reason of the Anabaptists. And such misunderstanding gives them cause to boast of their patience for great holiness, and to condemn all authority; for they think that all Christian works must be absolutely equal. This is vain blindness, and comes from a wrong interpretation of the Scriptures, and from the misunderstanding that they do not know the difference between the spiritual nature in the heart, and the outward estate, which should and must have unequal works; as the man and the woman, the father and the child, have outwardly unequal works, and yet in the heart there should be one fear of God and faith in Christ.

(26) Therefore, if the Anabaptists use sayings in which vengeance is forbidden, they should know how to respond to them, namely, that all vengeance is forbidden apart from the ministry, but vengeance in the ministry is God's commandment and a holy good work. This difference is taught to us by the Holy Scriptures themselves, and is not invented by men.

27 For Paul speaks of the office that wields the sword as being God's work and order, and that the authority is God's servant, for the vengeance and punishment of the wicked, and for the protection of the pious. From these sayings it is clear that this vengeance in the office is not sin, but God's commandment and order and a right holy service of God. And since the ministry is not sin, but a good work ordained by God, Christians may have and use such ministry as other gifts of God, as food and drink 2c.

28 Yes, they must preserve this office and not destroy it, because the law must remain in the world for the punishment of the wicked, as Paul says: "The law is for the sake of the unrighteous." Now the office that wields the sword is a piece of the law.

Fourth. God commands in the Holy Scriptures that widows and orphans be protected. This is preached and commanded to the Christian authorities; therefore punishment is God's commandment, and Christian authorities are obliged to take punishment and revenge against the wicked.

(30) From all this it is clear that the sayings which forbid vengeance speak of works apart from the office. The other sayings, which praise and enjoin vengeance, speak of works in office. And it is easy to understand why works in office and works out of office must be different: for this is necessary for the preservation of peace and discipline. For what disorder and sedition

would follow if each subject wanted to punish and be judge himself? That is why God has ordered the regiment to be beneficial and useful.

The second article.

Christians shall have no other authority than the ministers of the gospel alone.

In this article, the spirit of the Anabaptist sect can be seen even more clearly than before. For here, at the same time, the authorities are condemned and obedience is torn apart. And because this article is easily mislaid, it does not require many words here; only the simple are to be admonished that they want to diligently consider how terrible this article is. And that this article of the Anabaptists is also false, Paul proves in Romans 13, when he says: "Be subject therefore for necessity, not only for punishment, but also for conscience' sake. This saying teaches that God will consider it a sin and will punish severely if someone does not want to be a subject. Now this saying binds all men on earth, and it is in no one's power to withdraw from it. Therefore, all Christians must have worldly authority and rule.

(33) Secondly, it is public that God has ordered these two offices differently, the ministry of preaching and secular authority, and has commanded that Christians be under both offices. Therefore, it is an abominable error to mix these offices together, or to abolish and take away one of them, when they are both God's order and command. For no human being has the power to overrule God's order.

34 But that the Anabaptists speak against it: The pious have no need of punishment, therefore they have no need of the authorities and worldly regiments, is vain blindness. For the pious need the authorities for protection. Item, the authorities need the obedient and pious Christians for the preservation of the regiments. Therefore God wants to have us under this order for both reasons; namely, that we have protection, and on the other hand, that we serve with body and goods, in all obedience and faithfulness and at all times, in times of war and otherwise help, each according to his profession, to preserve the regiments, peace and discipline and to ward off the wicked; to this service belong especially the devout Christians. Paul teaches all this in Romans 13, where he says: "We owe obedience, worship and honor 2c. to the authorities. Whoever, on the other hand, teaches that Christians may have no authority, teaches that the authority may be deprived of the righteousness it has in our obedience; this is openly contrary to Paul.

The third article.

Christians are forbidden to swear an oath, and swearing an oath is a sin.

This article is also a destruction of the secular regiment and court. For regiment and court are taken by oath. But that Christians may swear oaths is proved first by the examples. For St. Paul himself swears an oath in clear words, 2 Cor. 1: "I call upon God as a witness to my soul." So St. Paul often swears, as Rom. 1. Phil. 1: "God is my witness", and in other more places.

Hebrews 6: "In all things, in courts of law, the oath is the end and confirmation. Here the oath is praised in the courts and considered necessary. From this it follows that it is not wrong to swear an oath, for among Christians courts and judges must also remain, as is said above about the regiment and the authorities. For courts are a pleasant part of the regiments and of the office of the authorities.

38 In the fifth book of Moses, chapter 5: "You shall swear by the name of the Lord. Here, in the other commandment, it is commanded that one should swear, but only by the name of God. If then it is commanded to swear, where such is demanded, it must follow that swearing is not a sin, but a good, holy work, by which God is honored, if one swears rightly and with truth and does not do so frivolously, but because God's honor and the authorities demand it.

(39) But as the Anabaptists object to Matthew 5: "Thou shalt not swear by the temple," 2c., the first answer is that the oath is not forbidden here, but this is forbidden, that one should not give the honor due to God to creatures. God alone is the Lord, who knows the hearts and punishes untruth; therefore God's name is to be invoked and not the temple or anything else.

40 Secondly, when Christ says, "Your speech shall be yes, yes," 2c., he says, "Your speech," indicating that he forbids the oath in our own and private speeches; namely, if the judge or the authorities do not interpret the oath to us; item, if God's honor and other people's salvation does not require our oath. On the other hand, it is right and necessary to swear if the authorities or the judge requires it, as it is said in Hebrews 6: "The oath is the end and confirmation in courts of law" 2c.

The fourth article.

Christians are obliged to give their goods in common and should not have ownership.

This article attracts the loose crowd that does not like to work and squanders more than it knows how to earn honestly. But that such teaching causes vain robbery and turmoil, everyone can easily understand. But to warn and instruct the simple, we will recently prove from God's word and commandment that Christians may have property; and that it is sedition and against God to command that goods be given in common.

43. to the first. This understanding is highly necessary to Christians, that they may know that outward worldly government is God's order; and that it is pleasing to God that we should live and serve one another therein, as before indicated. Now, having property is one of the noblest and most necessary things in government; it must follow that a Christian may use and keep such an order. Yes, he who wants to abolish and forbid this order and make a new regiment against it, and command that the goods be thrown into a common heap, is subjecting himself to tearing down God's order, and is doing harm to God.

44 Secondly, Paul teaches in 1 Corinthians 7 that Christians may buy and sell. Therefore they may have property and goods. And in 1 Tim. 6 he writes: "The rich are to give alms gladly," not saying that they should leave their goods, but that they should remain in their goods and riches.

45 Third, kings and princes must have goods and property; now the Scripture clearly teaches that some kings and princes will be saved.

46. fourth, Proverbs 5:16 f.: "Let thy wells flow forth, but thou shalt remain master over them." The holy scripture teaches that each one should remain master of his inheritance. But from the fruits and benefits one should also help others. This is what he means when he says, "Let the fountains flow forth. And it is truly a comfort to a sensible, God-fearing Christian, if he knows that God is pleased with this worldly order, that one sits in goods and seeks nourishment, and that God therefore wants to protect his order and help to nourish 2c.

47 But that the Anabaptists, on the other hand, use the apostles' example, when the Christians at Jerusalem gave their goods in common, this is not a commandment. For there have been many Christians who have not kept this way, but have remained in their goods, as can be seen from Paul, 2 Corinthians 9, where Paul also teaches that no one should be deprived of his goods, but that almsgiving should be based on each person's good will. But because of

When there was a great persecution in Jerusalem, and the Christians were daily deprived of their goods and driven away, it was more useful for them to sell the goods themselves and to collect the money to keep them in need. So they did this because of the persecution, and not because such works would be a new holiness, as some monks, Anabaptists and other foolish saints consider such unrighteousness and disruption of natural order and rule to be deliciously heavenly beings; and do not understand that Christian holiness must be in the heart, and that it pleases God that we keep ourselves in the outward life according to ordinary and orderly rules.

The fifth article.

(48) If in marriage one person is a true believer and the other married person is not a true believer, let such a marriage be fornication, and let the true believer leave the other for the sake of faith alone and marry another.

49) This article is intended to move reasonable and disciplined people to become serious and heartfelt enemies of the Anabaptist sect. 1) For it is terrible to hear that they desecrate and tear apart right marriages.

50) But that this article of the Anabaptists is wrong is quite clear from Paul, 1 Cor. 7, since Paul actually deals with this question: whether believers and unbelievers should remain with each other in the marriage state? and he insists that they should remain with each other, teaching that such a marriage is a right, holy and pleasing marriage to God for the believer. Therefore he says: "The unbelieving person is sanctified by the believing"; that is, the conjugal companionship of this person becomes holy, that is, pleasing to God, and is not sin. For so the word "holy" is to be understood in this place, as Paul otherwise also speaks, "The food is sanctified," that is, it is not sin to use the food that GOD has created.

51 Thus St. Paul teaches both of these things, namely: the first, that the believing person should remain with the unbelieving and is obliged to remain, if he is not wilfully abandoned by the unbelieving. The other, that there is a true marriage between the believer and the unbeliever; that is, that the believer can be in such a marriage with a good conscience, as in a holy state pleasing to God, and is obliged to remain in it. For Saint Paul clearly says that this cohabitation is holy. Therefore

1) The words: "feind werden" to "zerreißen" are missing in the Wittenberger.

it is vain devil's play that the Anabaptists call such marriage fornication and tear it apart.

52 And although the Anabaptists are quite impudent, and invent lies and glosses as they please, yet any reasonable person can easily understand that this, as we have said, is thoroughly and actually St. Paul's opinion. In contrast, the Anabaptists have invented their own slogan: One faith, one love. They interpret this to mean that they do not owe it to those who are not of their faith to keep their marriage vows. If this saying were to be interpreted as meaning that we should not owe allegiance or love to anyone who is unequal to us in faith, then we could easily eradicate all quarrels, obligations and guilt. Christ commanded that we should love even our enemies who persecute us and are publicly unequal in faith: how much more should husbands and wives be faithful to one another 2c.!

This would be better interpreted, that each one should have in his own heart One Faith and One Love towards God, that is, that he should believe in God alone, have his trust in God alone, love God alone above all things, and not let himself be turned away from God by pleasure, honor, money or goods. 2c. This same love for God also entails obedience in all the works that God has commanded for every state.

From infant baptism.

The Anabaptists hold that infant baptism is wrong.

Now consider, first, how terrible it is to throw a large part of the human race not only into an uncertain state outside the Christian church, but to tear it away from God's order and grace to damnation. On the other hand, what disruption would follow if two groups, one baptized and one unbaptized, were to grow up among us! And if the baptism were to be completed for the most part, then the pagan nature would publicly break down, and the devil would gladly make a way for this.

(56) Therefore, all devout Christians should be well informed about infant baptism and know how to comfort and strengthen themselves with good reason, so that they faithfully receive infant baptism for the glory of God, for the salvation of the dear children and for our own comfort. For it is quite comforting to devout Christians when they are sufficiently informed that children will certainly become children of God and be saved through baptism; therefore we want to prove that infant baptism is right and necessary.

57 And this is the first reason: It is certain and undeniable that the grace of Christ, forgiveness of sins and blessedness, promised in the Gospel, belongs also to the children, as Christ says: "Let the children come to me, for such is the kingdom of heaven.

Now, apart from the Christian church, that is, where there is no sacrament and the Word of God, there is no blessedness; therefore, the children must be incorporated into the Christian church and become members of it, and such grace must be bestowed upon them through the sacrament. For God has ordered and commanded the outward ministry in such a way that through it forgiveness of sin is to be distributed to all in the church. All this is public and certain. For the Anabaptists can never prove that blessedness is outside the Christian church, that is, where there is no sacrament and God's word.

The other reason. The children should and must be members of the Christian church, if they are to be saved otherwise, as is now said. Now Saint Paul teaches that the Christian church is the assembly purified by the Holy Spirit and baptism. Therefore no one can be a member of the Christian church without baptism, even with contempt of baptism.

60 Christ also teaches John 3: "No one can enter the kingdom of heaven unless he is born again through water and the Holy Spirit. Here Christ includes all men on earth, young and old, and says of water. Therefore, if the Anabaptists ask where it is commanded to baptize infants, we should keep to this saying and know that it is commanded, for Christ says, "No one can enter the kingdom of heaven unless he is born again through water and the Holy Spirit," for the ministry of water baptism is commanded to the church.

The fact that they despise water and outward signs out of great wisdom and holiness is the cleverness of their master, the devil, who, as a trustworthy spirit and enemy of God, drives wretched people to mock God's word and order. But Christians should know that in such outward signs is God's word, command and order. Therefore, the signs must be used, and God works with His order, as He has promised. For this reason St. Paul says: that the Church is purified through baptism; item: that we are born again through baptism; all of which is said so that we may certainly believe that God works with the signs.

62 But that the Anabaptists say, "The children have no faith," is a human error.

This is a strange thought, and it is not true. For it is certain that God works in the children according to their measure, if they are brought before Him through baptism. For no one is saved without divine action and rebirth, John 3. Now it is certain that the children who are members of Christianity will be saved; so it follows that it must be true that God works in them.

The third reason. The children have sin in them, namely, original sin; therefore they need forgiveness of sins, which is imparted to them through baptism. For this forgiveness and the outward ministry must make a difference between the children who are saved and the others. But here the spirit of the Anabaptists can be rightly noticed, for they hold and teach that the children have no sin in them, and that original sin is not sin; item, that the inherent evil desire in man is not sin.

(64) If you want to color lies, you need many more lies; so here, if the Anabaptists want to overthrow baptism, they invent many horrible and terrible lies for it. And consider every one of the Anabaptists holiness! They seek new outward disorderly works, so that they want to be holy; and are so blind in their hearts that they do not consider their own evil lust to be sin, despise baptism and God's word outwardly, and do not consider that one should seek God there, and that God is involved. Therefore, they do not know what faith is, and seek strange works, or want to have special enlightenment apart from and without God's Word. This is vain blindness, error and the devil's specter, and these are the very holy people of whom Paul speaks, that they are mad, and they pontificate and boast of things of which they know nothing. Christians should consider all these things carefully, so that they may learn to know the false spirits and heresies, to flee and avoid them.

That children bring original sin with them, and that inherent evil desire is sin, is clearly taught by St. Paul in many places. Rom. 5: "Through Adam's transgression we all became sinful." In Rom. 7 he calls the evil desire in man "sin that dwells in us". And Rom. 8 he says: "The lust in the flesh is hatred against God"; that is hard and clear enough. Item, Eph. 2: "We are born children of wrath", that is, sinful and damned,

66 And in sum, this understanding has always remained in Christendom: that original sin is truly sin, and that it is forgiven the children through baptism. And so that I do not make it long here, because all good-hearted and

If it is clear enough to those with understanding that the Anabaptists deny God's word quite wilfully here, I will only add one more reason to clearly understand that there is sin in the children, which is forgiven them through baptism. For all Christians must confess that Christ is the Savior not only of the aged but also of children. Therefore, if they need Christ as the Savior, there is undoubtedly sin in them. Since it is sufficiently proven that sin is in the children, if they are to be forgiven, the outward ministry must be added, otherwise there would be no difference and no church.

67 The fourth reason. Baptism and circumcision both mean grace and forgiveness of sins, as Paul teaches. Now the circumcision of the children was right and necessary, and through it the children of Abrahah were accepted by God and became God's children. Therefore, there must also be a sign in us that makes a difference between God's children and the damned.

The fifth reason. The Lord Christ has spoken a very comforting saying about children: "The Father's will is not that these children should perish. These words are spoken of the circumcised children; so they must also be understood by us of those children alone who are members of the church. For they cannot be understood by Gentiles and Turks, since there is no blessedness apart from the Church, that is, where there is not God's Word and Sacrament.

(69) Therefore, all devout Christians should take comfort and joy in knowing that their children are certainly God's children, if they have become members of the Church through baptism and have been accepted by God. For this reason, infant baptism is a sweet and high consolation. And that we conclude: If all Anabaptists bring together all their wisdom, holiness and suffering, they still cannot make any man certain that children outside the church, as Turkish children, will be saved. Therefore, their doctrine is a vain and uncertain thing and a fictitious devilish fraud.

(70) Although we have shown good consistent reason from divine Scripture, let us also remember that infant baptism is not a new thing, but was also in the oldest pure church, which is not to be despised. For what is necessary for salvation must have been known beforehand in Christendom, and especially at the time when the doctrine was purer. If infant baptism is wrong, and rebaptism is necessary for salvation, then

Such a testimony of the Holy Spirit in the church.

To introduce new doctrine without God's Word is great

Because the Anabaptist doctrine is entirely a new poem presumption, impudence and, in addition, error. of its own, without any examples or testimony from the old Whoever considers these causes diligently and holy church, reasonable Christians should shy away from carefully can, by God's grace, strengthen his faith and rebaptism. For it is not valid to joke about Christian protect himself from the unchristian error of the doctrine, to introduce a new doctrine without God's word Anabaptists. For we should know that faith will suffer and some proven examples, yes, against God's word and temptation and should be strengthened by God's word. against all the examples of all common Christianity from Therefore, we should be courageous and careful that the the beginning. This is cruel presumption and audacity, for devil does not lead us away from God's word into his own which may God mercifully protect us! For it is a devilish thoughts, as happened to the Anabaptists. For this is the contempt of God, and is the characteristic of the Antichrist, reason and beginning of the deception in the Anabaptists, as Daniel and Paul say. As the pope and the monks have that they despise the Word of God and fall into their own introduced many terrible abuses with equal boldness in thoughts, and have such great pleasure and lust in the Christianity without and against God's word and old same that they pretend it is the Holy Spirit, and then go examples, as their mass of death, prohibition of marriage on and blaspheme God, saying: one should not respect and other more things. And although the Anabaptists also the outward word and Scripture, but one should follow the want to count infant baptism among such things, they are Spirit. If this entrance and this door is open, that each one mistaken. For infant baptism has God's word and the should judge according to his own spirit, and not oldest pure church's example. For Christ says, "No one according to God's word, oh God! what a terrible thing will can enter the kingdom of heaven unless he is born again follow! as the example at Münster has proven. Thus many through water and the Holy Spirit." Now this outward of us have heard from the now punished Anabaptists, ministry of baptizing with water is commanded to the when they had overcome with clear Scripture, they finally church; therefore the church should communicate it to all. said: The Spirit taught them thus.

For this, infant baptism has examples from the earliest For this reason, it is highly necessary to pay attention that we do not allow ourselves to be led away by God's Christianity.

For Origen speaks clearly in his interpretation, Rom. 6, word to our own thoughts, but know that the Holy Spirit [v. 3. f.] that Christianity therefore received the order from does not work without God's word, but through God's the apostles to baptize children, because there is inherent word; and that we should and must recognize and grasp sin in children, which is washed away by water and the God by His word, as Paul says: "Faith comes from Holy Spirit. hearing," that is, from the sermon or the outward word.

Thus Cyprian writes to Fido a good teaching that the This order God keeps and does not tear apart. Therefore, church should not exclude children from baptism and contempt for the external word and the Scriptures is grace, but is obliged to share baptism with them. For as blasphemy, which the secular authorities are also obliged much as there is in her, she owes it to all men, young and to punish, according to the other commandment, in which old, to communicate her ministry. -And in doing so, he it is commanded that blasphemy be punished. In addition, clearly states that children need baptism for this reason, one can see what shame and vice would follow in the so that through God's grace and work in baptism they outer life, if everyone wanted to teach and live according receive forgiveness of original sin. There are many such to his own thoughts. Therefore the wise king Solomon sayings in Augustine, who also says that this order is kept says: "When the right preaching is gone, the people and in the whole church as if it were the tradition of the the government are scattered. For this reason, the secular authorities should also be vigilant here and not apostles.

These sayings we have told, so that the simple may not tolerate this blasphemy, that is, public contempt for be deceived by some lying spirits, who imagine to the Scripture and the external word, but should seriously unlearned that the ancient saints did not keep infant defend and punish it. And especially all Christians should baptism, as some have written in Münster. In addition, it consider such contempt of the Scriptures as devilish, and must be remembered that in the Christian church, against know that it is the serpent's speech in paradise to Eve.

such 'old examples,

The Anabaptists also have more aberrations.

The following is a list of the most important articles of the two sacraments and their customs, as well as other articles, of which others have also been written before, and which time does not permit to be dealt with now. And this instruction is primarily intended so that the simple may thereby learn to judge and know the spirit in the Anabaptists by means of several easy articles, and to be the more careful. Therefore ask the Christian preachers to explain these and other articles further, and to teach the people often and with diligence in such dangerous times, as they are obliged to do, and to give account to God, if they do not resist these errors with earnestness. The Anabaptists also have some pretensions to move people more than with doctrine, namely, that they use many more splendid and strange words and boast of high enlightenments, which is all a lie, as experience has often proven. Item, that they pretend great humility in those whom they praise. Item, that great brotherly fidelity seems, that they are

Give their goods in common. Item, that they show great patience in suffering, and go to death with great boldness and defiance.

Now it is no wonder that such gestures move anyone; but a Christian should lift up and set God's word high and far above all appearance in outward gestures, and should know that spiritual matters are to be judged according to God's word, and not otherwise. The heathen can also run freely and joyfully into death. For the devil can blind his own, so that they do not feel their sin and punishment. Christians feel sin and fear, and overcome them with faith; therefore, while they contend, weakness appears in them. Therefore, although the Anabaptists defiantly run to their deaths, we should not fall away from God's word, but consider that maintaining right faith in the heart also requires earnestness and a struggle against all kinds of troubles.

80 May our Lord Christ graciously preserve us from all error and keep us in right faith and obedience. Amen.

42 Philipp Melanchthon's Lessons Against the Doctrine of the Anabaptists 2c. *)

Second half of the year 1535 or later.

(1) I have often taught before what are the main things that every Christian needs to know, as the Lord Christ himself indicates when he commands us to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins in Luc. 24. St. Paul also wants to show us the most important elements of Christian doctrine, when he says: "The main sum of the commandment is love from a pure heart, and from a good conscience, and from undimmed faith" 2c. These same principal things are also everywhere practiced by the prophets, and without this the whole Scripture holds before us these most noble causes, repentance, faith, love, patience, and other fruits of faith.

(2) These are the main things we must always keep in mind, and our hearts and minds must be trained in them, so that righteous fear of God, and true faith, and right and truthful beliefs, may increase in us daily.

God's knowledge, and whenever we deal with a place of Scripture, we are to look primarily for the main points therein, so that we may take and grasp the right summa of Christian doctrine correctly and intelligently.

(3) But at this time the Anabaptists and some others turn back, leaving the knowledge of Christ, which is the true wisdom, and quarreling about outward ceremonies, about the doctrine of men, without cessation; meanwhile true repentance, faith, the cross, patience, love, and other Christian fruits and works are kept silent. However, we have often discussed the main points and the summa of Christian doctrine.

4 Because so much ugly, harmful error and discord are occurring about the sacraments, we should stir them up here, so that we can make the simple and inexperienced resist such heresies, which are increasing in number from day to day.

*This writing appeared without indication of printer and year at Wittenberg. In the collections it is found only in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 291. After that we give the text. The city of Münster had already been conquered and the rebels punished, so the writing, like the previous one, is to be placed in the second half of the year 1535 or later.

may increase, prepare. For it is very difficult to stay and hold on to the right truth when so much trouble, heresies and so much discord come in, and it usually happens that one error soon follows another, and one heresy gives birth to another, as 2 Tim. 3, 13 St. Paul indicates when he says: "The longer it goes on, the worse it gets with evil and seducing people, who seduce and are seduced."

5 First, we will speak in general about the sacred sacraments, what their proper use and benefit is, and how many of them there are; then we will speak in particular about baptism; item, about the difference between John's and Christ's baptism, and also about the baptism of young children.

From now on, the Münster Anabaptists will also be remembered in general, whose terrible history, how they became powerful in the city of Münster, raised a king there, practiced many diabolical blasphemies against God and unheard-of cruelty, sin and shame in the city, and how they were finally controlled and the alleged king and others punished, is better summarized in this book.

Of the Holy Sacraments.

(7) From the beginning of the world, God the Lord has always given, in addition to His divine promises, some outward signs that could be seen, so that His word would be the more clearly imprinted on the descendants and bequeathed to them. For such outward signs, which are seen, remind us somewhat more strongly than the teaching or the oral word alone.

8 Thus circumcision was a wonderful outward sign, reminding the Israelites of the divine promise of the blessed seed of Christ, and with the outward sign the divine promise remained all the more certain in the memory and was inherited by the descendants.

(9) Therefore, when we speak of such sacraments, we should not only look at the outward sign, but first of all take to heart and consider the divine promises to which such an outward sign is attached. For the word "sacrament" means an outward sign which God has given and instituted. Thus, two outward signs belong to baptism: the washing with water and the word of promise. In order that one may remember the divine promise and understand more clearly what sacrament is in general, I will speak of the custom of the sacraments.

First of all, all God-fearers are to be warned here against the ugly error of the unbelievers.

who teach that those who need the sacraments are justified only by the outward work done, *ex opere operato*, even if the heart is not involved. This false Pharisaic teaching should be eradicated from the Christian church with all seriousness, for it is strongly against the gospel and against faith; for such hypocrites teach that man is justified solely by the work and custom of the ceremonies, even if he does not believe. Yes, further they may impudently say, if he has not a good heart or devotion, only that he give not obloquy and hindrance, that is, that he be not in the intent of deadly sin.

(11) Against this are some clever and unintelligent people who want to speak politely of ceremonies, who teach and say that the sacraments are not signs of God's gracious will toward us, but only outward signs and slogans, so that God's people are known to other pagans, as the Romans are known to the Greeks by their clothing; item, as the monks are known to others by their clothing. But this does not yet indicate the proper use of the sacraments. For although they are signs by which Christians or God's people are known, they are not the noblest custom, nor do they help or comfort consciences. But we Christians should know and seek the noblest custom of the sacraments.

The third opinion is that of the blasphemous Anabaptists, who speak of it even more clumsily and foolishly, saying that the sacraments are only signs of good works. They say that circumcision was a sign that one should control and resist the flesh and evil desires. Baptism is a sign that Christians must be immersed in the world, bear and suffer all kinds of great danger and persecution; this means that water was poured over them. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a sign of brotherly, Christian love and unity, because among all other peoples eating and drinking with one another is a sign of friendship, love and unity.

(13) Although the sacraments signify all this, it does not indicate the proper use of the sacraments, for the sacraments are not primarily signs of Christian love and peace among us, but they are holy, sacred seals by which faith is strengthened, signs of divine will and grace toward us. For the gospel does not preach works alone, but primarily faith and the knowledge of divine grace, divine will toward us.

The first part, and in addition the least part of the Christian being, namely the works.

The fourth opinion is the right reason, namely, that the sacraments of the New Testament are primarily instituted to be signs of God's will toward us, that they stand before our eyes to remind us to believe the more strongly the divine promise preached in the Gospel. For God attaches these two to each other, His divine promise and outward signs.

(15) If the divine promise is to be grasped by faith, then there should also be faith in the right use of the sacraments, so that the heart may look upon the Savior Christ in the word of promise, and certainly conclude that you may obtain forgiveness of sins, which is offered by the divine promise.

16 Such use of the sacraments is highly necessary and useful for the God-fearing in the right fight against the devil and sin. Thus says St. Paul: Circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith, that is, a divine sign that God gave, so that we might believe the promise more surely and firmly; item, so that every troubled conscience might take comfort in the promise; for 1) we see that God has not only given His word and promise, but has also painted and written His word and promise on our bodies when we are immersed in water through baptism; item, when we bodily enjoy the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.

17 Augustine finely compares the outward sign with the word, since he says: "The sacrament is a visible word; that is, just as the word is a voice that one grasps with the ears, so also the sacrament (that is, the outward sign) is a painting and memorial sign before the eyes. Just as the divine Word is a testimony and outward sign of the invisible God and His will, and just as God is known through the Word when we believe, so we also know God and His will through the outward sign when we believe.

18 Therefore, just as the Word and Gospel is an outward instrument through which the Holy Spirit works and is powerful, as St. Paul says: "The Gospel is God's power to all who believe in it"; item, Rom. 10: "Faith comes from hearing": so also the Holy Spirit works through the outward sign, if we receive it in faith. For the outward signs are given and set before the eyes for this reason, that they may

1) Wittenberger: when.

Against our weakness we should strengthen the faith in our hearts, imagining God's will as the gospel and [God's] word is given, that it may move us to believe.

19 From this it may be inferred what is the proper use and benefit of the sacraments, namely, that this is their ultimate use and fruit, that they are to lift up and comfort the hearts and consciences in temptations.

The apostles, as well as the ancient fathers and teachers of the Church, teach this right and noblest use of the sacraments. St. Paul says Titus 3: "He made us blessed through the bath of regeneration." Therefore, God works through 2) the outward sign, through the water of Holy Baptism.

21 And St. Peter speaks of it as a right, learned, high preacher, 1 Peter 3, when he says: "that baptism is not only a washing away of the filth of the flesh, but a covenant of a good conscience with God through the resurrection of Jesus Christ"; that is, baptism is a covenant, seal and sign of the covenant, by which God testifies that He is gracious to us for the sake of Christ, who suffered for our sake and rose from the dead. Again, the heart also becomes certain that it has a gracious God, and that we are righteous before God for Christ's sake.

22. and Apost. 2. St. Peter says: "Let everyone be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins. Peter calls baptism a testimony and sign of the forgiveness of sins and the Holy Spirit.

The ancient teachers also called the sacraments *signa gratiae*, that is, external seals and signs of divine will toward us. Therefore, they are not mere signs or slogans by which Christians are known to other peoples. For this reason, it is false and ungodly to teach that the sacred sacraments should be made into mere signs or slogans by which people are known, even though their proper use is to remind and comfort the hearts and consciences when they are in trouble.

(24) If we have this right and noblest use of the sacraments, then we may also consider other fruits and benefits of the sacraments, namely, that they are testimonies of confession, by which we publicly show before others that we call upon the Savior Christ, that we adhere to the gospel, which confession is also a high worship.

(25) After that, they may also be images and signs of Christian love, life and being, as the ancient fathers often described Christians in their sermons.

2) "by" is missing in the Wittenberger.

exhorts to Christian love. For when we receive the body and blood of the Lord over the table of the Lord, we make a brotherly holy covenant of Christian peace, unity and love, and show that we are all one body under the head Christ, and all members of one body. The holy fathers have often used this argument.

From number of sacraments.

(26) There is no need to quarrel about the seven sacraments or a certain number of sacraments. For if one wants to call sacraments not only the ceremonies instituted in the Gospel, but also other works to which a divine promise is attached, then there are many sacraments to be counted; as, "prayer" one would call a sacrament, for it is a Christian divine work, and divine promises are attached to it, since Christ says: "All things whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, that will he give you."

27 Thus affliction, cross-bearing, almsgiving may be called sacraments, for these works have attached to them glorious, divine promises, as the Lord says: "Pray, and it shall be given you. And it would be good, and not useless, to give such noble works such high and comforting titles, so that we might learn to see and esteem the comforting, divine promises, and thereby be stimulated to Christian walk and good fruits.

Thus the marriage state may also be called a sacrament, for it is an outward state which God has honored and adorned with His word and promise. It is also a sacred sign, as St. Paul indicates in Eph. 5, of spiritual union, since Christ is the Church or our Bridegroom, and we are His bride. But all these things I have said are not ceremonies instituted in the New Testament.

(29) If we call sacraments only the ceremonies instituted in the gospel and the outward signs given and attached to the divine promise of the forgiveness of sins, it will soon be noted which are the most prominent sacraments in the New Testament, as baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Absolutio. For these outward signs are instituted in the Gospel and are used to indicate the promise of the Gospel. For this reason we received the sacrament of baptism, that we believe the divine promise that our sins are forgiven. Therefore we received the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and hear the consolation

Word of absolution that we believe the divine; promise that our sin is forgiven.

(30) Confirmation and oelung were not considered necessary or required works by the ancient teachers themselves, and as they are now used, they are dead images of confirmation and oelung, which were common among the apostles.

Confirmatio was used by the apostles in this way: If anyone had been baptized and now had a fair understanding of the doctrine of Christ, he was interrogated and had to confess his faith. And if he confessed well and had good testimony, the apostle laid his hand on his head, prayed for him and gave him the gift of the Holy Spirit for a special work, such as healing diseases or speaking foreign languages, so that he could preach in other countries. This custom is now extinct.

32) But it would be desirable to arrange the confirmation in such a way that the young people were interrogated and made to confess the right faith, punished the indolent and careless; but to the disciplined, diligent and godly the priest laid his hands on their heads and prayed for them; this would not be unfruitful.

But the confirmation, which is now used by the papal bishops without interrogation 2c., is an abuse that is reprehensible and should be changed.

34) The present calling of the saints is to be rejected altogether; but it is a very old custom that the holy preachers, as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Isaiah 2c., and after them the apostles, were preachers and physicians at the same time, and God gave his blessing and gift to their art, so that they helped many people wonderfully. For God wanted to give testimony to His preaching, He also wanted to give His servants an art, so that they would have access to many people. Thus Abraham was a physician, and because of this art he was required to preach to noble people; thus he had cause to preach with it.

This art and gift was renewed by the Lord Christ and given to the apostles; it remains in the true church of Christ, and it is right to pray for the sick. There is no doubt that many are helped by such prayer, as I know from many examples. But these are gifts of the true church of Christ, and the papal ointment should not be colored with them, which is an abuse to be punished and to be retracted.

I am very pleased that the ordination of priests is included in the number of sacraments.

But so that by such ordinatio one understands the calling to the ministry of preaching and the administration of the sacraments, and thus the ministry itself. For it is highly necessary and almost useful that the office of preaching in the church be held in high esteem, honorable and holy, and that the people be taught that God wants to give the Holy Spirit through hearing the sermon and reading the Word of God and the Holy Scriptures, so that no one seeks other revelation and enlightenment outside the office of preaching, as the Anabaptists claim.

The ministry of preaching is established by God's high command; God wants the gospel to be preached and heard diligently. He has also given a glorious promise of comfort to those who teach or hear the gospel, for St. Paul says: "The gospel is the power of God to all who believe in it.

38 It is also very necessary to know about the preaching ministry and profession that such a calling is based on God's word and command, and that God considers the pastors and preachers who are Christianly called to be his servants, as if he had called them from heaven with his own voice, wants to be with them, and to be pastor and teacher through them. This is a precious treasure among Christians; they know well that they should be grateful for it without ceasing, and help to promote, honor and preserve the ministry of preaching for the sake of the divine command.

(39) In this way it is useful to include the office of priests and ministers among the sacraments. For it is the highest, most sacred office, the highest, most excellent, most holy service in the whole church; therefore, those are not Christians who do not hold the priest and the chair of the church sacred as God's office and servant.

(40) But the adversaries speak of the sacrament of ordination or consecration in such a way that they do not remember the ministry of preaching with a single word. They want to think that through ordination or consecration the ministers are called to sacrifice in the mass for the living and the dead. They still invent this false doctrine and abomination, as if there would be no forgiveness of sins in the church if there were not, above the sacrifice on the cross, the daily sacrifice of the mass. They continue to teach impudent lies that the priests earn forgiveness of sins from others with such sacrifice.

41 These ugly blasphemous teachings have all flowed from the fact that some hypocrites and monks have had foolish thoughts that the New Testament must be like the Old Testament with its sacrifices and ceremonies. The priesthood and sacrifices in the New Testament, however, are much and often discussed elsewhere. That is enough about the number of sacraments.

From baptism.

42) That baptism is an outward sign and seal of the divine promise in the New Testament is indicated by these words of Christ, Marc. 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Therefore, when we are baptized, this promise is immediately written and painted on our bodies.

And because such outward signs also have their spiritual interpretation, holy baptism signifies repentance and forgiveness of sins through Christ, or, as St. Paul says, the new birth, and Christ, John 3, the new birth through water and the Holy Spirit. For that we are immersed in the water indicates that the old Adam and sin in us must be killed, which happens in the anguish when the conscience is frightened, sin feels God's judgment and wrath 2c. That we are drawn out of the water means that we now, washed and renewed by the water and Holy Spirit, await a new and eternal righteousness and life, which Christ has purchased for us.

44) Now the right custom of baptism is indicated by the two outward signs and the promise: "He who believes and is baptized will be saved"; item the words used in baptism: "I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit", that is, by this outward sign I make a covenant with you and testify that you are reconciled to God and accepted by God, who is God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Father accepts you for the sake of the Son, and promises you the Holy Spirit, through whom He will renew you, make you alive, comfort you and sanctify you. Thus, in the words are high, glorious, holy, comforting promises of God and the summa of the whole Gospel.

45 This is the right custom of holy baptism throughout our lives, so that we may be certain that God is reconciled to us and wants to be reconciled to us and forgive sin through Christ, and that he has made baptism a sign and seal of this covenant. For even if we fall into sin immediately afterward, the divine covenant remains firm for all who turn to it again with right faith, seek comfort there, and amend themselves again. Thus we will understand the fruit and power of baptism more and more, if we diligently consider the words of the comforting divine promise, exercise our faith in them, and thereby strengthen ourselves in all kinds of temptations, in fears of death, against the devil and sin.

046 And as circumcision was a sign for ever, that one should not be circumcised more than once: so he that is baptized once shall not be baptized again. And this for this reason, which is certainly right and constant: The other commandment teaches that one should not take God's name in vain, nor blaspheme the right custom. Now the rebaptizers reject the first baptism, saying that the name of God is useless, falsely and unjustly invoked and called over them; this is blaspheming the name of God. Therefore, rebaptism is a terrible, evil error and blasphemy of God's name. Moreover, the rebaptizers who have now gone astray in the world add much more error to it.

From the Baptism of John and the Apostles

Both of these baptisms were outward signs and testimonies of the New Testament. There is no difference between the baptism of John and that of the apostles, except that John's baptism points to the future Christ. The baptism of the apostles points to Christ, who is now coming and has been revealed. Both baptisms are the same ministry and require faith in the Savior Christ; and through faith both those baptized by John and those baptized by the apostles were sanctified and saved at the same time.

48 But when John says, "I baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that shall come after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire," he is not distinguishing the offices or ceremonies, but the persons of the ministers from the person of Christ, and is signifying that Christ is the Savior and the Lord himself, through whom baptism has divine efficacy and power, and who gives life, righteousness, the Holy Ghost, and eternal blessedness. 2c, and that he, John, is a servant to it, who alone administers the outward sign, the water, and preaches the word. This outward ministry of baptizing and preaching is the same in John and the apostles, and is equally powerful in those who believe the promise of Christ.

But it is true that after the resurrection of Christ there are more and clearer examples of the Holy Spirit being given to the baptized, as the stories of the apostles show in public.

From the young children baptism.

St. John commands and instructs with great seriousness and diligence that spirits should be tested to see if they are from God. And Christ sets this rule in Matthew 7: "By their fruits you shall know them." But it is a certain indication of a

Heretic's false ungodly doctrine. Therefore, we should pay close and diligent attention to the rebaptizers, who reject the baptism of young children, to perceive such signs, so that they can be known.

But in the Anabaptist doctrine one finds all kinds of ugly, horrible errors, lies and blasphemies. Lies and blasphemy. For they teach wrongly not only about baptism, but about many other highly important articles of the whole Christian doctrine; they say that Christians cannot be in regiments, princes or lords, 2c., that they should have nothing of their own, but everything in common, that they should not take oaths, 2c., and thus teach seditiously against the proper regiments.

From this and the like it is clear that they do not know what Christian righteousness or life is; they do not know anything about the knowledge of Christ or faith; they want to think that Christianity is only an outward monasticism. In addition, the new Anabaptists at Münster teach even more ugly and insolently that one married person may leave the other if he does not want to accept the sect 2c. Above this, they are possessed by the devil, chasing away and daring to destroy the proper authorities. They invent and teach unashamedly that before the last day there will be such a kingdom of Christ on earth, in which only the saints will rule and destroy and subdue all the ungodly 2c.

These are vile errors, seditious doctrine, Jewish fables, and the true stains and black marks of the devil, by which such fanatics can be known and tested. Because the Anabaptists publicly teach against the Scriptures, they are to be condemned and to flee.

54 Also, in their articles, when they forbid the baptism of young children, there is much more terrible, abominable devilish doctrine and error against the whole of Holy Scripture. As when they say and teach that there is no original sin. This is once again a mark of the devil, who is a liar and a murderer, that they do not know about the highest, most necessary articles of Christian doctrine and the holy scriptures. They neither know what sin or righteousness is, but think that only the gross and outward vices are sin.

(55) Therefore, if it is certain that the Anabaptists teach from an evil spirit, the devil, their teaching should not move us to depart from this common teaching of the Christian church, that young children should be baptized, and that this baptism is Christian.

But in order that it may be known that infant baptism was also in the first and pure church, I will draw together some testimonies from the ancients.

57 Origen, in the 6th chapter to the Romans, writes: "Therefore the church received this teaching from the apostles, that even young children should be baptized. For they who had been commanded the mysteries of divine things knew well that in all men there was original sin and inherent pestilence, which must be washed away by water and the Spirit." These are the words of Origen, as he confesses and teaches both that young children should be baptized, and that through baptism they receive forgiveness of sins, that is, that they are reconciled to God 2c.

58 Cyprian writes that in the Concilio this doctrine is condemned, since some prescribe that children should not be baptized before the eighth day, since the Concilium concludes that they should be baptized and not expected before the certain time of the eighth day.

59 Augustine on Baptism, against the Donatists, lib. 4, gives a fine clear word about infant baptism (as he says): "This article of infant baptism, which the whole church holds, is not instituted in the Conciliis, and yet is always held in the churches. Therefore, it is rightly believed that this was started by the apostles themselves and is customary"; item further: "What the sacrament of baptism does to the young children, we can truly take from the circumcision, which was commanded by God to the former people".

(60) These and similar sayings clearly show that the whole Christian church has considered the baptism of young children to be Christian and right from the beginning. This should therefore be diligently remembered, for some deceivers want to deceive the unintelligent, as if the old fathers taught against infant baptism, when they are doing them great injustice. All God-fearing people should also take great care to remember that this is an annual practice, and no one should dare to accept a doctrine that has no evidence in the first old Christian church.

(61) We will also give more reasons from the Scriptures for baptizing young children. My first reason is this:

(62) It is certain that the kingdom of God, the gospel, and the promise of grace also pertain to children; for it is certain that outside the church (since there is neither word nor sacrament) there is neither salvation nor forgiveness of sins. Therefore we must also incorporate the children into the church and give them the outward sign, which indicates that the forgiveness of sins and the promise also apply to them. 1)

The first, that the promise and the kingdom of God also pertain to the children, is certain, for Christ Himself says in Marc. 10: "Such is the kingdom of heaven"; item: "It is not the will of My Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish."

(64) These sayings cannot be made pale by the fictitious gloss, as if no promise were made to children, but as if Christ alone admonishes us to become like children in simplicity. The gloss is strange, sought after and nothing, and it is certain that Christ speaks of children and little ones, who are small in age, infants or the like. And Christ says: "Their angels always see the face of my Father who is in heaven." Therefore, He indicates that they please God and are protected by the angels. And even more clearly Christ says, "It is not the will of GOD that any of these little ones should perish."

These sayings clearly give the church the comfort that is to be held dear and cherished by us, so that the children may be saved. And the comforting sayings should be diligently instilled in the youth, so that they keep them throughout their lives and learn to comfort themselves with the divine promise.

66. Infant baptism also confirms the law of circumcision, since God the Lord says, "I will be their God. God indicates that He will be gracious to those whom He calls circumcised, and commands the young children to be circumcised. No one will be able to deny that the young children should not be excluded from the Gospel and from God's kingdom.

Secondly, it is also certain that outside the church, where there is no gospel, no sacrament, no true invocation of God, there is no forgiveness of sins, grace or blessedness, as there is among Turks, Jews, and pagans. For God alone wants to give us such gifts in His Church and through His Word and Sacrament. Therefore he says: "Whoever is not born by water and the Holy Spirit cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." This is a clear speech, which indicates that apart from the Church, since there are no sacraments, indeed, persecution of the sacraments, God does not give beatitude.

68) In Ephesians 5, St. Paul teaches what the church is, namely a people purified by God's word and baptism, from which it is clear that there is no church apart from God's word and baptism.

69 And this is taught even more clearly in St. Peter's Apostle 4: "There is no other name given to men, that they may be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ. 4: "There is no other name given to men, that they should be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ. Therefore

1) So put by us instead of "angehöre" in the Wittenberg, because this word "angeht" is repeated immediately in the following paragraph, but "sie angehöre" is linguistically wrong.

is certain that there is no blessedness apart from the church, that is, in those over whom the name of Christ is not invoked.

70 From all this it follows that infants should and must be baptized, for it is certain that the promise of eternal life belongs to the infants, and yet it does not belong to anyone apart from the church, since there is no salvation. It follows that children must be incorporated into the church through baptism and made members of the church. Whoever diligently considers this reason will find that it is solid and constant.

The other argument is very strong and clear. Over whom the name of Christ is not invoked, and are not marked with any sacrament, they are certainly not God's church; now some children must be a part of the church, therefore it is certain that over them the name of Christ must be invoked, and must be baptized.

(72) How wicked the Anabaptists are, that they want to make a part of the church a people, over whom the name of Christ is not called, when this saying is unchangeable: "There is no other name by which one is saved, but the name of Jesus Christ"; over whom this is not called, he is not a member of the church of God. Now this invocation and blessing takes place in baptism, which is why it is terrible that the devil exercises such courage, and will not let the name of Christ be invoked over the little children and bless them through baptism.

The third argument is that children need forgiveness of sins, because they bring with them the great misery of human weakness and innate disobedience. Now God has commanded the Church to forgive sin and to distribute such forgiveness through the sacraments. From this it follows that one also owes it to the children to communicate forgiveness through baptism,

The fourth argument: To whom the promise belongs, the sign certainly belongs. As, to whom the sold good belongs, to him also belongs the letter about it. Now it is quite certain and public that the promise of eternal life and the merit of Christ's death belong to the children; it follows that the sign also belongs to the children,

The Lord Christ, the Son of God, died not only for the elderly, but also for children. Since this great salvation belongs to the children, and Christ wants it to be distributed through the gospel and the sacraments, it is certain that the sign also belongs to the children.

76. the lying and poisonous devil in the

The Anabaptists pretend that there is no sin in the children, as if the Son of God had not become a sacrifice for the children as well. To prevent such a murderous error, one should not withdraw the sign of Christ's grace from the children.

The fifth: Baptism is clearly commanded to all without distinction: "Whosoever is not born again of water and the Spirit cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. This is a saying that concerns all, as the right, certain, natural understanding of this speech shows. From this it follows that the children should and must be baptized, and is contempt of baptism publicly against this saying, which has now been drawn from St. John.

78. and let the parents diligently consider the causes mentioned to awaken their faith themselves, namely, that they were also accepted by God through baptism, that God promised and pledged to them in their baptism that He, the eternal Father of the Mediator of Christ, would be gracious to you, make you blessed for the sake of His Son JEsu Christ, who also then accepted you, and would give you His Holy Spirit to work in you new righteousness and eternal life.

79. And if the parents thus consider their own baptism, they should also value the baptism of children, thanking God that He thereby accepts the children into His church and grace. And at the command of Christ, when He said: "Let the children come to Me, for such is the Kingdom of Heaven," they should bring their young children before the Lord Christ for baptism, so that they may be incorporated into the Church, and God accept them, give them forgiveness of original sin, and purify them.

And in this faith that God will surely accept the children, the parents should also call upon God over the children, command them to God with right earnest prayer, and then, when they learn to speak, draw and accustom them to God's and the Lord's invocation, and thus to the teaching of the Gospel for and for.

(81) But against this Christian report and consolation, the Anabaptists cry out: first, where there is no faith, baptism is not useful; now the infants who have not yet heard the teaching have no faith, therefore baptism is not useful to them.

82. Answer: The Holy Spirit is given to the children through baptism and in baptism, who works in them according to their measure, as he also worked in Johanne in the body of Elizabeth. And although there is a difference between the old and the young, that the old notice their works, yet the Holy Spirit's works in the old and the young are an inclination towards God.

That God works in the young, and only in those who are brought before Him and incorporated into the Church through baptism, is not a fictitious delusion, but it is certain for this reason: the children in the Church will be saved, as Christ speaks in clear words: "It is not the Father's will that any of these children should perish. Item: "Such is the kingdom of heaven," that is, forgiveness of sins, grace, the working of the Holy Spirit, new righteousness, and eternal life, for all these are to be summed up in this word "kingdom of heaven."

84. and it is quite certain that without divine action no man can attain eternal life, as John 3. says: "Whoever is not born again of water and the Spirit cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. Item Rom. 8: "Those who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God." Item 1 Cor. 15: "The flesh and blood that is corrupt and in death cannot have eternity," but must be regenerated through the Lord Christ, who is life and light, as John says.

And such grace and effect is not in the children of the Gentiles, Jews and Turks, because there is persecution of God and Christ, therefore God's name is not called upon them. Therefore in these words: "Let the children come to me, for such is the kingdom of heaven", there are two parts. Christ speaks before: one should let the children come to him. After that he adds: such, that is, those who are brought to Christ, is the kingdom of heaven; not those who persecute and despise God and his Son Christ, gospel and baptism.

Since it is certain that the children in the church will be saved, it certainly follows that they should be baptized and that God then accepts them and gives them the Holy Spirit, who works in them according to their measure, as also expressed in the Gospel that the Holy Spirit is given when one receives baptism, John 3, Titus 3, where baptism is clearly called "a bath of new birth through the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, baptized children are a large part of true Christianity and truly God's people, church and saints, which the elders should diligently consider to instruct, govern and preserve the children with greater earnestness, lest they be torn away from God, who has previously accepted them in baptism, by the devil's cunning, by their own imprudence, or by evil company.

88 Secondly, the Anabaptists cry out that nothing should be done without orders. Now you will find no

They say that because of the command in the Gospel about infant baptism, infants should not be baptized,

89 Answer: It is true that one should do nothing without a command. But that it is commanded to baptize all those who belong to the kingdom of Christ is quite public John 3: "Whosoever is not born again of water and the Spirit cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. These words are a commandment, since no one is to be excluded, but it concerns all, young and old; as all those of understanding know that such speeches, so negative, are very strong.

90. This is also true: Everything that follows from God's word and command in a right and constant sequence is also called God's word and command. Now I have indicated above that it certainly follows from God's word that one should and must baptize children; for since it is certain that grace and eternal life are also promised to the children, it follows irrefutably that they must be incorporated into the church through baptism. For this blessing, grace and promise, is not apart from the Church of God, is not of the Jewish or Turkish children, or of other peoples who despise or persecute God and His Son Jesus Christ.

Here also the other arguments may be recovered, which I set above. From this it also follows that one should communicate baptism to the children. Because they need forgiveness of sins, the church should give them forgiveness through baptism. 2c. But there is this lie in the Anabaptists, that they think original sin is nothing, which is a great error, as is said elsewhere.

Third, the Anabaptists cry out that baptism is a covenant in which one commits oneself to the death of evil desires and to a strict life and patience in suffering. But this the children do not yet understand and do. Therefore, they say, baptism is not useful for children.

93 Answer. This 1) of the Anabaptists' speech is vain blindness, for baptism is first and foremost a testimony of divine grace towards us and a covenant, through which God promises us His grace; this is to be seen first. Therefore, when the minister says: "I baptize you in the name of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit", it has this meaning: I testify with this work by command of God that God, the eternal Father, forgives your sin for the sake of His Son, Jesus Christ, who also accepts you, and wants to start a new light and righteousness and eternal life in you through His Holy Spirit, who also accepts you. This is what the words

1) Here, like Walch, we have omitted "and".

in baptism, and are not to be understood thus: I baptize you on your austere life, on your patience 2c.

94 I ask that the God-fearing diligently consider all these things, which are indicated for the protection of infant baptism, in order to strengthen themselves against the manifold errors of the Anabaptists. Also I ask God,

the eternal Father of our Savior Jesus Christ, that he may keep the hearts of all God-fearing people, so that they do not fall into Anabaptism or other errors. He also wants to eradicate all the aversions that miserably oppress his poor church, which was redeemed by the blood of our Savior Jesus Christ, and graciously enlighten, teach and govern us, amen.

43 Nicolaus Amsdorf's final speeches against the Anabaptists and Sacramentarians. *)

First half 1535.

Nicolaus Amsdorf to the reader.

My dear friends, I have let these sayings go out in German, for the reason that the enthusiasm from Münster is coming nearer and nearer to us every day; so that we may now be warned and know how to guard against them, I have wanted to do this little teaching to the best of my ability, for the benefit of pious hearts, which would gladly do right and believe if they knew it.

(2) Those of Münster also boast that if they err, they will let themselves be guided by God's word; whether they are serious and mean this from the heart, we will now see; for I have ever clearly shown from God's word, among other things, that the children are capable of the blessing that baptism gives, for which reason one should not nor can deny them baptism.

(3) And though they would not let themselves be wise, yet I believe that there will be some among them who are ignorantly deceived, who will be reformed and converted by it, or at least will preserve ours, so that they will not fall into their infatuation.

For if one wants to ward off the misfortune that is false doctrine, one must do it with God's word; by force of the sword one will accomplish little, for the sword may well compel the mouth and the tongue to speak and confess what the princes and bishops want, but no force can compel the heart, only God's word must move and persuade it to abandon error and believe rightly.

For this reason, God's word in the Gospel is compared to a fish net that sifts people,

The more one resists with the sword, the more it breaks down and spreads further. False doctrine takes hold of the heart in such a way, because the heart clings to it and believes that it is the right doctrine, that man cannot be resisted or forbidden by fire or sword, as we see in the poor people, the Anabaptists and Sacramentarians, Jews and Turks, who all let themselves be strangled and burned for the sake of their doctrine.

Against the Anabaptists in Münster and elsewhere.

Nicolaus von Amsdorf.

1. the baptism of Christ is nothing else than that one dips a person into water, soaks him with water, or washes him with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit by Christ's command.

2 And even if the baptized did not believe, it would still be a true baptism of Christ.

3. for the manner, nature and essence of baptism is based on Christ's word, command and order, not on the faith of the baptized.

(4) If baptism were founded and built on the faith of the baptized, no one would be sure whether he had been baptized correctly (even if it is an age),

5 Because the baptizer cannot be sure whether the baptized person has a true faith or not.

6 Similarly, baptism is not built or based on the faith of the baptizer.

*This writing appeared in 1535 at Magdeburg in quarto. Then it is found in the Wittenberg edition (1551), vol. II, p. 395d; after that we give the text. As it seems from the 14th and the 61st thesis, the Anabaptists were still at work in Münster; therefore, this writing must be placed in the first half of the year 1535.

7 Otherwise no one would know if he was baptized correctly, because he cannot know if his baptizer believed correctly.

8 Therefore, if a man is baptized by a sinner or a sinner's wife, he is truly baptized and shall not be baptized again.

9. it is enough that the Baptist is called to the ministry and service of Christ.

10 This same ministry, and not his faith, gives him authority and power to baptize whoever comes to him.

(11) Likewise, necessity makes every woman who is considered a Christian a baptizer of Christ.

(12) Therefore it is foolish and ungodly that the Anabaptists say that a man must be baptized one more time.

(13) In this way they make baptism completely uncertain, so that neither the baptizer nor the baptized can know whether baptism is right, even if one is baptized four times.

14 Even those at Münster cannot know, and Herrmannus Rottmann 1) himself cannot know, who was baptized correctly.

(15) For (this I know for certain) they cannot know who believes rightly or who does not believe.

(16) They are always uncertain of the matter, and must believe the words of the baptized.

(17) Now let no man be believed nor trusted, as it is written, Cursed be he that believeth a man.

18) Therefore, baptism should not be based on the 2) faith of the baptized.

19 But much less on his confession, lest the Baptist be deceived.

20. but on 3) Christ's word, commandment and order, one should baptize and command the faith of the baptized to God.

"The words of Christ do not lie or deceive us, but make us sure and certain that baptism is right, and that the baptized person is all right.

22 But men lie and deceive and can miss, therefore they only make the Baptist uncertain.

when he places and builds baptism on the word and confession of men.

(23) It follows irrefutably that baptism is right in itself, even without the faith of the baptizer and the baptized.

(24) But faith is necessary for the baptized, so that baptism may work its own work in him by its power.

25 For without faith, baptism cannot come to its work and effect.

26 Although it has its power from God's order and command, not from the faith of the baptized.

27 But it is prevented by the unbelief of the baptized, so that it cannot use its power in it.

(28) The work of baptism is to cleanse the heart from all sins.

(29) It cannot do this because of the faith of the one who is baptized.

(30) But to the aged, pretending to believe, she cannot forgive their sin.

(31) Nevertheless they are truly baptized, and shall not be baptized again, neither can they,

32 Although baptism cannot work in them because of their unbelief.

Otherwise, the old people who did not believe in their baptism would have to be baptized again.

34 As you are now baptized much, not only at Münster and otherwise, without faith.

35 For it is not possible that in such a great multitude all should be rightly believing.

(36) Even in the time of Christ, the smallest number and the least part have always been believers.

37 Therefore, if the Anabaptists at Münster and elsewhere were right, they would have to baptize the majority again for the third and fourth time.

(38) It is not because they can be spiritual and speak much of Christ; the devil can also be spiritual and preach much of Christ, and much better than those at Münster.

(39) From this it follows that no one should be baptized again, but if anyone did not believe correctly in his baptism, he still believes.

(40) Such a one must not be led back to the water, but to the word, to preaching, that he may believe.

41 Thus baptism comes into its own and does its work, namely the forgiveness of sin, even though it has already taken place.

Baptism has its effect from the faith of the baptized, 43. because the baptized person after his baptism

1) "Rottmann", written by Amsdorf instead of: Rothmann. This refers to the preacher at Münster, M. Bernhard Rothmann. Compare the note to the superscription of No. 38 in this volume. - It seems to us that in this thesis instead of: "who is not baptized" should be read: "who is rightly baptized"; therefore we have put this.

2) "Baptized" put by us instead: Baptist.

3) Wittenberger: "from". We have taken the reading "on" from the old edition of Walch, because it seems to us to be the correct one after the 45th thesis.

If a man believes, the baptism that has taken place is useful and blessed for him.

(44) Therefore it is unjust, ungodly, to the great shame and dishonor of Christ and his household, that people should be rebaptized,

(45) Since baptism is founded and built on Christ's word, commandment and order.

46 From this it follows that children should not be baptized again when they grow old.

(47) Though they believed not, yet shall they not be baptized again.

It would be enough that they believed in their time, as is indicated above by the ancients.

(49) Now that we are sure and certain that the children have believed, there is no need to baptize them again.

5V. And even if they do not believe by hearing, like the ancients, they believe in another way, if God is well known.

51 For Christ says, "Such is the kingdom of heaven," which cannot be 1) anyone's but his who believes.

52 By the word that Christ himself speaks, he does not exclude the children, but means the same.

53. if the kingdom of heaven is of those who are like children, how much more is it of the children themselves.

54. as clearly follows in the text, Christ laid hands on them and blessed them, not outwardly in the body, as the priests are consecrated, but inwardly in spirit and conscience.

55. that they may be blessed truly in soul before God, not in hypocrisy before men.

(56) Therefore, since infants are capable of the blessing and benediction that baptism gives, why should they not be baptized?

57 If they are blessed and given by Christ, the kingdom of heaven is theirs.

(58) If the kingdom of heaven is theirs, they must certainly believe, for without faith no one can be a child of the kingdom of heaven.

59 If John believed in his mother's womb, why should the faith of our children be taken away, if Christ has brought them to him?

(60) From this it is certain that there is another way to believe than by hearing, as St. John believed.

(61) Therefore, if the children do not hear the word, it cannot take away their faith, no matter how wicked Rottmann may be.

(62) Therefore mate shall baptize the children, and shall not baptize again those that are baptized in any way.

63) One must not despise the word of Christ, "Let the children come to me," as those at Münster do.

64 It is said: "Let them come to me", not only bodily, since he lived on earth, but spiritually to his sacrament.

This indicates the work of Christ in blessing and benedicting them with the same blessing that baptism gives.

(66) There is no other blessing of Christ but this, that He may cleanse us from sins, and make us children of the kingdom.

67 Therefore, the words and history of Christ conclude powerfully that infants should be baptized.

68 For he says, "Let them come to me," and blesses them, which he also does by his holy baptism.

69. What more abominable thing could be said and devised against God and His mercy than to reject the eaves, done from His word, commandment and command? .

(70) And this for no other cause, but that the baptized man hath not had a right faith.

71. as if God's work and sacrament were built and founded on human faith.

O of the Sacrament, which is built on sand, that is, on man's doing!

The same would be as certain as the reason, which is quite uncertain, that no one would know when we would have Sacrament or not.

Man's unbelief and wickedness does not cancel God's work and sacrament based on His immovably firm Word.

75 Yes, the abuse rather confirms it, because one sins against it.

(76) Just as with unbelievers the gospel remains a true gospel and does not become false or unjust because of their unbelief:

Thus, baptism truly remains a true baptism and does not become false or unjust because of the unbelief of the baptized.

How would God have His order, commandment and commandment be broken or changed for the sake of our wickedness?

Thus, baptism is ever God's order and command, therefore it cannot be prevented by our wickedness.

(80) Although its power and effect are hindered by the unbelief of the baptized, it remains righteous and true in its nature and essence.

1) "niemand's" put by us instead of "nobody" in the Wittenberger.

(81) Therefore, even if no one on earth believed, every order of Christ remains firm and certain in itself.

82 Therefore, whoever has been baptized once should not be baptized again in any way.

Against the Sacramentirans.

1. spirit and letter, as the enthusiasts speak of it, is one thing, but not as St. Paul speaks of it.

2 For as St. Paul writes of them, they are very far from each other.

We call the letter the sense of the holy scripture, so the letter gives.

4. but the spirit is the sense which the Holy Spirit wants to have in his letter.

5 And the meaning given by the letter is the meaning of the Holy Spirit.

6. and what the Holy Spirit wants, the letter brings.

7 And so the letter is truly the spiritual sense.

8 Now this is the meaning of the Holy Spirit, which the Spirit has given us through the Scriptures in the letter,

9 That we may be sure and certain of what the Holy Spirit wants us to base our faith on.

(10) For if the spiritual sense were a different sense than the letter gives, no one could be sure and certain what God wanted in His Scripture.

So no one would know for sure whom or what to believe.

12. each one would want to make a special one for him, and to conceive and seek a spiritual meaning.

13) As Zwinglius and Oecolampadius did with the words "this is my body.

14 So that we may be sure of the Holy Spirit's meaning and mind, we must let the letter remain the spiritual meaning.

(15) But the sense in which the words are interpreted differently than they are is not the spiritual sense,

16. but is the right carnal sense, invented by human reason, which the Holy Spirit never thought of.

Such senses may be conceived and changed in many ways by many minds.

18) But the spiritual sense is a certain unchangeable sense, which cannot be changed.

19. just as the letter, steady and firm, should and must remain immovable.

20. for both are one mind, of the Holy Spirit, which is like one sound in

all people around the world, so hear or read the words, 21. so that we have to fence against the heretics, fight, contend and overcome them again.

But the carnal senses, as *figurae* and *tropi*, do not respect, do not dispute, much less overcome the adversity.

(23) Nor is it a common sense among all men who hear or read the words.

How many are there in the world who could have taken Zwingel's interpretation or Oecolampadius' figure from these words "this is my body" if they had heard or read them ten times?

(25) But the sense of the Holy Spirit, if the letter gives it, can be understood and heard by anyone who hears or reads the words, if he knows the language otherwise.

(26) Therefore the letter should and must be taught and preached, and with it alone lay the foundation of faith.

For this reason, Sebastian Franks is a crude and unlearned fellow, since he writes in his Chronica: Luther teaches the letter and not the spiritual sense in the words "this is my body.

But we say that Luther teaches the right spiritual sense in the words "this is my body".

29 And Zwinglius and Oecolampadius teach the carnal sense in that they write and teach: This is the figure of my body, or: This means my body.

30 For this sense the letter does not give, the Holy Spirit does not will, but has been conceived by human wisdom and carried into Scripture.

31) For this reason, that Christ speaks clearly and brightly in his Scripture, without all figures and tropes, 2) so that everyone who hears the words "this is my body" can understand him.

32. when the Holy Spirit employs, 3) commands or commands something in His Scripture, He does not speak figuratively and tropice;

(33) But clearly and plainly, that even the laity (as the apostles were) may hear.

Even in the Old Testament, which is figura and umbra, he has never spoken in darkness and gloom, in parabolis and figuris, when he has commanded or ordered something.

1) In the Wittenberg: "Bastian Franü. Compare Tischreden, Cap. 37, § 99. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1070.

2) Wittenberger: Tropis.

3) Wittenberger: "employed", which is probably erroneous.

(35) Then, in the New Testament, when Christ instituted a new sacrament and commanded and commanded us to keep it, should he speak figuratively or tropically?

That is why Sebastian Frank did not keep his promises in his chronicle.

37 He promises to write badly the Historia, as it happened, and not to fight anyone. 1)

38) From that time on he falls from Luther to Oecolampadio, as he has taken all the words from Oecolampadio, and says: Luther has caught the letter that makes heretics.

39 From this it follows that he smuggles, Oecolampadius teaches the spiritual sense that makes Christians.

40 O a fine theologian, who reveals his ignorance so clearly.

The letter never makes heretics, but the spiritual sense of the Franks always makes heretics.

Therefore, he would like to go to school with his Zwinglers and learn what is spirit or letter before they write against Luther.

43 But those at Strasbourg are cunning, do not want to confess their doctrine, but may write impudently, they keep it with Luther.

(44) If they lie publicly, as their book, which they ascribed to those at Munster, testifies publicly.

(45) If they are like Luther, why are the preachers in Strasbourg, and also the preachers in Frankfurt am Main, so hostile to Luther?

(46) Why are their people at odds with our people?

(47) Therefore, no matter how good the words of those at Strasbourg may be, they are not to be believed in any way.

48 Much less should they be accepted as brothers or Christians,

49. unless they confess and recant their error.

50. namely, that Oecolampadius and Zwinglius wrote wrongly and falsely about the Sacrament,

1) In the Wittenberg edition: "beföelhen"; in Walch's old edition "befehlen". Since we are not able to give a solution of the word "beföelhen", but Walch's interpretation does not seem to puff us, we have put our conjecture into the text.

51. that they have taught and preached wrongly, in that they preach: This means my body, or: This is the figure of my body.

Item 52: That they confess that they did violence and injustice to Luther, and that Luther wrote well, rightly, and Christianly.

(53) If they do this and ask for mercy, let us consider them dear brothers and Christians.

(54) For it is not fitting to receive sinners without repentance, much less to receive false teachers without repentance (that is, without correction and confession of sin) into the congregation of Christendom.

(55) If they were so badly received, everyone would say that we came to them and accepted their error.

(56) Thus we denied our doctrine and condemned ourselves.

(57) Therefore let them make such confessions that God and His Word may have glory, so that everyone may say that they have come to the truth and have forsaken their error.

58 Since Paul says, "The letter killeth, but the Spirit quickeneth," he does not speak of the spiritual sense, hoc est, de tropis, allegoriis et figuris.

The same spiritual, even carnal, senses kill as well as the letter.

60. but speaks of the Spirit who gives life to the letter and renews man,

61. who pours grace and faith into the heart and purifies it, making man a new creature,

62. who makes the evil tree a good tree, that it may bear good fruit.

The same Spirit makes God's Word, the letter, to be spirit and life through faith.

64 But he that believeth not the letter, though he be of the mind of the Holy Ghost, he helpeth not, but killeth or choketh.

Therefore, spirit and letter are one thing, as the Zwinglians speak of the spirit, but not as St. Paul speaks of it.

66. and the one thing, God's Word, is the letter, so kill if you do not believe in it.

67, And is also the spirit, so alive made who believes it from the heart.

44 Phil. Melanchthon's concern that secular authorities were guilty of resisting the Anabaptists with corporal punishment.)

Anno 1536.

Whether Christian princes are guilty of resisting the Anabaptist unchristian sect with corporal punishment and with the sword?

First of all, it should be noted that this question does not refer to the office of preachers, for preachers and ministers of the gospel do not wield the sword. Therefore they are not to exercise bodily authority, but only to fight against error with right teaching and preaching. But if they take up another office and want to wield the sword, as Münzer did and as happened at Münster, this is unlawful and seditious. But here the question is from the secular authorities, whether they are guilty to defend and punish the Anabaptists against unrighteous teachings and the like with bodily force.

Secondly, before the punishment is inflicted, the deceived people should first receive clear Christian instruction and admonition that they want to renounce their error. If they do so, it is Christian to show them mercy. But if they are stubborn and do not want to renounce it, punishment is necessary.

3) Thirdly, this is public, that the authorities are obliged to resist sedition and the destruction of the civil government, and to punish seditious with the sword, as Paul says: "Whoever does evil against the authorities shall be punished."

4 Now the Anabaptists have two articles. Some of them are especially concerned with the outward physical government, namely, that Christians should not have the office of the sword; item, Christians should have no authority except the ministers of the gospel; item, Christians should not swear; item, Christians should not have property; item, Christians should leave their wives if they do not want to accept rebaptism.

These and similar articles are commonly found among all rebaptizers. Now it is public that these articles are without means a destruction of the outward bodily rule, authority, oath duty, ownership of goods, marital status 2c. For if these articles and doctrines are absolutely in common

should go, what destruction, murder and robbery would follow!

Therefore, the authorities are undoubtedly obligated to punish these articles as seditious. And shall punish the obstinate, whether Anabaptists or others, who hold such articles, one or more, with bodily force, and according to the circumstances also with the sword; for these articles are not only spiritual things, but are without means and in themselves a destruction of the bodily regiments.

7 And it is not to be respected that the Anabaptists, on the other hand, say: We do not want to do anyone. It is protestatio contraria facto, tearing up the regiment, and saying, we will not do anything to anyone; for if their doctrine should prevail, then authority, oath, property 2c. would be abolished.

Since the Holy Scripture clearly teaches that the articles of the Anabaptists are unjust and devilish, and it is clear and public that they are without means of destroying secular regimes, there is no doubt that the authorities are obliged to prevent such false and seditious teachings and, according to the power of their office, to mitigate the punishment or make it more severe, as they see fit.

(9) That it should be said against this, that the authorities cannot give faith to any man, therefore they ought not to punish any man for faith's sake: to this there are many more constant answers; but we will answer this only. The authorities do not punish on account of the opinion in the heart, but on account of outward false speech and teaching, by which others are also deceived. Therefore, as the authorities are obliged to punish other seditious speech and doctrine, by which sedition is really aroused, so they are also obliged to punish this seditious speech and doctrine, as by it people are really moved to cause destruction, as much as is in them, because they want it to be no authority, no oath, no property.

(10) And though with hypocrisy they color and excuse some of these articles, yet this is in the bottom of their opinion; for our mind is

*) This writing is found in the Wittenberg Allsgabe (1551), vol. II, p. 382 b and is marked there with the year 1536. After that we reproduce the text.

Nor should the Anabaptists be driven by subtle questions, but one should look for and notice the right reason in their teaching and speak to the same. In doing so, one should not be deceived even by the devil's hypocrisy. Some can adorn themselves a little, but in the bottom of it they are found to be full of reported errors, and that their seeming holiness is only hypocrisy and a devilish specter. For Paul clearly teaches that those are of the devil who hold such erroneous articles of bodily government and pretend them to be new holiness. Therefore, let not the Christian authorities be frightened by the apparent and hypocritical holiness or patience of such spirits, but look at the erroneous articles that are witnesses in the stiff-necked that it is a devilish sect.

(11) That is enough of the seditious articles, for it is not difficult to understand that in these articles it is the duty of the authorities to use their office, to maintain the regiment.

12 Those at Münster have also held that there must be a physical kingdom before the last day, in which there are all saints, 2c., item, have taken many wives; such errors are seditious and should be fought with seriousness.

13 Secondly, the Anabaptists have articles concerning spiritual matters, such as infant baptism, original sin, enlightenment apart from and against the Word of God. Some, such as those at Münster, have also claimed that Christ did not take His body from Mary's body; item, that there is no forgiveness after mortal sin 2c.

14.¹) Of such spiritual articles, this is also our answer: Just as the secular authorities are obligated to prevent and punish public blasphemies, blasphemies and perjuries, so they are also obligated to prevent and punish public false teaching, unrighteous worship and heresies in their territory and in persons over whom they have jurisdiction. And God gives this in the other commandment, saying: "Whoever dishonors the name of God shall not go unpunished. Everyone is obliged, according to his position and office, to prevent and punish blasphemy. And by virtue of this commandment, princes and authorities have the power and command to put away unrighteous worship and to establish righteous doctrine and righteous worship. This commandment also teaches them to prevent public false teaching and to punish the obstinate,

The text 3 Mos. 24. also serves this purpose: "Whoever blasphemes God shall be put to death."

(15) But the authorities must first be constantly and properly instructed, so that they may be sure and do no one wrong. For it is not right to judge by custom alone, contrary to God's word and contrary to the ancient and pure church's understanding and teaching. Custom is a great tyrant, therefore one must seek cause from God's word and the ancient pure church's understanding. For one should not accept any doctrine that does not bear witness to the old pure church, because it is easy to understand that the old church had to have all the articles of faith, namely everything that is necessary for salvation. Therefore, the Potestat 2) is obliged to let himself be thoroughly instructed from God's word and the teachings of the ancient church.

16 Now find some articles of the Anabaptists, where it is noticeable, for what disruption would follow if the children were not to be baptized? what would finally come of it, but a publicly pagan being?

Item 17: Infant baptism is so well established that Anabaptists have no just cause to overthrow it.

18) To say that children are not entitled to forgiveness of sins, and that original sin is nothing, are public and very harmful errors.

(19) Above this, the Anabaptists separate themselves from the church, even in those places where pure Christian doctrine exists and where abuses and idolatry have ceased, and set up their own ministry, church and assembly, which is also against God's command. For where the doctrine is right and idolatry is not practiced in the churches, all men are guilty before God that they remain in the proper, public ministry and do not establish any segregation. And whoever, in such a case, creates segregation and new ministries, is certainly doing evil to God.

(20) As the Donatists of old also made a rebaptism and a segregation, and had no Ursch, because only these, that there were priests and people in other churches, were not pious; they wanted to make a church that would be completely pure. We have heard this from some rebaptizers; when we asked them: "Why do they make segregation, even from those churches, since they could not punish the doctrine and worship?"

21 In this case, the law is made in Codice by Honorium and Theodosius, which says that Anabaptists are to be put to death; for Tren-

2) i.e. the one who has the power.

1) What Melanchthon said in the foregoing about the behavior of the authorities against rebellious doctrine and life is correct; but in the following he inverts the proper relationship of church and state by giving the latter the right to standardize the faith of the subjects.

The new ministers and the new government, but because of the evil customs of others, is certainly against God; and because it is very annoying and gives rise to eternal discord, the secular authorities should severely defend and punish it.

22 Some argue that secular authorities should not have anything to do with spiritual matters. This is much too broad. It is true: both offices, the preaching office and the secular government, are distinct. Nevertheless, both are to serve God's praise. Princes are not only to protect their subjects' goods and physical life, but the most noble office is to promote God's honor, to ward off blasphemy and idolatry. This is why the kings in the Old Testament, and not only the Jewish kings, but also the pagan converted kings, had those who were false prophets and idolaters killed.

Such examples belong to the office of the rulers, as Paul also teaches: "The law is good to punish blasphemers" 2c. The temporal authorities should not only serve man for his physical well-being, but first and foremost for the glory of God. For it is God's servant, whom it should recognize and praise with its office, Ps. 2: Et nunc reges intelligite.

(24) But that these words of the tares should be used against them, "Let both grow," is not spoken to worldly authorities, but to the preaching ministry, that they should not exercise bodily authority under the appearance of their office. From this it is clear that worldly authorities are obliged to prevent blasphemy, false teaching, heresies and to punish the followers in the body.

25 Where the Anabaptists have articles against the secular government, it is all the easier to judge. For there is no doubt that in the same case the obstinate shall be punished as rebellious. But if someone had articles only on spiritual matters, such as infant baptism, original sin, and unnecessary segregation, since these articles are also important; for it is not a small matter to throw the children out of Christianity and to put them in an uncertain state, even to bring them to damnation, item, to set up two nations among ourselves, baptized and unbaptized, since one sees and grasps that grossly false articles are in the Anabaptist sect: we conclude that in this case the stiff-necked may also be killed. If both worldly and spiritual errors are found in the Anabaptists and they do not desist from them, the judge is all the more certain and should punish them severely.

(26) But the measure shall always be kept, that first the people shall be instructed and admonished to desist from error. The judge should also make a distinction. Some are seduced out of simplicity, and are not defiant; they should not be hurried, nor should they be punished less severely than by reprimand or imprisonment, so that they do no harm. Some are beginners and defiant, so the judge should also show seriousness. And if they have erred in secular rule, nothing else may be done to them, except that they also go pregnant with a Münsterian rule; therefore he shall punish them as rebels.

(27) If we esteem the glory of God, we should also earnestly guard against the spread of blasphemy and harmful error.

(28) And for the instruction and confirmation of the conscience in us, this is to be well remembered: We are to notice at all times some clear articles in which the sect is grossly and markedly mistaken, knowing that the stiff-necked are blinded by the devil, and that it is certain that they have no good spirit, though they have a great appearance. For it is well known that the false prophets have sheep's clothing, that is, some good appearances, but by the fruits they shall be known. Now the most certain test is by these fruits, namely, if one stubbornly defends false articles against God's word clearly and publicly, then the judge can instruct his conscience and strengthen himself; for thus he knows that the sect is of the devil, therefore he knows that the sect must be resisted; although there may be wretched persons among them, who must be pitied; nor does he know that the seed must be resisted.

29 And in sum, intelligent examiners know how to keep this in mind, and they also understand well that under this rebaptism there is much abominable error; for it is basically a Manichaean sect and new monasticism; for outward unrighteousness and barbarism, not having one's own, not having rule: such things are their holiness, and it is to be understood that they are far from Christ and do not have the right understanding of Christ.

(30) Just as a prudent preacher teaches other estates their profession, as he teaches a housemother that bearing children is pleasing to God, (2c) so he should also teach the secular authorities how to serve God's glory and ward off public blasphemy. Anno 1536.

45 Martin Luther's warning to Lorenz Castner and his companions at Freiberg to beware of corner preachers*).

February 11, 1536.

1. grace and peace in Christ. Honorable, wise, dear friends! I must answer your writing briefly this time, because I am overwhelmed with business, and also weak 2c.

2. and is my faithful warning, beware of the high spirit that wants to enter you, and have this as a sign that he comes from himself and casts himself out, when God speaks in the prophet Jeremiah Cap. 23, 21: "I did not send them, and they ran; I commanded them nothing, nor did they preach or teach."

3 Therefore let seals and letters show you who sent him; or give signs from God that he was called by God or man. If not, let him be silent and shun him. For what God calls or sends, He does in a proper way, either by signs or by the testimony of men.

(4) Secondly, notice the devil in this, that he is afraid to go to preaching, even though Christ is preached purely; yet St. Paul rejoices that his gospel was preached even through hatred and envy in the judgment house at Rome, and allows Christians to go to idolatrous houses as guests, and yet they are not partakers of idols, as you may read in 1 Cor. 8 [and] 9. For such partaking is spiritual, and not bodily. Otherwise a Christian would not have to eat or drink with the wicked, nor talk or trade with them.

5. 2 Kings 5:18, 19. The prophet Elisha allows Naaman the prince to worship the right God in the temple of Rimmon of his king. And Jeremiah writes to the captives of Babylon that they were worshiping idols.

Servants should worship God, and not worship idols with the others. And how wise such a spirit is, he shows also herewith that he leads the saying, Christ is not here or there 2c. Is Christ not here and there (at Leisnig); how then is he at Freiberg in his house? Or does not Freiberg 1) also mean here and there, all places where you go or stay? Why then does he want to give the sacrament in his house, since his house must be called here?

And what a hopeful lie is that, if he calls it pilgrimage, when someone receives the sacrament or hears a sermon in Leisnig, or do we not know what pilgrimage means, 2) that the spirit must interpret it to us with new language? It would be good for the authorities to do this and to keep the spirit silent, because he would like to take you to Freiberg to a bath. Take good care of yourselves! By all means, do not let yourselves be persuaded that every householder should give the sacrament in his house. For I may teach at home, but I am not a public preacher, for I would be publicly appointed. St. Paul also speaks of the sacrament in 1 Cor. 11, 20 ff. that we should come together and not make each one his own supper.

7 Therefore it is not spoken: The sacrament is made by the word, therefore I may make it in the house. For it is not God's order and command; but he wills,

1) The words: "in his house - Freiberg" are missing in the editions.

2) "or - hot" is missing in the outputs.

*) This letter is found in the Wittenberg edition, vol. XII, p. 202; in the Jena edition (1568), vol. VI, p. 349; in the Altenburg edition, vol. VI, p. 907; in the Leipzig edition, vol. XXI, p. 87; in the Erlanger, vol. 55, p. 123 and in De Wette, vol. IV, p. 673. Further, in the "Trostschriften" published at Jena by Rödinger's heirs, pp. b ij ff, with good variants given to De Wette, vol. VI, p. 486, note 3, almost all of which we have included. Otherwise, we give the text of the letter according to the Jena edition. The postscript, which is found in a copy in Ooä. ekart. OotU. No. 401, is printed in Burkhardt's "Briefwechsel", p. 245 f., and included by us.

that the sacrament is administered by public ministry. For the sacrament is instituted for public confession, as Christ says, "Do this in remembrance of me," that is, as St. Paul says, "Proclaim and confess the death of Christ."

8 But how can I write everything so abstemiously and so briefly? I advise you to beware of this spirit, for it has often appeared to me, and has always been disgraced with its boasting.

(9) Go ye with the church, and let the priests do what they do. Where they preach the gospel, hear them; ask nothing of their doings, if they speak the word only, as Christ saith, Matt. 23:2, 3: "They sit in Moses' seat. What therefore they say, hear, and do; but after their doings do ye not."

10. what may the evil spirit say, if all that is not God's word, which the papists have, where then did we get the baptism and the whole Bible? or shall we then make a new Bible by this spirit? The Jews have the Bible, and we all got it from the Jews, so I hear if I heard a Jew read the prophets, it would not have to be called the prophets. Why then does St. Paul, Apost. 13, in the Jewish school at Antioch? But I cannot have more time now. Hiemit GOtt commanded, Amen. Friday after Dorothea, 1536.

D. Mari. Luther.

[Postscript.]

Tell also the other good friends, so Magistri Antonii 1) half of Leisnig wrote to me, that I heard such their heart almost gladly, and of my fortune I will gladly do the best, but they also wanted to help advise how it should be done. The good man works very hard and faithfully; but such a great disagreement has arisen between him and the parish priest there that I have no other advice to find but that he be taken from there, in addition to the fact that he also has little pay there. But this should not prevent a time when the priest and he could serve God and the souls in love and unity, so that the trouble would stop. The priest wants to be right and is not easily repudiated. So I also know and know well Magistrum Antonium that such trouble and discord hurts me, and I do not know how to advise him without divorce. Now ask both of you, as I have done, that the parish priest will not allow himself to be challenged and find a good means even in this, as he thinks that agreement can be reached between the two. For it is truly no good, lind evil mouths get cause to speak, which is not good. Hereby commanded by God. On Friday after Dorothea, Anno in 1536.

1) M. Antonius Lauterbach. Cf. Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 1416, Luther's letter to the council of Leisnig.

46 D. Martin Luther's preface from Justus Menius' book "On the Spirit of the Anabaptists". *)

Anno 1544.

It is a proverb: The world wants to be deceived. Such a saying is heard every day, especially in the church regime. So here it is: Even if the truth is not true

so pure and bright is preached, and so mightily proved, that if a cow had sense, she could grasp or grope it: nor are men so darkened as to know it

*The writing of Menius was published in 1544 at Wittenberg by Nickel Schirlentz and is included in its entirety, with Luther's preface, in the Wittenberg edition (1551), vol. II, p. 350b. The preface alone: in the Jena edition (1562), vol. VIII, p. 190; in the Altenburg, vol. VIII, p. 363; in the Leipzig, vol. XXI, p. 450 and in the Erlangen, vol. 63, p. 381. According to the latter, which is the original print, we give the text of the preface, comparing the Wittenberg and the Jena.

not only do not want to hear, but also like to and deliberately rage against it.

2 From this it can and must be noticed that human reason alone does not do this, but the evil spirit helps it and shows in this what great obedience it has in the world, because it rules this high, noble, fine creature so mightily where it wants, as St. Paul says Eph 2, 2: "The prince of this world works in the children of unbelief. Paul says Eph. 2, 2: "The prince of this world hath his work in the children of unbelief," and 2 Cor. 4, 4: "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, that they see not the bright light of the gospel of the glory of Christ."

Now in this booklet He Justi Menii of the Anabaptist heresy is so powerfully refuted, ohue what he and others have written before against it, that (as I said), if a cow had reason, it would have to say, it would be the truth, and could be nothing else. So it is pure German that one cannot say that it is not spoken clearly nor understandably enough, just as they and the sacrament celebrators speak German so shamefully that not only their theology, but also their speech cannot be understood well. For God has ordained it in our time that the devil must not speak good German, as Carlstadt and Zwingel had to speak, so that it was great work for me to understand their speech.

(4) And it is the truth that the Anabaptist and the fanatic spirits are one spirit. For even though they outwardly pretended not to be of one spirit, as Zwingel and his followers pretended to be enemies of the Anabaptists in certain articles, yet in baptism and sacrament there was entirely one spirit in both. For both of them taught the great art, namely, that in baptism badly

Water is bad, and in the sacrament is bad bread and wine.

And summa, as this booklet says, no error nor heresy is alone. Where the devil puts a foot, there he goes after with the whole body. He who allows baptism to be water must allow the sacrament to be bread and wine, and so on. When this original sin has happened, and this apple has been eaten, one must then adorn oneself with such fig leaves: How can water wash souls? How can bread and wine be Christ's body and blood? Do you not see that he is seated in heaven? How can a wicked man be prince or lord? How can a wicked woman be a holy man's wife?

(6) Well, we defend ourselves as much as we can, according to our command and office, and if our defense is not in vain, this also has a certain hope that such lying spirits must perish in the end, and the truth remain, as Isaiah says in chapter 40, v. 8. and Psalm I, 4. 5.: "The wicked do not remain, but are scattered like the chaff of the wind," as the examples of the heretics from the beginning of the church testify, also now the heretic of all heretics Aboml-natio in loco sancto; he also goes there, according to his hour. 2) Without having to have stiff-necked mobs in our time, which practice and plague us, as our forefathers were plagued by heretics in their time, and the prophets were plagued by false prophets in their time. For the world must and will be deceived, and the elect must be tried, tested and purified, all to God's praise and glory forever and ever, amen.

1) Wittenberg and Jena: "nothing". This is the only variant in the whole scripture.

2) This text is consistent in all editions. The sense is undoubtedly: The pope is now also gone, after the time set for him by God has passed. According to it perhaps would like to be read: "gehet" or "goes now".

47 D. Matt. Luther's short confession of the delicate Sacrament Against the Enthusiasts. *)

End of September 1544.

Grace and peace in the Lord.

My dear friend! That Schwenkfeld spreads my letter from time to time, and speaks ill of me along with his eutychners and sacrament abusers, I must therefore believe that you have just received the copy of the same letter and sent it to me. And it is dear to me that he spreads such a letter, to his honor and glory and to my unhappiness and shame. For that is why I did not want to seal it but leave it open, nor did I want to attribute it to him but to his messenger 1) nor to honor his name. For such a damned blasphemer shall not (whether God wills it) be worthy with me, that I should ascribe a letter to him, or speak with him, nor see him, nor hear him. It is just as much to me, if he or his cursed pack of the enthusiasts, Zwinger and the like, praise me or scold me, as if Jews, Turks, Pabst, or equal all devils peeled me or praised me.

For I, who now walk in the pit, will bring this testimony and this glory with me before the judgment seat of my dear Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, that I have condemned and shunned the heretics and enemies of the sacrament, Carlstadt, Zwinger, Oecolampad, Stenkefeld, and their disciples at Zurich and where they are, with all seriousness, according to his command, Titus 3:10. 3, 10: "You shall avoid a heretic, if he is once or twice admonished, and know that such a one is perverse and sins, as he who is evil wants to be condemned."

They are often enough, also seriously enough admonished by me and many others, the books are in the day. And all of us still preach daily against their blasphemous and lying heresy, which they know well.

3) Therefore, it alienates me not a little and makes me think that Schwenkfeld has become so bold and audacious to approach me with writings and books, because he knows, or should know, that he is my unreconciled enemy: first, in this matter of the holy sacrament, which he has made into vain bread and wine in Silesia, deceived so many thousands of souls, for which he has not repented, but, as Solomon says [Prov. 2, 14]: exultat in rebus pessimis, as if he had done well, and yet thinks that Luther must be glad of his letters and books. For from this should probably arise a delusion 3) as if Luther were well at one with Schwenkfeld and the enthusiasts, and had revoked everything, taking and giving letters* and books to each other as good friends 2c.

(4) It is true that I have often been told before that the fanciers should boast that I was one with them, which I did not want to believe because no one wanted to write it publicly. But by this means faith shall come into my hands before I fail. It is true, fifteen years have passed since Zwinger and Oecolampad, and we some too, were in Marburg [1529].

2) "körrn" in the Wittenberg and Jena editions, probably as much as "dreist"; while "körre," which the Erlanger offers here, is as much as kirre, tame. Cf. Erlanger, vol. 22, p. 68.

3) Walch and the Erlangers: "such a delusion".

1) This letter (dated November 8, 1543) is in this volume No. 34.

*This writing appeared in the year 1544 at Wittenberg with Hans Luft; further in the same year without indication of the printing place. Similarly, in 1545, also without indication of place and printer. In the collections: Wittenberger (1551), vol. II, p. 255; Jenaer (1562), vol. VIII, p. 174; Altenburger, vol. VIII, p. 345; Leipziger, vol. XXI, p. 439 and in the Erlanger, vol. 32, p. 396. In the Erlanger edition, this writing is erroneously assigned to the year 1545, although all editions, including Mathesius, Luthers Leben, St. Louiser Ausgabe, p. 265, place it in the year 1544, yes, although the Erlangen edition itself had cited the two above-mentioned individual editions from the year 1544. We have taken the closer time determination from Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 593. We give the text according to the Jena edition, comparing the Wittenberg and Erlangen editions.

We came together and made up in many articles, which are completely Christian, as the printed note testifies; but in the article about the sacrament it got stuck, so that we should otherwise be good friends, so that the sharp writing against each other would rest, whether God would in time, through our prayer, also give unity of mind in this, and I had quite a bit of hope, because Zwingel and his gave up so many good articles, that in time some article would also be found. And so there was a silence between us with writing against each other for several years.

However, the Zwingel was miserably slain in the field by that part of the papists, and Oecolampad, much too weak to bear such an accident, also died of suffering. Which caused me such heartache myself two nights, 2) that I could easily have stayed, because I was hopeful of their recovery, and yet I had to grieve for their souls to the highest degree, because they, still immersed in error, 3) thus perished in sins.

But after Zwingel's death a booklet went out, which he is said to have made hard before his end, with the name: *Christianae fidei expositio, ad Christianum regem etc.* It was supposed to be an exception to all his previous books. And that it had to be his, the Zwingel's, gave the nature of his wild, wild speech, and his previous opinion. I was very frightened by this booklet, not for my sake, but for his. For since he may have written such things according to our agreement at Marburg, it is certain that he acted against us in Marburg with a false heart and mouth, and [I] would have to despair (as I still do) of his salvation, since he died in such a sense, regardless of the fact that his disciples and descendants made him a saint and martyr. Ah, Lord God, the saint and the martyr!

For in this booklet he not only remains an enemy of the holy sacrament, but also becomes a pagan altogether; so finely has he improved, according to my hope. You can notice that, among other words, he addresses the same king thus: You will see there in all kinds of company all holy, pious, wise, manly, honest people, the redeemed and redeemer, Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, Moses, Joshua, Gideon, Samuel, Pinhen, 5) Eliam, Elisäum, also Jesaiam, and the virgin, God's child-bearer, of whom he prophesied, David, Ezechiam, Josiam, the Baptist, Petrum, Paulum, Herculem, Theseum, Socratem, Aristidem, Antigonum, Nurnam, Camillum, Catones, Scipiones, and your ancestors all who died in faith 2c.

This is written in his booklet, which (as said) is supposed to be the most precious and best booklet, made hard before its end. Say now, whoever wants to be a Christian, what may one believe in baptism, sacrament, Christ, the Gospel, or the prophets and holy scriptures, if such godless pagans, Socrates, Aristides, yes, the abominable Numa, who first founded all idolatry in Rome through the revelation of the devil, as St. Augustine de civitate DEI writes, and Scipius, who was the first to be born in Rome. Augustinus de *civitate DEI* writes, and Scipio, the Epicurus, are blessed and holy, with the patriarchs, prophets and apostles in heaven, if they have known nothing of God, Scripture, Evangelio, Christo, baptism, Sacrament, or Christian faith? What else can such a writer, preacher and teacher believe about the Christian faith, but that it is equal to all faiths, and that everyone can be saved in his own faith, even an idolater and epicurean, than Numa and Scipio?

Because in this booklet Zwingel has not only fallen away from the Marburg treaty (yes, the same is not meant seriously), but has become much worse and even a pagan, and yet the enthusiasts, his companions, praise and honor such a booklet (in which there are also many more abominations), I have also abandoned all my hopes of their improvement, and have so completely disregarded them that I have also not wanted to oppose such a booklet.

1) In the editions: "bleib's"; this is the imperfectum, as is clear from 10.

2) "that" is missing in the Wittenberg and Jena, but is found in Walch and in the Erlanger.

3) In the Wittenberg and Jena editions: "verteufft", which we have resolved with "vertieft". Luther derives "baptism" from "deep". Erlanger: "verteift".

4) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: had to.

5) i.e. Phinehas. 4 Mos. 25, 7. 13.

I pray for them even more, because I saw that all my previous writings and exhortations, as well as my Christian love and faithfulness, shown at Marburg, had to be so badly invested and so shamefully lost.

(10) Now, if anyone has heard or talked out of such a contract that I am in league with the enthusiasts and that we are one in this matter, I sincerely ask him for God's sake not to believe it. Then God protect me, as He has done until now, that I should knowingly cover up or 1) strengthen the very smallest article of the enthusiasts with my name. For even at Marburg we did not come to them in a single article, they came to us in all articles, without the Sacrament article (as the note printed indicates), which (as said) remained stuck on hope that it should also finally follow. But how this hope turned out, you have now heard. I would much rather, I say, let myself be torn or burned a hundred times, before I wanted to be of one mind or will with Stenkefeld, Zwingel, Carlstadt, Oecolampad, and whoever else they are, the tiresome enthusiasts, or approve of their teachings.

11) For I still think, it is also still written in their books, how exceedingly shameful they blasphemed us with our dear Lord and Savior, calling him a baked god, a broiled god, a weeping god, a breaded god 2c. They call us flesh-eaters, blood-drinkers, 2) Anthropophagos, Capernaites, Thyestas, 2c., since they knew that they were wilfully and exceedingly blaspheming the Lord and us and telling shameful lies about us; which was a sure sign that there could be no good spirit in them. We still let it all go in Marburg, in the hope that they would and would completely mend their ways. For they knew very well that we had never taught nor believed such things, without which they would have liked to make the illusion for their glory and for our disgrace before the mob, as if we were such mad, senseless, raving people, who had believed in Christ in the name of the Lord.

crament localiter, and eat them as a wolf eats a sheep, and drink blood as a cow drinks water. Well did they know (I say) that in this they called us flesh-eaters and blood-drinkers out of the devil's gear with obviously insolent lies; for the papists also never taught such things, as they also well knew, so that they also wanted to hurt us with the name papists, the holy, spiritual people.

12. For this is how it was taught under the papacy, as we also keep and still teach, as the true old Christian church has kept from 1500 years ago (for the pope neither founded nor found the sacrament, which the zealots must also testify themselves, as almost they want to make it papist), when you receive the bread from the altar, you do not tear an arm from the body of the Lord, or bite off his nose or a finger, but you receive the whole body of the Lord; the other also, if it follow thee, the same whole body, as the third, and a thousand after a thousand for and for. Likewise, when thou drinkest the cup or wine, thou drinkest not one drop of blood from his finger or foot, but drinkest all his blood, so also he that followeth thee unto a thousand times a thousand, as Christ's words plainly are, "Take, eat, this is my body." He does not say, Petre, you eat my finger; Andrea, you eat my nose; John, you eat my ears 2c., but: It is my body, take it and eat it 2c., each one for himself undivided.

No, praise God, we, the holy church under the papacy, are not such coarse dolts, as the evil spirit would have liked to have imagined us through the enthusiasts to adorn their heresy with such desperate lies to the great annoyance and displeasure of the people. For they knew that their mouth was a lying mouth, also because they had undoubtedly often sung and read the masses of the Holy Corpus Christi (as it was called) themselves, in which, among many others, it is clearly written: Sumit uniis, sumunt mille, quantum iste, tantum ille, nec sumptus absumitur. Therefore, they knew well that we were not carnivores, blood drinkers, Thyestes, Capernaites, nor localists, and that our God was not a ge-

1) Wittenberger: "and".

2) Wittenberger: "Blutfrefser".

baking god, weeping god 2c. could be. 1) Nor did we have to hear such their courageous, recognized blasphemy, and, who will not leave it with them, still blasphemers, because they read it in their books.

(14) We still let everything go to Marburg (as I said), so that we would show abundant Christian love. For (help God!) how we had to hear that we had no Christian love, despised the servants of Christ, distressed and confused the churches 2c.! And there were no sinners on earth, because we alone, and no saints in heaven, because the enthusiasts alone, with them was vain fire of love, with us vain ice of unmercifulness; because we were carnivores, they were vain pure, pure, pure, the spirit itself.

(15) But what good has such superfluous love and humility done us? without making everything worse and our good hope miserably lacking; for love is and must be deceived, because it believes and trusts everything, 1 Cor. 13:7. But faith cannot be lacking, for God does not lie as man does, 1 Sam. 15:29. 15, 29. How should and could I now burden my poor conscience with such unrepentant blasphemy of the impenitent blasphemers and blasphemers, as I would have to do if I joined them with books, writings or words, as Stenkefeld seems to me now? St. John says, 2 John v. 10 f.: "If any man come and bring not this doctrine, receive him not at home, and salute him not: and he that saluteth him maketh himself partaker of his evil works." Here you hear who is the man who calls me neither to hear nor to see the heretics, but to shun and condemn them, as I also said above from 2) St. Paul, Titus 3:10: "You shall shun a heretic when he is once or twice admonished" 2c.

16 And if it were per impossibile, and they were right, that all bread and wine were in the Lord's Supper, should they therefore rage and thunder against us, with such abominable blasphemies: baked God, baked God 2c.? Should they not be accused of the holy

1) Wittenberg and Jena: "could". Walch and the Erlangeners: "could".

2) "from" is missing in the Wittenberger.

(which we have not invented): "This is my body", in which he ever clearly calls the offered bread his body? So they would also blaspheme him 3) a cloth-covered, woven-in, sewn-in God, because he walked in skirts and garments, sewn and woven; item, a watery God, because he was baptized in the Jordan; a cloudy God, because he went up to heaven in clouds.

17. I would have known how to call their God, and I would have done so, if I had not spared the name of God, and I would have given them their right name, so that they would not be bad bread eaters and wine drinkers, but soul eaters and soul murderers, and they would have a devilish, devilish, over-devilish, blasphemous heart and lying mouth; and would have told the truth with it, because it cannot be contradicted that they have lied brazenly with such their blasphemies, against their own conscience, and have not yet repented, even boasting in their wickedness.

(18) Well then, no one of the Christians should and can pray for the devotees, nor take care of them. They are given and sin unto death (as St. John says). I speak of the masters; the poor people who are among them, may the dear Lord Christ help them from such murderers of souls. They are (I say) highly and often enough admonished, they do not want mine; so neither do I want theirs; they have nothing from me (they boast), of which I thank God; so I have much less from them, praise be to God. Let always go what does not want to stay, it will find itself, has it not already found itself too much.

19 First, they were warned in the beginning by the Holy Spirit, because they were divided into seven spirits over the text, always one different from the other.

The first, Carlstadt, made the text thus: "This is my body" should mean so much: Here sits my body. And the text should stand thus: And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave to his disciples, saying, Here sitteth my body.

3) Taken by us from the old edition of Walch. In the old editions: "jnen", that is, them.

my body, which is given for you. Oh, this was so certain that not only the Holy Spirit, but the heavenly Father Himself had revealed it to him, of which I have written enough against the heavenly prophets.

The other, Zwingel, said that this was not done correctly, regardless of the fact that the heavenly Father Himself had revealed it. And made the text by his other holy spirit thus: Take, eat, that means my body, which is given for you. Here "is" had to mean "means".

22 The third, Oecolampad, brought forth the third Holy Spirit, who again made the text different, that is, Take, eat, this is the sign of my body.

23) The fourth, Stenkefeld, thought his stench was theses 1) in all the world, brought 2) from the fourth holy spirit this rule: One must put these words "this is my body" out of one's sight; for they hinder the spiritual mind. You must remember this rule if you want to become a theologian; namely, where the bright words of God hinder your understanding, you must seek another that pleases you, and then say that it is the Holy Spirit, and then arrange and interpret the words as seems good to you. So, here you must first grasp the high spiritual understanding that bread is bread, wine is wine, which no pope nor Luther ever understood, nor any baker nor Kretzmaier. 3) And therefore make the text so, putting the hindmost first, namely: Take and eat, my body, which is given for you, is this (hear, a spiritual food). There you have it; now go and say that Stenkefeld does not have the Holy Spirit far above the three holy spirits of Carlstadt, Zwingel, and Oecolampad.

(24) The fifth holy spirit, and some of his covenants and ungodly ones, thus say, Take, eat; that which is given for you is my body.

The sixth Holy Spirit thus says: "Take, eat, this is my body, for a memorial," should be so much: Take, eat, this is my body's memorial (*nominativum*).

1) "Thesem" a fragrance from the thesema apple.

2) Wittenberger: needs".

3) Kretschmar - Krämer, Wirth, Weinschenk.

corpus per genitivum corporis exponendo) given for you 2c.

The seventh holy spirit, John Campanus, makes it thus: "Take, eat, this is my body", corpus, scilicet paneum, should mean so much: The bread, which I give you, is a body or body for itself, not my living, natural body, but a dead, lifeless body, as stone and wood is a body. But because it is my creature, it is also my body, which I have created. This is the most high holy spirit, against and above all others, so that he takes the honor from the baker, who nevertheless also made something in the bread, and God does not create the bread, but the grain for the bread.

(27) Above these, another holy spirit (for the devil is holy and a great spirit) was wandering around, saying: there is no article of faith here, therefore one should not quarrel about it, everyone may believe here what he wants. This holy spirit seems to me to be a young holy spirit, which the old holy spirit, Stenkefeld, has incubated and hatched. For he finely keeps Stenkefeld's rule, and not only puts the text out of sight, but throws it away behind him, with faith and all, like a numb nut, making nothing else out of it.

(28) These holy spirits, though they may disagree about the text, agree together in the high spiritual sense that bread is bread and wine is wine. And he that hath not such a high understanding should be led astray, and believe that bread is not bread, but wood or stone; that would be a dangerous thing.

29) So the Lord's Supper with them is nothing else than a daily common meal, where bread and wine are needed; for in it one can speak of Christ, read, praise, give thanks, and thus eat spiritually, just as in the Lord's Supper of Christ. And Christ is exceedingly a great fool, in that he institutes a separate supper, which the world before is full, full, and daily. It would have been enough if he had said, "When and where you eat bread and drink wine, do it in remembrance of me. Just as St. Paul said of the

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, whatever you do, do it, giving thanks to God the Father through him" [Col. 3:17]. What is this but to keep a spiritual meal in everything we do, that is, to remember the Lord and to strengthen our faith? Thus, in time, the Lord's Supper would become a fine fellowship, as the Corinthians began.

(30) Secondly, they were warned by many, and by me in particular, because I wrote so diligently against them, and greatly misrepresented their reasons and causes, that their consciences felt it. For they had two sayings for themselves, one, Joh. 6, 63. 1): "Flesh is of no use," which Oecolampad called his iron wall. The other, "Christ has gone to heaven", Eph. 4, 10, therefore his body and blood cannot be in the Lord's Supper. And more of the sayings that speak of Christ's ascension taught us very vehemently that Christ had gone to heaven, just as if we had never heard such a thing 1500 years ago. But that therefore all bread and wine were in the Lord's Supper, they would never bite nor touch the little nut, as my books, where they exist, testify against them.

I took the first saying, "Meat is not useful," from them so powerfully that even Zwingel no longer remembers it in his last booklet.

(32) The other also I took away from them, namely, that it was impossible that they should be moved in earnest to deny the body and blood of the Lord in the Lord's Supper for the sake of the saying, "He is gone up to heaven," as they always insisted in many books and with proud words; but they must surely lie in this. I proved this for this reason: Christ instituted the Lord's Supper and gave his body and blood to his disciples, as the words are written, "Eat, this is my body," before he ascended into heaven. For there he sitteth over tables on earth, and keepeth the first supper. Therefore it cannot be true that they boast, namely, that they were moved by the sayings of the Ascension.

1) The Erlangen edition has again reprinted Walch's wrong Bible quote here: "Joh. 6, 65."

For it is contrary to this that Christ holds the Lord's Supper before he ascends to heaven. If then his ascension hinders the first supper, how can it be true, and not a lie, since they say that the ascension moved and hindered them? since we now keep 1500 years no other supper, than that which the Lord instituted and commanded at the first, as he says: "This do in remembrance of me. They do not know or understand what "go to heaven" means, so how could they have been moved to do so?

They could do nothing more against this, and sought ways to mend their wicked ways, and to compare themselves with us. Then the *colloquium* was held in Marburg, in which they rectified the matter and admitted that it was not just bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, as they had so far most vehemently disputed, but that the body and blood of Christ 2) were also in it, but not bodily, but spiritual. Such would not hold the sting either; for spiritual partaking is of the saints and righteous alone. But St. Paul says that the unworthy receive the body and blood of Christ as well as the worthy, 1 Cor. 11:27, 29.

(34) And the disciples had a long discourse with me on local inclusion, that the body of Christ could not be in the bread as in the room or vessel, just as if we taught that Christ's body was in the bread as straw in a sack, or wine in a barrel. Accordingly, some of them excused themselves, saying that they had not understood it otherwise, that we and the papists taught that Christ's body was in the sacrament localiter than straw in sackcloth. Oh, that was a lazy, cold, lame excuse. For they knew very well that neither the papists nor we had taught so. And even if they (unbelievably to speak) had not understood otherwise, they would have to confess that they, as the nonsensical ones, dispute such things which they themselves had never heard nor understood. For the teaching of the papists was much more at that time, than now, in the day, yes, there was no other teaching in the day, that the fanciers must have had the same science.

2) "Christi" is missing in the Erlanger.

(35) Now the papists, yes, not the papists, but the holy Christian church, and we with them (for the pope, as I said, has not instituted the sacrament), teach that Christ's body is not localiter (like straw in a sack) in the sacrament, but definitive, that is, it is certainly there, not like straw in a sack, but still bodily and truly there; as I have strongly proved in my little book. This, I say, they knew well, or were ever guilty of knowing, since they wanted to rage so horribly against that which they did not know.

So we left Marburg with such hope (as said), because they yielded to all Christian articles, and in this article of the holy sacrament also departed from the previous error (that it would be bad bread), that they would come to us fully and completely with time. Because now, through the devil's business, such a thing has failed, and I have been deceived, as I found out from the booklet, after Zwingel's death, that he became worse after the colloquio than before, and certainly acted wrongly with me at Marburg: I am forced not to accept the fellowship of any of the enthusiasts, called Stenkefeld, Zwingel, Oecolampad, Carlstadt, or whoever they are, the enthusiasts, bread-eaters and wine-bibbers, that is, Christ's blasphemers and enemies, but must neither know nor see nor hear their letters, books, greetings, blessings, writing, names or memory in my heart.

37 For because I am sure, and their own conscience must be against them, that they are unrighteous and blaspheme God, I will and can gladly say before my dear Lord Jesus Christ at the last day, Lord Jesus, I have faithfully warned and admonished them, and their own conscience has convinced them, and they must confess this before you, you know, dear Lord.

38 For the third time they were admonished by the terrible judgment of God, when the devil was so miserably slain, as the histories and their letters testify, and with him about five hundred 2) men, very fine people. Although they immediately wanted to interpret such a wrathful judgment as a sign of grace, and the Zwingel

as a saint, who (as all saints must suffer much) was also innocently slain. What does it help if God sends even more plagues upon them than he did upon Pharaoh, because they are of such a mind that they want to make vain holy suffering out of it? as the Jews now also interpret their suffering and misfortune for 1500 years and harden themselves with it, so that they are admonished so horribly. But I, as certain as I am that Zwingel (as his last booklet testifies) died in great and many sins and blasphemies, cannot believe their interpretation.

39 Although I wish and wish that God would have used with him the saying of St. Paul 1 Cor. 5, 5: "Delivered to the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus"; and 1 Cor. 11, 32: "When we are punished, we are chastened of the Lord, that we be not condemned with the world. Oh, how I would have liked him to follow these sayings, for I was, and still am, exceedingly sorry for his misfortune. If suffering is to be called holy and make holy, there must first be innocence and a good divine cause, as St. Augustine also says: *Non poena, sed causa facit martyrem*. Now you know well that Zwingel, beyond the blasphemy against the sacrament, also had a worldly evil cause, since he acted sacrilegiously against that part of the 3) street. That it is more likely that he was judged according to this sentence: *Qui acceperit gladium, gladio peribit* [Matth. 26, 52]. Yes, so we must think and hold, they may interpret, say, decorate, what they want; the histories and their writing are against themselves.

40 They also comfort themselves (I hear them say) by writing many books and doing great work in the church and on the Scriptures. What does it help, because they counterfeit and pervert God's Word and Sacrament, and do not want to hear? He who does not hear God does not hear him again, but his prayer is an abomination, Proverbs 28:9. The Jews also work very hard on the Scriptures, now probably 1500 years. Yes, which

1) Wittenberger: by.

2) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: five thousand.

3) The five Catholic cantons were deprived of their supply by occupying the roads, which caused them to wage war against the Zurichers.

4) Erlanger: Theils.

Heretics have not worked much more with teaching and writing, than the Christians? The devil's martyrs (as they say) will deserve hell much more sourly than heaven to the right saints.

41. Because so many and great warnings and admonitions of God are badly lost on them; for my writing, which went out 17 years ago 1) I can also boast with a good conscience and strong faith [as a] divine admonition, besides the other two admonitions; I am also not too low, that they should be admonished by me, if they boast highly; for I am also a servant of Christ, as well, if not more, than they, and have also worked in his church, before them, will not boast too highly: I must let them go and shun them as the *autokatakritos* [*αὐτοκατακρίτους*, Tit. 3, 11.] who knowingly and willfully want to be damned, and have no fellowship of any kind with any of them, neither with letters, writings, words, nor works, as the LORD gives Matt. 18, 17. For I count them all in one cake, as they also are, who will not believe that the bread of the Lord in the Lord's Supper is his true natural body, which the ungodly, or Judas, receives orally, as well as St. Peter and all the saints. Whoever does not want to believe this (I say), let me be satisfied with letters, writings or words, and hope for no fellowship with me; nothing else will come of it.

Herewith you have, my good friend, my reason why I did not want to hear the blasphemer, Schwenkfeld, nor answer him; you may, if it is revealed to you otherwise, report this to those whom perhaps Stenkefeld is chewing the fat against me. I (as I said) like it that such blasphemers disgrace me, and that they are very angry with me; there is no one here who gives in to their anger. May they reproach the father of the house Beelzebub, what should they not reproach his servants? that is, may they reproach our dear Lord Jesus Christ, and may they reproach his servants?

1) In the first edition it says "15 years". What is meant is the writing No. 20 in this volume, which went out in 1527.

To give the lie to his words "Take, eat, this is my body" 2c. and to interpret and turn his blessed, consoling sacrament into a peasant's lark: what should the most arrogant spirits not do to poor Luther?

Summa, they are invented by me and overcome manifold as the blasphemers and liars. First, since they taught in the beginning that there was nothing but bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, they called us carnivores, blood drinkers, Thyestas, Capervaites; our Lord the baked God, the baked God, the weeping God 2c., as the books of the day testify forever. What Christian heart can or will believe that the Holy Spirit, and not rather the wretched devil, is in them again and forever? because they interpret the bright words of the Lord, "Take, eat, this is my body," out of their own thirst and iniquity, to their dream that he is there spiritually and not bodily. For we know very well that although the Lord Christ dwells in our hearts through faith (as St. Paul teaches Eph. 3:17), which is called a spiritual dwelling place, he has not taken a spiritual body or blood, nor given it for us, as he says Luc. 24:39: "Take hold and see, a spirit has no flesh and legs, as you see that I have," and yet he dwells spiritually in our hearts.

44 Secondly, the sayings which they have spoken, such as those concerning the ascension into heaven and the useless flesh, I have clearly proved that they have interpreted them falsely and used them in a lying mind, and thus have been caught in many gross lies, and in such public blasphemies and lies they remain unrepentant, obdurate, and stiff-necked to this day. So I would have to condemn myself to the abyss of hell, together with them, where I should hold it with them, or have fellowship with them, or keep quiet about it, if I noticed or heard that they presumed or boasted of my fellowship; this the devil and his mother do or keep quiet about, I do not.

I will stand with the holy father Abraham and all Christians on the saying Rom. 4, 21: "What God speaks, that He is able to do", item Psalm 51, 6: "That you may

I do not want to first ask my reason how it rhymes or is possible that I may receive his body and blood verbally, and then, as a judge of God, interpret his words according to my conceit. No, I will not rave like that; he has said it, so I will leave it at that; if he deceives me, then I am blessedly deceived. He has never lied, nor can he lie. But the enthusiasts are public liars invented by me and by themselves; they must also continue to lie, because they trust their conceit more than the word of God.

46 And whoever does not want to do this, and does not stand on the or similar sayings: "What God speaks, that He can do"; item: "God cannot lie" 2c., to him I faithfully advise that he leave the holy Scriptures and the articles of the Christian faith alone; for with his interpretation he demonizes himself the longer the more, and it is better for him to remain a damned heathen than to become a damned Christian.

O dear man! who will not believe 2) the article in the Lord's Supper, how will he ever believe the article of the humanity and divinity of Christ in One Person? And if it offends you that you receive the body of Christ orally when you eat the bread from the altar; item, the blood of Christ orally when you drink the wine in the Lord's Supper: then it must certainly offend you much more (especially when the hour comes), how the infinite and incomprehensible Godhead, which is and must be essential everywhere, is bodily resolved and comprehended in the humanity and in the virgin's body, as St. Paul says Col, 1, [2]. Paul says Col, 1, 19. [2, 9.]: "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily."

(48) And how is it possible that you should believe that the Son alone became man, and not the Father, nor the Holy Spirit, when the three Persons are none other than the one God, in the very essence and nature of the one Godhead? How can it rhyme? How is it possible that the unified whole perfect Godhead of the Son can be

1) i.e. sunk; cf. K 5 of this paper. Erlanger: verteifet.

2) Wittenberger: does not want.

So should we separate or divide it, so that it is at the same time united with mankind, and the same one Godhead of the Father and the Holy Spirit is not united in mankind? And is at the same time one Godhead in Christ with mankind One Person, and not the Father or the Holy Spirit. Oh, how they shall rave, stagger and rumble when they come here! There they shall find to interpret; as I then hear that they go on confidently and piously with eutychei and nestorei. For I thought so, I also said that they must come here; the devil cannot celebrate where he founds a heresy, there he must find more, and no error remains alone. If the ring is broken in one place, it is no longer a ring, no longer holds, and always breaks away 2c.

(49) And if they boast much that they believe this article about Christ's person, and talk much about it, you must not believe it, they certainly lie about everything they say about it; they say it with their mouth (as the devils in the Gospel also call the Lord the Son of God [Marc. 5, 7]), but the heart is far from it, Matth. 15, 8, that is certain. Just as the Jews swore by the living God, but swore falsely, says the prophet. The Turk also praises the name of God, but in death they find out who their God is. For it is certain that whoever does not believe an article rightly, or does not want to (after he has been admonished and taught), certainly does not believe one with earnestness and right faith. And whoever is so bold that he may deny or punish God with a lie in one word, and does this wantonly against and above that which he has been admonished or instructed once or twice, may also (certainly does) deny and punish God with a lie in all his words.

(50) Therefore it is called round and pure, whole and all things believed, or nothing believed. The Holy Spirit cannot be separated, nor divided, so that he should teach or make believe one part true and the other false. Wherever there are weak people who are willing to be taught and not 3) stubbornly contradict. Otherwise, where that should apply, that

3) In the editions: "to be taught".

If every one of them were to deny one article because he considered all the others to be right (although this is impossible in principle), then no heretic would ever be condemned, nor would any heretic be able to be on earth. For all heretics are of this kind, that they first begin with one article alone, then they must all be denied afterwards, and all together, just as the ring, if it gets a bristle or a scratch, it is no longer good at all, and if the bell bursts in one place, it also no longer rings anything and is completely ineffective.

51 Let the examples teach you this. Arius took this one article, that Christ was not God, but a creature; the other articles all, and especially that God the Father was one God, Creator of heaven and earth, that Christ died for our sins, that baptism, sacrament, key, resurrection of the dead and eternal life, he believed more devoutly (as his words read) than the true Christians believe: nor does the holy scripture stand, and testify that he believed no article. For thus saith St. John 1 John 2:23 [4:15], "He that denieth the Son hath not the Father; and he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also." 2c. If Arius does not have the Son and the Father, then he does not have God, nor the Creator of heaven and earth, that is, it does not help him that he calls God the Father Creator of heaven and earth with his mouth and praises Him highly, although no other God is Creator of heaven and earth than the one whom Arius calls with his lying mouth; nor is he a God to him, to Arius, because he denies his only Son Christ and blasphemes that he is not God.

So baptism is no longer baptism, forgiveness of sins is no longer forgiveness of sins, sacrament is no longer sacrament, that is, it is no longer of use to him, even though he was previously baptized correctly, received correct forgiveness, and correct sacrament. So he has lost all articles of faith, because he denies the right God of faith, Christ, and no article is of any use to him, and he can also deny no article with right forgiveness.

He must not believe in it seriously, but must use it all for his condemnation, as the other commandment says: "You shall not take the name of your God in vain" [Ex. 20:7]. There you hear that even the right holy name of God does not help, 1) but harms those who do not believe rightly, but misuse it. Therefore the old fathers also disputed whether Arian baptism was also true baptism. So one misfortune always comes from another.

Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, the heretic, also believed all the articles, without the one that the Holy Spirit was true God. What did it matter to him and his people, he believed none of them. And even if he pronounced and named them correctly with his mouth, he still has no God, because he does not consider the Holy Spirit to be a God; therefore he also has no Creator of heaven and earth. His baptism is nothing, no forgiveness of sins, no sacrament, no eternal life. And even if he lives strictly and leads an apparently Christian life, nor is he a true Christian, but a great hypocrite, it would be much better for him not to be a Christian, nor to misuse the Christian name in such a way, and to lead it falsely, that is, to lead and honor it so damned.

So Nestorius also, bishop of Constantinople, was with his own a strict man in all the other articles, but in the one he was a heretic, that the Son of God, Christ, was not born of Mary of virgins, and Mary was not, and could not be, the mother of God. With this, the other articles were also nullified for him, without what he could call them with his mouth and abuse them. Therefore, from these three heretics, many more heresies finally broke out and appeared in the day (because they were hidden inside before), until the troublesome Mahomet came out; because all histories testify that Mahomet came from the Arians, Macedonians and Nestorites, in whom he was also in time and from the beginning.

55 And whence has the pope become so full of heresy, and has always been a heresy after heresy?

1) So the old edition of Walch and the Erlanger, "helps" is missing in the Wittenberger and the Jenaer, but the latter has the Randglosse: "perhaps: nützet".

until now in Rome, especially in the Pope's court, they are vain epicureans and mockers of the Christian faith? namely, because they have fallen from the faith of Christ to works, that is, to their own righteousness. Of what use is it to him that all the other articles remain? What does it help him that he praises with his mouth the right God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and puts on a good show of a Christian life? Nevertheless, he is and remains the greatest enemy of Christ and the real antichrist, has made himself the head of Christianity, yes, the underhole and backhole of the devil, through which so many abominations of masses, monasticism, fornication are thrown into the world, until so long even the monks helped the dying Christians to heaven with their lousy caps.

(56) So it will not help the fanciers that they make a big fuss about the spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, and about the love and unity of the Christians. For these are vain fig leaves, since Adam and Eve wanted to cover and adorn themselves with them, so that God should not notice their shame and sin. Much less will they help their great work with teaching and writing, with serious chaste behavior; that is still all a pagan thing. This also is lost, that they believe God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and Christ the Savior. All, I say, is lost with all articles, however rightly and blamelessly they call or give them with the false blasphemy, because they deny this one article and punish it with lies, since in the Sacrament Christ says: "Take (the bread) and eat, this is my body, which is given for you" 2c.

For all their talk about spiritual food and love is intended to cover up and adorn such harm and poison that it should not be respected or seen, but should be regarded as the best and most special Christians. That means in German, to put a devil's specter before the eyes, and to adorn the dark devil (as St. Paul teaches [2 Cor. 11, 14.]) with the bright garment of the light angels. Therefore, their great boast and much work, because

they do not want to be Christians in this some article, lost.

(58) This is what the Lord says in Luc. 11:35: "See to it that the light in you is not darkness. If therefore thy body be all light, and have no part of darkness, it shall be all light. There you see that the Lord wants everything to be light in us, and not a piece of darkness under it. As also Matt. 6:23: "If the light that is in thee be dark, how great shall be the darkness itself?" and Paul Gal. 5:3: "I testify unto every man, that whosoever shall be circumcised (which was one piece) is fallen from Christ and from grace, and is guilty of keeping the whole law." Hence the saying Jac. 2, 10. f.: "He that keepeth the whole law, and sinneth in one piece, is guilty in all pieces: for he that commanded, Thou shalt not commit adultery, commanded also, Thou shalt not kill" 2c. There is One God who has commanded all things; he who is angry with Him in one, with you again are angry all creatures and all commandments of God, even his own good works which he thinks he has done according to the other commandments; for they are not done in the right obedience of God, nor in the faith of Christ 2c.

(59) Would you like to say: Oh, dear Luther, it is to be hoped, or ever not to be feared, that God should be so fiercely and cruelly strict that He would condemn men for the sake of one article, when they otherwise faithfully keep and believe all other articles. For not only the heretics, but also other sinners, as Sirach writes [Cap. 7, 9], comfort themselves as if God would look upon their other good works and be gracious; just as King Saul wanted to adorn his disobedience with his devotion and sacrifice, 1 Sam. 15, 15. So go there safely and surely, as if there were no need for them: the many great works and labor, which they otherwise do, will outweigh a few things. On the other hand, it must be said that God can neither hope nor provide for His poor, miserable, blind creature to be so foolish and proud against its Creator and Lord that it would deny, punish with lies and blaspheme His divine word; rather, it is to be hoped that its humble, submissive, obedient, and faithful creature will be able to do the same.

The creature will not deny and blaspheme a single word, but will warmly accept all and every one in particular, and will give thanks with all joy that it is worthy to hear a single word from its dear God; indeed, this is how God is to be remembered.

60 Now the heretics do nothing else with the word of God, except as if it were the word of men, or the word of a fool, which they despise, mock and blaspheme, and could make everything better according to their own beautiful conceit. They will not let themselves be instructed to do so; then all is lost. And here the great many good works and labors will not outweigh the few evil things. For there is neither much nor little, neither small nor great good works, but vain, evil, damned works; for unbelief or blasphemy makes even the good (as they call it) works vain and damned. Yes, such good works are worse than the bad sins, because they go and happen in blasphemy and stubborn denial of God's name and word, so that it would be much better and desirable if they did sin and evil works for it, so that they would know what they were doing.

(61) Now it is according to the saying of Solomon, Ecclesiastes 5:1: "Keep thy foot when thou goest unto the house of God, and come near to hear: for this is better than the sacrifice of fools, which know not how evil are their works. Sacrifice is a good work; it is still called evil when the fools who do not want to hear (that is, the godless or heretics) do it. But they will be judged much more harshly and cut by the saying Ps. 50:16: "God says to the wicked, 'Why do you take my word into your mouth? That is enough of that, let him who will not hear go away.

In the end, I must also add this. I hear it said that some are moved to think that we are at one with the enthusiasts, that we have dropped the elevation in our churches and left it standing, so that we should confess that Christ's body and blood are not in the sacrament, nor are they received orally. But this is the way it is: it happened twenty or twenty-two years ago, when I began to condemn the Mass, and wrote harshly against the papists that they were

would not be a sacrifice nor our work, but a gift or testament of God, which we could not offer to God, but should and must receive from God, just as baptism would not be a sacrifice, but a gracious gift of God, 2c. I was at the same time well inclined to abolish elevation for the sake of the papists, who held it to be a sacrifice and work offered by us to God, as they still do, and have done for over six hundred years so far.

But because at that time our doctrine was new and beyond measure annoying in the whole world, I had to go clearly, and for the sake of the weak I had to let up a lot, which I did not do afterwards; so I left the elevation, because it could have a good interpretation, as I wrote in the booklet *De captivitate ba-byconica* 1), namely, that it was an old custom, taken from Moses, and remained with the first Christians for and for. For what Moses writes of the *Tnuphah* and *Trumah*, especially 2 Mos. 35. and 25., 2) can now be read by any layman in the German Biblia, that they were not sacrifices to propitiate God for sin, as the papists held their sacrifices and sold them most shamefully 2c., but vain thank offerings or thanksgiving for the received goods of the land 2c.

This would also be a fine interpretation, that the priest with the abolition of the sacrament did nothing else, but that he transfigured the words "this is my body", as if he wanted to say with the deed: Behold, dear Christians, this is the body that was given for you. So that the lifting up was not a sign of the sacrifice (as the papists would have it) against God, but an admonition against men to provoke them to faith, especially because he lifted it up just after the words "this is my body, given for you," and yet did not report a single letter of the sacrifice. You will find this in the book *De captivitate Babylonica*.

In thinking and remaining like this, Hans Unver-rumbles and rumbles against me.

1) Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XIX, 4ff. The passage Luther is referring to here is found in Col. 50.

2) In the original edition, the Wittenberg and the Jena erroneously: "Deuteron. 16."

Carlstadt, with his heavenly prophets, and sends out a booklet against us, in which he calls us Wittenberg Christ murderers, Christ crucifiers, new papists 2c. and makes it very crude and insensitive. 1) He had no other reason than that we had abolished the sacrament. He interprets such abolition as sacrificed. He further interprets sacrificed as much as Christ was crucified, murdered, slaughtered, and acted much worse than the Jews had ever done. Now he knew very well that we Wittenbergers did not consider the sacrament a sacrifice, but had argued against the papists for almost three years that it could not be a sacrifice, nor could it be called one, but a gracious gift and testament of God (as said above), and we did not have to thank him for the teaching that the sacrament was not a sacrifice, because we had not learned it from him so long before, but he had to thank us, from whom he had learned it; otherwise it might never have fallen into his head.

When I saw such a mad spirit raging against us without cause, that he wanted to make us sin, and such an abominable sin, since there was no sin, nor could there be any sin, I closed and kept the elevation, contrary to the same devil and to annoyance, which I was nevertheless inclined to drop against the papists. For I did not want to suffer it, nor did I want the devil to teach me anything to order or set in our church. Especially not that I should have such an awful conscience, as if I had murdered, crucified, desecrated Christ 2c., where I held the elevation and did not abstain, as the mad spirit pretended, and for the sake of such an evil conscience would have to and would be forced to abstain from the elevation. No, no, I was innocent of such a conscience, I knew that for sure, and if I could not accept it, he knew it well. For before I would accept such a conscience or burden myself with it, that I would have to drop the elevation because of it, that I would consider myself a murderer of Christ, an executioner, I would not only keep the elevation this very day, but, if it was necessary

One would not be enough, three, seven, ten elevation would help. That is why I want it to be free (as it is and must be a free thing), so that no sin could occur if it were held or dropped.

For this reason elevation has remained with us. For what is free, that is, neither commanded nor forbidden, in which one can neither sin nor earn, that shall be in our power, as subject to our reason, that we may use it or not, keep it and let it go, without all sin and driving of the conscience, according to our liking or need; In short, we want to be free masters in this, and not servants, who may do with it as, what, where and when they want, and not be forced to abjure such grave, great, terrible sin, as Carlstadt's spirit wanted, nor to abjure it at the loss of the soul's blessedness, as the devil of the pope wants; but it should be said: If you do not want to pick it up, leave it; if you do not want to leave it, pick it up. What does God ask about it? What does my conscience ask about it? Just as little as the altar asks about it, whether you want to lift it up or lay it down is equally important to it.

68 Accordingly, the enemies of the sacrament have no reason to boast that we are doing it for their sake and service by dropping the elevation. And let no one think that we thereby incline to their blasphemous error, much less commit it; but let us steadfastly and firmly hold them for God's and our damned enemies, and not deny, profane, and pervert Christ's word along with them, as if we had to learn from them to eat bread and drink wine, which we can well do without Christ's Supper, and the whole world does too much daily without God.

69 But this is the only reason that we leave the abolition in place: because almost all of the churches have long since abandoned the abolition, we wanted to compare ourselves to them and not practice something special in such a piece, which in itself could stand or lie freely and without danger to the conscience. Especially because I was inclined to do so from the beginning and certainly would have done so at the time when Carlstadt did not have such greu-

1) i.e. inedible.

The church would have made a sin out of it, as has been said. For, where it can otherwise be done without sin and danger or without annoyance, it is quite fine that the churches compare themselves, even in outward things, which are nevertheless free, as they compare themselves in spirit, faith, word, sacrament, 2c. For such is fine and pleases everyone.

70 Also because such inequality, being unnecessary, looks very much like a schism, disunity or division of hearts. For from the beginning of the Church, the ceremonies have caused much unhappiness in the Church; as, the Easter feast caused such an essence that few churches were of one mind with each other about it. And the bishop of Rome, Victor, put under ban all the churches in Greece and in the east, because they did not keep Easter on the same day with the Roman church. But he was punished by the bishop of Lyons, Irenaeus, so that he had to desist and let every church have its own way and day for Easter, because it could not be compared without danger and annoyance, and there was no question whether Rome kept Easter on a different day, and the Greeks also on a different day.

71 Such a thing is much more, in which the Greeks did not compare themselves with the Romans, nor do they compare themselves yet. And what does the bishopric of Milan still do today, which lies under the pope in the French lands? Since not only the elevation, or a part of the mass, is unequal to the other churches, but the whole mass, especially that it does not have the small canonem, and all things have their own way in the mass, so that in 1510, when I passed through there, I could not say mass in any place, 1) and the priests told us: OS SUMUS Ambrosiani, non poteritis hic celebrare. And what may it be much words? There is no church on earth with so many inequalities and ways in worship and in the church as in the Roman church. This shows

not only the experience, but also the books in the spiritual law, which would be much less, where more equality would have remained in the Roman church. But it was of use to the pope that much or everything was unequal, if they became equal only in that they considered him the head of the whole Christendom.

72 Hence the saying went among them: Si fueris Romae, romano vivito more, if thou art at Rome, keep thyself Roman. So I may also say here: If you come to a place where elevation is still held, you should not be angry, nor condemn it, but let it be, because it is done without sin and danger to the conscience; perhaps they cannot yet change it. But nevertheless it is finer and better that the piece be compared in all churches. And since elevation is offered and unnecessary, as without God's command of human devotion, it is cheaper to compare with the churches that do not have elevation than with those that do. For St. Paul faithfully teaches us everywhere to be diligent to teach and live alike and in one accord, and to guard against disunity or inequality where we can, Rom. 12:16: "Have one mind among yourselves"; 1 Cor. 1:10: "I remind you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you speak one mind, and do not suffer division among yourselves."

But where this cannot be, the 14th chapter of Romans should be followed. V. 1 ff.: "Do not confuse consciences. One thinks he may eat all things, but he that is weak eats herbs. One man keeps one day before another; another man keeps all days alike. Let every man be sure in his own mind. [The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. Therefore let us strive after that which leads to peace, and serve for the betterment of one another." This help us all our dear Lord Jesus Christ with God the Father and the Holy Spirit, praised forever and ever, amen.

1) Compare the Table Talks, Cap. 35, § 6. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1001 f.

The following writings also belong to the above section:

Luther's report to Melanchthon of the new prophets who reject infant baptism. January 13, 1522.

Walch, old edition, vol.XV, appendix, no. 103.

Luther's letter to two pastors about rebaptism. Beginning of February 1528.

Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 2643.

Luther's Preface to the Book of Justus Menius on Anabaptist Doctrine and Mystery. 1530.

Walch, old edition, vol. XIV, 276.

Luther's sermon on Holy Baptism.

January 6, 1535.

Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. X, 2054.

Luther's preface to the new Münster newspaper. Beginning of 1535.

Walch, old edition, vol. XIV, 328.

Luther's preface to Rhegius' refutation of the Münster Anabaptists. 1535.

Walch, old edition, vol. XIV, 323.

Third Section.

Luther's writings against the errors, blasphemies and abominations of the Jews and Turks.

I. Luther's writings against the Jews, and what ways he proposed to deal with the Jews to convert them.

48 a. D. Matt. Luther's scripture that Jesus Christ was born a Jew.*)

Anno 1523.

But a new lie has 1) gone out about me: I am said to have preached and written that Mary, the mother of God, was not a virgin before and after childbirth but

1) but - again.

she had Christ from Joseph, and after that she had more children. About all this I am also said to have preached a new heresy, namely, that Christ is Abraham's seed. How well this lie tickles my dear friends,

*)This writing appeared in 1523 at Wittenberg in seven individual editions (Erl., vol. 29, p. 45), all without indication of the printer; one of them has the title Lotthers (Dietz, Wörterbuch, p. XHII). In the collections it is found: in the Wittenberger (1556), vol. V, p. 434b; in the Jenaer (1585), vol. II, p. 216b; in the Altenburger, vol. II, p. 313; in the Leipziger, vol. XXI, p. 646 and in the Erlanger, vol. 29, p. In 1577, Selnecker had all of Luther's writings Wider die Juden at Leipzig (in octavo) reprinted, namely: this writing; wider die Sadbather; von den Juden und ihren Lügen; and vom Schem Hamphoras. We give the text according to the Jena edition with comparison of the Wittenberg. A Latin translation of this writing made by Justus Jonas in 1523 is found in the Wittenberg edition, Lora. VII, col. 156. By comparing them, we have been able to correct many readings. However, in some cases the translation is such that it is not possible to decide on the variants, but these are usually only insignificant.

the papists! And because they condemn the gospel, they are worth nothing better than that they atone for and feed their heart's joy and lust with lies. I would bet my neck on it, whether the same liars, who pretend such great things to honor the Mother of God, would believe this article from the heart, and yet want to pretend with such lies, as [if] they are highly interested in the Christian faith.

(2) But it is such a poor merciful lie that I despise it and would not answer it. For these three years I am almost accustomed to hearing lies, even from our closest neighbors; and again, they are also accustomed to the noble virtue that they do not turn red, nor are they ashamed if they are publicly overcome by lying, let themselves be called liars, and do it more and more; nevertheless, they are the most Christian people, who want to eat the Turk, and exterminate all heresy with body and soul.

But because I must answer this lie for the sake of others, I have thought to write something useful as well, so that I do not rob the readers of their time in vain with such lazy, loose jokes. Therefore I will tell from the Scriptures the causes that move me to believe that Christ is a Jew born of a virgin, whether I might also provoke some of the Jews to the Christian faith. For our fools, the popes, bishops, sophists, and monks, the coarse asses, have thus far dealt with the Jews, that whoever would have been a good Christian might well have become a Jew. And if I had been a Jew, and had seen such dolts and gags governing and teaching the Christian faith, I would have become a sow rather than a Christian.

(4) For they have dealt with the Jews as if they were dogs and not men; they could do no more than to bark at them and take their goods when they were baptized; they have been shown neither Christian doctrine nor life, but have been subjected only to piety and monasticism. When they have seen that the things of the Jews have such strong Scripture for themselves, and the things of the Christians have been mere babble, without any Scripture, how may they still their hearts, and

become really good Christians? I have heard it myself from devout baptized Jews that if they had not heard the gospel in our time, they would have remained Jews under the Christian mantle all their lives. For they confess that they have never heard of Christ from their Anabaptists and masters.

(5) I hope that if the Jews were dealt with kindly, and were carefully instructed from the Scriptures, they would become many true Christians, and return to the faith of their fathers, the prophets, and the patriarchs; but they would be further frightened if their cause were rejected, and nothing at all left, and only acted with arrogance and contempt toward them. If the apostles, who were also Jews, had thus dealt with us Gentiles, as we Gentiles do with the Jews, there would never have been a Christian among the Gentiles. If then they have dealt so brotherly with us Gentiles, let us again deal brotherly with the Jews, if we may convert some; for we ourselves are not yet all gone, let us not say all gone.

(6) And though we boast highly, yet we are Gentiles, and the Jews are of the blood of Christ; we are sisters and strangers, they are blood friends, cousins and brethren of our Lord. Therefore, if one should boast of blood and flesh, the Jews belong closer to Christ than we do, as St. Paul also says in Romans 9. God has also proven this by deed, for He has never done such great honor to any nation among the Gentiles as He has to the Jews. For no patriarch, no apostle, no prophet has ever been exalted among the Gentiles, not to mention very few true Christians. 1) Paul says Rom. 3, 2. and Ps. 147, 19. 20.: "He proclaims his word to Jacob, and his statutes and his judgments to Israel. He has not done so to any nation, nor revealed his judgments to them."

7 I hereby ask my dear papists if they are tired of calling me a heretic.

that they now began to call me a Jew. For I will perhaps also become a Turk, and what my Junkers only want.

8. the first is promised to Christ soon after Adam's fall, when God said to the serpent: "I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your seed and her seed; the same shall bruise your head, and you shall bite his heels". [Gen. 3:15. Here I leave it to prove that the serpent spoke possessed by the devil, because no unreasonable animal is so clever that it could speak and hear human language, much less speak and ask of such high things as the commandment of God is, as the serpent does here; therefore it must certainly have been an understanding, highly reasonable and powerful spirit that can make human language, and so masterfully handle of God's commandments and saw and guide human reason.

(9) Since it is certain that a spirit is higher than man, it is also certain that this is an evil spirit and an enemy of God, for he breaks God's commandment and does against His will; therefore it is certainly the devil. So the word of God, which speaks of the trampling of the head, must also refer to the devil's head, but not excluding the natural serpent's head, for he speaks with the same word of the devil and the serpent, as of one thing; therefore he means both heads. But the head of the devil is his power, so that he rules, that is, sin and death, so that he has brought Adam and all Adam's children under himself.

(10) Therefore this woman's seed must not be a common man, because it must tread down the devil's power, sin and death, since all men are subject to the devil through sin and death, so it must certainly be without sin. Now human nature does not bear such seed or fruit, as has been said, because they are all under the devil with sin. How then will it be here? The seed must be a natural child of a woman; otherwise it could not be called nor be the seed of a woman. Again, human nature and birth do not bear such seed, as has also been said. So finally the means must remain, that this seed

Let him be a natural son of the woman, not coming naturally from the woman, but by a special work of God, so that the Scripture may affirm that he is only the seed of a woman, and not of a man, as the text clearly indicates, that he will be the seed of a woman.

11. So this is the first saying, in which the mother of this child is described as a virgin, and that she is a quite natural mother, and yet should only conceive and give birth supernaturally by God, without a man, so that he may be a special man without sin, and yet have common flesh and blood, like other men; which could not have happened if he had been conceived by a man, like other men, because the flesh is burned and corrupted with evil desire, his natural work and chastening cannot be done without sin, and what is inseminated and impregnated by the work of the flesh also bears a carnal and sinful fruit. Therefore St. Paul Eph. 2, 3. says: that we are by nature all children of wrath.

This saying has now become the very first gospel on earth. For when Adam and Eve, seduced by the devil, had fallen and were summoned to judgment by God, Genesis 3:9 ff, they stood in mortal peril and in the fear of hell, seeing that God was against them and condemned them, from which they would have gladly escaped and could not. And if God had left them in fear, they would have soon despaired and died. But when, after the terrible punishment, he let them hear this comforting word that he would raise up the seed of the woman over the serpent's head to trample it underfoot, their spirit was refreshed, and they drew comfort from such a word, with firm faith in such a future blessed seed of the woman, which would trample underfoot the serpent's head, sin and death, by which they had been trampled underfoot and corrupted.

(13) Now this gospel the fathers preached and preached from Adam onward, by which they also knew and believed in the future seed of this woman, and so were preserved by faith in Christ, as well as we, are also true believers.

Christians, as we are; without 1) that in their time such gospel was not preached publicly in all the world, as was to happen after Christ's future, but remained alone with the holy fathers and their descendants, until Abraham.

14 Secondly, Christ is promised to Abraham, Genesis 22:18, where God says, "In your seed shall all the Gentiles be blessed." If all the Gentiles are to be blessed, it is certain that otherwise they are all unblessed and cursed, except for this seed of Abraham. But from this it follows that human nature has vain cursed seed and bears unblessed fruit, otherwise it would not be necessary for them all to be blessed through this seed of Abraham. He who says "all" excludes none. Therefore, besides Christ, they must all be cursed in sins and death under the devil, who are born of men.

15 Now here the mother of God is proven to be a pure virgin. For since God cannot lie, it had to happen that Christ would be Abraham's seed, that is, his natural flesh and blood, like all Abraham's children. Again, because he is to be the blessed seed that should bless all others, he could not be begotten of man. For such children, as said, may not be conceived without sin, for the sake of the corrupt and poisoned flesh, which cannot do its work without poison and sin.

(16) Thus the Word, when God promised Christ to Abraham's seed, compels that Christ should be born of a woman and become her natural child. For he came not as Adam from the earth, nor as Eve from Adam; but as a woman's child comes from her seed. For the earth was not natural seed to Adam's womb; so Adam's rib was not natural seed to Eve's womb; but the flesh and blood of virgins, whereof children are otherwise born in all women, was natural seed to Christ's womb, even as she was of the seed of Abraham.

17 Again, the Word, when God promises blessing on all the Gentiles in Christ, compels that Christ should not be blessed by any man or woman.

Man's work come. For the work of the flesh, which is cursed, does not suffer with that which is blessed and blessed. So this blessed fruit had to be the fruit of a female body only, not of a man; although the same female body comes from the man, yes, also from 2) Abraham and Adam, that this mother is a virgin and yet a real natural mother; but not by natural ability or power, but by the Holy Spirit and God's power alone.

18 This saying has been the gospel from Abraham to David, and also to Christ, and is a short saying, but it hastened to become the gospel, and was wonderfully practiced by the fathers, both in writing and in preaching. Many thousands of sermons have been preached from this saying, and countless souls have been saved. For it is a living word of God, which Abraham believed with his descendants, and thereby redeemed and kept from sins and death and all the power of the devil. Although it has not yet been proclaimed publicly before all the world, as happened after Christ's future, but remained only among the fathers with their descendants.

19) But look at the perverse praisers of the Mother of God, who, when asked why they think so harshly of Mary's virginity, truly could not say. For the foolish 4) idolaters do it 5) no further than to honor the Mother of God, that they exalt her 6) for the sake of virginity and immediately make an idol out of it. But the Scripture praises this virginity nothing at all for the sake of the mother; she is also not preserved a virgin for her sake; yes, cursed.

2) Jenaer: from.

3) Thus the Jena. Wittenberg and Erlangen: right. The reading given by us is confirmed by the translation of Jonas: *opulentissimae gratiae nun- cium*.

4) The Jenaer has as marginal gloss: "unvernünftigen", what the Wittenberger and the Erlanger have in the text. Jonas: *stulti*.

5) Thus the Jenaers. Wittenberg and Erlangen "thun".

6) "dieselbe" taken by us from the old edition of Walch. In the other editions: "the same". Our reading proves to be correct by the translation of Jonas.

1) Wittenberger: "and" instead of "on" in the Jena.

This virginity, and all virginity, would be there for its own sake, and nothing better would work than its own benefit and praise.

(20) But for this the Spirit praises virginity, that it was necessary for it to conceive and bear this blessed fruit. For after the corrupt flesh such blessed fruit could not come without through a virgin. So that this tender virginity went in foreign service, for God's honor, not for her own honor. And if it could have come from a woman, it would not have taken a virgin; because virginity is against the appointed nature and was condemned in the law before times, and is now only praised because the flesh is poisoned and remote appointed nature cannot give its fruit without cursed works.

21 Therefore we also see that St. Paul does not call the mother of God a virgin, but only a woman, when he says Gal. 4, 4: "The Son of God was born of a woman. Not that he meant that she was not a virgin, but that he praised her virginity in the best possible way with her right praise; as if he should say: "To this birth no woman came, no man, namely, that there remained everything that belongs to it in a woman, that a child might be conceived, born, nursed and nourished, which works no man's image can do; therefore, if it is only a woman's child, then she must certainly be a virgin. But a virgin may also be a man; a mother cannot be only a woman's image.

(22) Therefore the Scripture neither denies nor says anything about the virginity of Mary after the birth, so that the hypocrites are highly concerned, just as if they were serious about it, and all blessedness would depend on it; although it should be enough for us to hold that she remained a virgin after the birth, because the Scripture neither says nor gives that she was crazy afterwards, and no doubt no one is so powerful 1) to fear that he extends without Scripture from his own head that she did not remain a virgin. But the Scripture remains that she was a virgin before and in childbirth; for so far from her virginity did God

We need him to give us the blessed promised seed without all sin.

23. the third saying is said to David, 2 Sam. 7, 12-14.: 2) "When your time is up, and you sleep with your fathers, I will raise up your seed after you, who will come from your womb, and I will establish his kingdom forever. He shall build an house unto my name, and I will establish his kingdom's throne for ever: I will be his father, and he shall be my son."

24 These words may not have been spoken by Solomon. For Solomon did not come from David and rise after his death. So also after Solomon (who was born and became king in David's time) God never called anyone his son, and gave him an everlasting kingdom, or built him a house. Therefore it is all said of Christ. But because this saying is too far, and would cost much to interpret, we leave it now. For it would be necessary to show here how Christ must be the son of a woman alone, that he should be called the child of God, who could not nor should come from cursed works.

The fourth saying is Isa. 7, 14: "God will give you a sign Himself; behold, a virgin is with child and will bear a son. This 3) may not be said of a virgin who is yet to become a bride. For what great sign would it be for a virgin to bear a child for more than a year, since the common course of nature is 4) daily before our eyes? Therefore, if it is to be a sign of God, it must be something special and great, which the common course of nature cannot give, as all signs of God tend to be.

026 Neither do the Jews help themselves that they would escape here, and make up such an excuse, that it is therefore a sign that Isaías saith even now, that it shall be a son, and not a daughter. For this would not be a sign for the virgin, but for the prophet Isaiah, as he had just guessed that it should not be a daughter. Thus

2) Here the Erlangen edition has reprinted Walch's wrong Bible quotation: "2 Sam. 23, 7."; furthermore in this writing two other wrong quotations.

3) Wittenberger: "this".

4) "is" is missing in the Wittenberg and the Erlanger.

1) powerful - very.

the text should read on Isaiah, thus: Behold, God will give you a sign himself, namely, that I will tell Isaiah that a young woman bears a son and not a daughter. But this is shameful and childish.

27 But now the text powerfully presses the sign on the woman's image, and clearly says: This is a sign, when a woman bears a son. Now it is not a sign that a mad woman bears a child, be it Ezekiel's mother, or whatever woman the Jews may interpret; but it must be something new and different, and an especially great work of God, that this woman is with child; the impregnation is to be the sign. So I do not consider any Jew so rude who does not give God so much power that he may make a child from a virgin, since they must confess that he made Adam from the earth and Eve from Adam, which requires no less power.

028 But if they pretend that it is not written in the Hebrew, saying, A virgin is with child; but, Behold, an Alma is with child. But Alma is not called a virgin, but Bethula is called a virgin, but Alma is called a young harlot. Now let a young harlot be a mad woman, and be called the mother of a child.

29. here is easily answered by the Christians from St. Matthew [1, 22. 23.] and Luke [1, 31.], which both lead the saying of Isaiah on Mariam, and interpret the word Alma virgin, which is more to believe than all the world, let alone 1) the Jews. And even if an angel from heaven said that it was not called a virgin, we should still not believe it. For God the Holy Spirit speaks through St. Matthew and Lucas, whom we certainly believe to 2) understand the Hebrew language and words well.

(30) But because the Jews do not accept the evangelists, we must meet them differently, and say here first, as before, that it is not a miracle nor a sign when a young woman becomes pregnant; otherwise one would like to call the prophet Isaiah by all means a miracle.

1) Wittenberger and Erlanger: "denn wenn".

2) So the Jenaers. Wittenberg and Erlanger: "and understand".

Rightly mock, and say, What other women should conceive, but the young? Are you drunk, or is it so strange with you that a young woman bears a son? Therefore such a requested answer of the Jews is only a vain defense word, that they only do not keep quiet.

31 And another thing, let it be said that Bethulah is called a virgin, and not Alma; and that Isaiah saith not Bethulah, but Alma: yet all this is a vain word of defence. For they pretend not to know that in no place in all Scripture is Alma called a madwoman, and yet they know it so well, but in all places she is called a young maiden, who is unchanged, and has never been guilty of any man, who is ever called a virgin, as St. Matthew and Lucas here interpret Jesaia.

32 And if they are so eloquent, and so attached to the letters, we admit that Bethula is another word than Alma. But with this they have won nothing, except that this woman is not called here by the name virgin, but she is called by another name, which also means nothing else, but such a woman, who is still young and unchanged. Now call it what you will, so it is ever a virgin in the person. But it is childish and shameful to make do with words when the interpretation is the same.

(33) Therefore, for the sake of the Jews, let us not translate Isaia, Behold, a virgin is with child, lest she mistake the word virgin; but rather, Behold, a maid is with child. For as in German "Magd" is called such a woman, who is still young and wears the wreath with honor and walks in the hair, that one says: It is still a maid, and not a woman; although it is another word than the word virgin, so also in Hebrew Elem is a young man who has never 3) had no wife, and Alma is a maid who has no husband yet; not like a maid, but who still wears a wreath. So Mosi's sister is called an Alma, 2 Mos. 2, 8. and Rebekka, 1 Mof. 24, 16. since they were still virgins.

3) "never" is missing in the Wittenberg and Erlanger.

34 If I were to say in German, Hans has entrusted him with a maid, and someone were to say, Je, so he has not entrusted him with a virgin, then everyone would laugh at him as a useless word warrior, who does not want to let virgin and maid be one thing, because they are two words. So it is also in the Hebrew, because the Jews help themselves here in the saying of Isaiah and say: Isaiah would not speak Bethula, but Alma. And I appeal to their own conscience among themselves, that it is so. So let them say, as they will, Bethula or Alma, so Isaiah means such a harlot, who is manly and still walks in the wreath, which we call a maid in the most proper German. Therefore one also says rightly of the mother of God "the pure maid", that is, the pure Alma.

035 And if I had spoken the name of Isaiam, he should have spoken unto me even as he spake, saying not Bethula, but Alma. For Alma is better suited here than Bethula. It is also clearer when I say, Behold, a maid conceives, for a virgin conceives. For virgin is a broad word, which may well be a woman of fifty or sixty years, unfit to bear fruit. But "maiden" actually means a young woman who is manly, capable of fruition and unchanged, so that she not only understands virginity, but also youth and fertile womb. Thus, in German, the young people are commonly called Mägde or Mägdevolk, and not Jungfrauenvolk.

36 So this is certainly the text of Isaiah in the most authentic German: "Behold, a maidservant conceives. That these are the words in Hebrew, no Jew will deny to me, who understands differently Hebrew and German. For we Germans do not say *concepit*, the woman has conceived; the preachers have made such German out of Latin; but so speaks the German man and the mother's tongue: the woman goes pregnant, or goes heavily, or is pregnant.

(37) But here in the Hebrew it is not written, Behold, a maid shall conceive, as though she were not yet with child; but, Behold, a maid shall conceive, as having the fruit already in her womb, and yet being a maid.

That 1) you must look at the prophet, how he is amazed that there stands before him a maidservant, who carries a child, before she recognizes a man; she should have a man, would also be skilled for it, and big enough; but before she comes to it, she is a mother. This is a strange miraculous thing.

38) In the 2) way St. Matthew acts this saying, when he says: "When Mary, Jesus' mother, was trusted, before they sat together at home, it was found that she was with child of the Holy Spirit" 2c. Matth. 1, 18.]

039 What else is this said, but that she was a young maid, which had not yet known a man, and yet was able, but before she knew the man she was with child? This was a strange thing, since no maid conceives before she is guilty of a man; so that the evangelist looked upon her even as the prophet, and made her a sign and a wonder.

(40) Now herewith also the false understanding is accounted for, which some have drawn from the words of Matthew, 3) when he saith, Before they sat together in the house, it was found that she was with child. They interpret this as if the evangelist wanted to say: Afterward she sat at home with Joseph, like another woman, and made love, but before this happened she was with child without Joseph. 2c. Item, when he speaks v. 25: "And Joseph knew her not, until she bare her first son." This they barked, as if the evangelist wanted to say that he had recognized her, but not before she had given birth to her first son. Such opinion Elpidius 4) held, and is punished by St. Jerome.

1) Wittenberger and Erlanger: Da.

2) Wittenberg and Erlanger: these.

3) Wittenberger and Erlanger: "gesogen", which has the Jenaer at the edge. Jonas: acceperunt, which confirms our reading.

4) "Elpidius" is probably a misprint instead of "Elvidius". Otherwise, we find in Luther's writings everywhere the spelling: "Helvidius", e.g. in the Table Talks, Cap. 7, § 26, para. 2. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XXII, 283; *ibid.* there, vol. XIX, 200 towards the end of the Columne, and in this volume in Luther's writing of the Shem Hamphoras, §167 (Walch, old edition, vol. XX, 2617). Against Helvidius at Rome" Jerome wrote his book at the end of the fourth century: *Adversus Helvidium*. Jonas offers: *Helvidium*.

For such carnal senses do not consider the opinion and cause of the evangelist. The evangelist, as I said, wants to put this great miracle, like the prophet Isaiah, before everyone's eyes and say how strange it is that a maid should conceive before her husband takes her home and puts her to sleep, and he does not recognize her until she has a son, whom she should have known beforehand.

(42) So that the words of the evangelist do not refer at all to what happened after the birth, but only to what happened before the birth. For the prophet and the evangelist, as well as Saint Paul, do not treat this virgin any further than until they have the fruit of her, for the sake of which she is a virgin and everything. After the fruit they leave the mother and say nothing about her, how it was with her, but only about the fruit. Therefore it cannot be concluded from these words that Mary became a woman after the birth, therefore it is not to be said nor believed. For all the words only indicate the miracle that she became pregnant and gave birth before she was asleep.

(43) The common tongue also has this way of speaking, as if I said, Pharaoh did not believe Moses until he was drowned in the Red Sea. Here it does not follow that Pharaoh believed after he was drowned, but the contradiction that he never believed. So when Matthew says that Joseph did not recognize Mary until she gave birth to her first 1) son, it does not follow that he recognized her afterwards, but the contradiction that he never recognized her afterwards.

(44) Pharaoh overtook the Red Sea before he came out. Nor does it follow that Pharaoh came out after the Red Sea had overtaken him, but rather that he did not come out. Neither does it follow that Mary was asleep afterwards, since Matthew says: "She was found to be with child before they sat together in the house" [Matth. 1, 18], but rather that she was not asleep.

45) In the 2) way also the Scripture speaks, Ps. 110, 1.: "God said to my Lord:

- 1) "first" is missing in the Wittenberg and Erlanger.
- 2) Wittenberg and Erlanger: these.

Sit at My right hand until I put your enemies at the footstool of your feet". It does not follow that Christ does not sit thereafter when His enemies are placed at His feet. Item, Gen. 28:15: "I will not leave thee till I fulfill all that I have spoken unto thee." Here God did not leave him after the fulfillment happened. Item Isaiah 42:4: "He will not look sour nor storm until He establishes justice in the earth." And much more like that; that such talk of Elpidii has no reason, and he neither respected nor perceived the Scriptures, nor the common language.

(46) Let this be enough for this time, that it may be proved strongly enough that Mary is a pure handmaid, and that Christ of Abraham's seed is a true Jew. For although more sayings may be used, these are the clearest. In addition, whoever does not believe a light saying of the divine majesty, it is to be assumed that he also does not believe any other dark saying.

(47) Thus no one can doubt that it is not impossible for God to make a maid pregnant without a man, since He also made all things from nothing. Therefore, the Jews have no reason to deny this, because they confess the omnipotence of God, and here Isaiah the prophet is clear.

The other part.

How to deal with the Jews, to convert them. 3)

(48) But because we are about to answer not only the useless liars who have carried me off in these matters, (4) but also would gladly serve the Jews, if we might bring some of them to their own right faith, which their fathers had, we will continue to deal with them, and present to those who wish to deal with them a manner and sayings which they shall use against them. For many of the sophists have also subjected themselves to this. But

3) This caption is missing in the Jena edition and in the Latin.

4) So the Wittenberg and Erlanger; Jenaer: austragen. Jonas: traduxerunt.

Just as they attacked it in their own name, nothing came of it; for they wanted to cast out the devil with the devil, and not with God's finger.

49] First of all, that the present faith of the Jews and the waiting for the future of Messiah is wrong is proved by the saying Gen 49:10, 11, 12, where Jacob, the holy archfather, says: "The scepter shall not be turned from Judah, nor a teacher from those at his feet, until the Shiloh come, and the nations shall cleave unto him. He shall bind his colt to the vine, and his ass to the noble branches. He shall wash his robe with wine, and his mantle with the blood of grapes. His eyes will be redder than wine, and his teeth whiter than milk.

(50) This saying is a divine promise, which cannot lie, and must be fulfilled, or else heaven and earth shall pass away. Thus the Jews could not deny that, since Jerusalem is disturbed, they have not had a scepter, that is, a kingdom or a king, for fifteen hundred years. Therefore the Shiloh or Messiah must have come before these fifteen hundred years, and before the destruction of Jerusalem.

(51) And if they would say that the scepter of Judah was also used at the time of the Babylonian prison, when the Jews were led into Babylon, and were captives seventy years, and yet at that time Messiah did not come, it must be answered that it is not so, for all the time of the prison the royal tribe remained in King Jechoniah, and afterward in Zorobabel, and other princes for ever, until Herod became king. For the scepter means not only kingdom but also principality, as the Jews well know. In addition, they had prophets everywhere, so that the kingdom or principality never fell, even though they were out of the country for a time, nor were they all driven out of the country, as has happened these fifteen hundred years, when they had neither princes nor prophets.

52. for this reason God created for them the prophets Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Haggaume, Zechariah at the same time, who told them how to get rid of Babylon.

lest they think that the saying of Jacob the archfather 1) was false, or that Messiah had come. But these fifteen hundred years they have had no prophet to proclaim to them that they should be delivered, which God would not have allowed to happen for so long a time, because he did not allow it to happen for such a short time that time. That he might abundantly shew that this saying must be fulfilled.

53) Since Jacob says: "Let the scepter last until Messiah comes," it clearly follows that such a scepter must not only not perish, but also become much more glorious than it ever was before Messiah came. For all Jews know well that Messiah's kingdom is to be the most glorious and greatest that has ever been on earth, as the 2nd, 72nd and 89th Psalms say. For David was also promised that his throne would last forever. Now the Jews must confess that their scepter is now nothing from fifteen hundred years ago, but that it should have become more glorious.

54 Therefore this saying is not to be understood of any other than Jesus Christ our Lord, who is of the tribe of Judah, of the royal house of David, and came in when the scepter came to Herod the stranger, and has been king until now, and remains these fifteen hundred years to eternity. For his kingdom is extended to the ends of the earth, as the prophets have said, and the nations have fallen to him, as Jacob says, and it is not possible that a greater king should be established on earth, of whose name more nations have boasted, than this Jesus Christ.

55 It is true that some of the Jews feel this saying, that it penetrates mightily and is deceiving; therefore they seek some wild help and evasion, which, if one pays attention to it, even sees itself; as when they say here that Shiloh is not called Messiah or Christ; therefore the saying should not penetrate them. His name is not Shiloh or Messiah; we do not deal with the name, but with the person, that the same shall come to pass when the scepter is turned from Judah.

1) So the Jenaer. Instead of "Jacob, the archfather" the Wittenberg and the Erlangen have: "Jacobi". Jonas: *Patriarchae*.

will. Such a person cannot be found, except JEsu[m] Christ; or the saying is false. He will never be a cobbler or a tailor, but a Lord, to whom nations will fall, so that his kingdom will be more glorious than the scepter ever was before, as has been said.

(56) So also is the remedy, when they say, The nations that fall to him may be the Jewish people alone, and Shiloh is called a lord. But be it as it may, I will not almost dispute what Shiloh means. 1) Although it seems to me that it means a man who is happy, who is well off, and who has enough and gives enough. From there comes the little word *Lalve*, which means, *copia, felicitas, abundantia*, full sufficiency of all goods, as Psalm 122,

7: *Et abundantia in turribus tuis*: It is all full and enough, and is well, that I would like to call Schilo in German: Wohlfahrt.

(57) Now his name is called Lord, or welfare, or *prosper*, or *felix*, *there* is nothing said that it should mean one of the former kings, princes, or teachers; for the scepter of Judah certainly comprehends all who have been kings or princes of the tribe of Judah, except this Shiloh, who is here singled out and preferred to all those who have had the scepter of Judah, as even a special one, because he says, "The scepter of Judah shall endure until Shiloh. What kind of speech would this be to me, that I would make Shiloh one of those who have had the scepter of Judah and the nations, since the saying here is that Shiloh is to come after all of them as a glorious and great king, and that no one is to come after him? Why else would he not have said so much more: The scepter of Judah shall last forever, and not wait for Shiloh?

58) Therefore Christ's kingdom is certainly described here so masterfully that before him the scepter of Judah should have many kings, 2) until he himself came and took it alone forever, so that no one would succeed him, nor would any other king from 3) the tribe of Judah. This indicates that his king

The kingdom was to be spiritual, succeeding the physical kingdom, for no person can have an eternal kingdom if he is mortal and rules in the flesh.

059 Therefore the scepter of Judah was established from David until Shiloh, when it was in the flesh, and had kings in the flesh one after another; but when Shiloh was come, it abideth in one person for ever, and hath no more kings one after another.

(60) From this it follows that this Shiloh must first die and then rise again from the dead. For since he is to come from the tribe of Judah [Gen 49:11], he must be a true natural man, mortal like all the children of Judah. Again, because he is to be a special king before all who have had the scepter of Judah until him, and is to reign alone for and 5) for ever, he cannot be a mortal man, but must be an immortal man; He must leave this mortal life through 6) death, and through resurrection take on an immortal one, that he may be sufficient for this saying, and become a Shiloh, to whom all the world belongs, and be a true living man, and King of the tribe of David, and yet immortal, eternal, invisible, and so rule spiritually in faith. But these lovely speeches are still too high and too heavy for the Jews.

011 But if they say, Yea, hath not this Jesus yet done that which Jacob saith afterward of this Shiloh, namely, "He shall bind his colt to the vine, and his ass to the precious branches; he shall wash his garment in wine, and his mantle in the blood of the grape." Answer: A foolish man might understand this, as if this Shiloh should become such a rich king that the wine would be as cheap as water in his time, since one washes clothes with it 2c.

(62) But we have seen from the foregoing that this Shiloh is to reign forever, a single person, that he has no heir after him, which also all the prophets say.

1) Wittenberger and Erlanger: means. Jonas: *significet*.

2) So the Jena. Wittenberg and Erlangen: should. "Kings" inserted by us according to the Latin.

8) Jonas: *de tribu Judae*. In all editions: on.

4) "den" is missing in the Jena.

5) So the Jenaer. Wittenberg and Erlangen instead of "for and for" - "furt".

6) "durch" is missing in the Wittenberg and the Erlanger. Jonas: *per mortem*.

Therefore, it may not be a kingdom in the flesh, in mortal perishable goods and beings.

(63) And though it did not compel 1) that this wine and vine should be spiritual, yet the manner and nature of speech and words compelled it. For what praise would it be to praise such a glorious kingdom above all kingdoms with these four pieces, namely, to bind his fill to the vine, and his ass to the noble branches, to wash his garment with wine, and his mantle with the blood of grapes? Could he find no other praise than what concerns drinking? Must such a king have nothing but wine? Item, is there nothing else praiseworthy about him, except that his eyes are redder than wine, and his teeth whiter than milk? What does it help a kingdom, 2) that he has white teeth, reddish eyes, and a filler tied to the vine?

(64) I suppose it is said of other riches; why does he not rather say, he will wash his garment in balsam or myrrh? That would be even more delicious. Who ever heard of wanting to wash clothes with wine? Item, why does he not say: he will harness his horses in wheat? Who ever heard of wanting to tie donkeys to the vine? What is the point of tying donkeys to vines and clothes to wine? It's all a nonsensical thing to say. Wine spoils clothes; the donkey is better with thistles than with grapevines; a horse would be just as well with a grapevine to eat the leaves. Therefore, such clumsy speech violently penetrates the spiritual mind.

So why does he praise him for his red eyes and white teeth? Is there no other beauty in his body but red eyes and white teeth? What kind of praise is this against such a magnificent great king? It is customary to praise great kings with a strong, beautiful body, but mostly with a great mind, prudence, mercy, strife, power and magnificent deeds and virtues. But here only his eyes and teeth are praised, which is more the praise of a woman.

than of a man, let alone of such a king.

There is no doubt, therefore, that the Spirit through Moses, in such words, portrays to us this man in a spiritual kingdom, how it is to be run and governed. But now is not the time to go into this at length, because we have had enough of it for this time, that herewith the Jews are mightily denied that the right Shiloh or Christ must have come long ago, because they have been so long deprived of the kingdom and principality, and also of the prophets, although here the clear text stands strong and testifies that with the tribe of Judah the scepter shall remain until the righteous king comes, when it shall first begin to be right.

67 Thus the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ agrees very well with this saying. For a principality remained with the Jews until he came, but after his coming it was destroyed, and at the same time he began the eternal kingdom, in which he still reigns forever, and is also irresistible from the tribe of Judah. But because he was to be an eternal king for his person alone, it could not be that he ruled temporally and worldly; for what is temporal passes away. Again, because he had to be David's natural seed, it could not be otherwise than that he would be a natural, mortal, temporal, transitory man.

68 Now the two are opposed to each other, to be temporal and to reign forever. Therefore it must be separated, that he should die in time and pass away from this life, and rise again from the dead and live, that he might become an everlasting king. For he must ever live, if he is to reign, because a dead man cannot reign; so must he ever die, if he is to change this temporal life, in which he must come from necessity, that the scripture might stand, which had promised him a natural blood, to David and Abraham.

(69) So now he sits and reigns, and has the noble office in himself, that he binds his fillings to the vine and washes his garment in the red wine, that is, he governs the consciences with the holy gospel. This is a gracious sermon of God's mercy.

1) Walch and the Erlanger: "erzwinge"; the old editions: "erzwänge".

2) Jenaer: "kingdoms" with the reading _König" in the margin, which the other editions have in the text. Jonas: *ad florem regni*.

of forgiveness of sins, of redemption from death and hell, of which all who believe it with all their hearts will be confident, joyful and drunk with the abundant consolation of God's grace. But this interpretation will not be respected by the Jews until they first come and realize that Christ must have come according to this saying; therefore we leave it until his time.

70 From this saying there is also a reasonable cause to prove that this Shiloh must have come at the time when our Jesus Christ came, and can be no other than the same Jesus, namely: The saying says that to this Shiloh nations shall fall or cling. Now I ask the Jews, when was there ever such a man from the Jewish tribe, to whom so many people clung, as to this Jesus Christ? David was a great king, Solomon also; but their kingdom never extended further than Syria, the smallest part.

This Jesus is accepted by the whole world as a Lord and King, so that the saying of the other Psalm may be fulfilled in him, when God says to Messiah: "I will give you the Gentiles for a possession, and your inheritance as far as the world is. Such a thing has ever come true in our JEsu, since the scepter was taken from the Jews, as before, and has never happened in any other Jew. Since Shiloh was to come at the end of the scepter of Judah, and since no other time fulfilled such sayings, this Jesus must certainly be the right Shiloh, whom Jacob means.

The Jews must confess that the Gentiles have never so willingly surrendered to a Jewish man as to a lord and king as this Jesus. For though Joseph was a great man in Egypt, yet he was not lord nor king in Egypt; and though he had been, yet Egypt was but a small thing compared with this kingdom, which all the world giveth to this JEsu.

73] Item, neither Daniel nor Mordecaius was king in Babylon or in Persia, though they were great men in the army.

74. and is wonder that the Jews have the

not moved to believe in this Jesus, their own blood and flesh, on whom the sayings of Scripture rhyme so powerfully and evenly, because they see that we Gentiles hold so much, so hard, so firmly to him, that many thousands have shed their blood for his sake.

75 They know well that the Gentiles have always been naturally more hostile to no people than to the Jews, and do not want to suffer their dominion, nor their laws, nor their rule; how then should it be that they should so willingly and continually go among these Jews, and confess him King over all kings, Lord over all lords, body and soul, if there were not here the true Messiah, to whom God, according to this saying and other sayings, has made the Gentiles favorable and submissive with great wonder?

76) The other saying is Dan. 9, 24, where the angel Gabriel speaks to Daniel about Christ in the most clear way, saying: "Seventy weeks are appointed for your people and for your holy city, that the transgression may be controlled, forgiveness sealed, iniquity atoned for, and eternal righteousness come, and the prophecy and vision be fulfilled, and the Holy of Holies be anointed.

77. v. 25 ff: "Mark therefore, and take heed: From the time that the saying goeth forth, that Jerusalem shall be rebuilt, seven weeks and threescore and ten weeks, even unto the prince Messiah, shall the gaff and the wall be rebuilt in time of trouble. And sixty and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, and they shall not be. But the city and the holy place shall destroy the people of the prince that shall come, and they shall make an end of it with fierceness. And when the strife is ended, there shall remain a certain desolation. But he will confirm the covenant among many in One Week. And in the half of the week shall cease sacrifice and meat offering" 2c.

Help God, how this saying has been used so many times among Jews and Christians that one would despair of taking anything certain from it! Well then, we will ever conclude so much from it that the

The right Messiah must have come a thousand and five hundred years ago, as we think of our Jesus Christ, and we want to save the reckoning and interpretation to the last, and say first of all: Neither a Jew nor anyone can deny that the angel Gabriel speaks here of the rebuilding of Jerusalem after the Babylonian prison, which was done by Nehemiah.

79) On the other hand, he cannot speak of any destruction of Jerusalem, except that which happened afterward by the Roman emperor Titum, after the ascension of our Lord about the fortieth¹) year; for after Jerusalem was rebuilt,²) it was never destroyed, though it was won in the days of Maccabeorum. From this we conclude powerfully and irrefutably that the Messiah, of whom Gabriel says here, must have come before this disturbance; that is ever, I think, certain and clear enough.

It is true that the Jews have long felt this powerful conclusion, have protected themselves even fearfully with many a wild gloss, and make something else out of this Messiah than the right Messiah, namely the king Cyrum in Persia, whom Isaiah calls a Messiah in the 45th v. 1, whom the queen Tomyris³) slew in Scythia 2c. But this and the like are vain words of defense and wilful evasions, without any reason, therefore it is soon misplaced, namely thus:

These seventy weeks (saith Gabriel) shall run upon such a Messiah, that in his time, when the weeks are expired, sin and iniquity shall be put away, and forgiveness and everlasting righteousness shall come, and the prophecy and vision shall be fulfilled. Now I ask both Jews and every man, whether in the days of Cyrus such things were done? For in the days of Cyrus, and after his days, there was no righteousness in the earth, save that which was before and after in the days of other kings; neither was there righteousness in the days of David and Solomon much greater than in the days of Cyrus.

Nor does the Scripture call it eternal righteousness. Therefore this righteousness must be much higher than it was in the days of David, the most holy king, let it be said that Cyrus the Gentile had such righteousness in his day.

82] Further, since Gabriel says here that the city of Jerusalem will be rebuilt in seven weeks, and after that the Messiah will be cut off sixty-two weeks, how can it be King Cyrus who was slain before the seven weeks began, or at least, if their account is true, before Jerusalem was rebuilt? How can it be the same Messiah, who was slain before Jerusalem was rebuilt, and who was cut off after sixty-two weeks, after Jerusalem was rebuilt?

So we have that their word of defense is wrong, and this saying of Cyro cannot be understood. Since, according to Cyro, the Scriptures call no Messiah but the one, the right Messiah, and since such great things cannot be the same for a temporal king, we conclude, and forcibly overcome the error of the Jews, that the right Messiah has come after the rebuilt one, and before the destroyed Jerusalem. For no Messiah has ever been killed before the destroyed Jerusalem without our Lord Jesus Christ, whom we call Messiah, that is, Christ or the Anointed One. Therefore let us now see the text, how powerfully it refers to our Lord Jesus Christ.

Invoice of the weeks Danielis. ⁴⁾

84 But I must speak before them that know the histories of the kingdoms: for they that know them not shall not understand me well. The most certain thing in this interpretation is to reckon back to the time when Jesus was baptized and began to preach. To the same time Gabriel speaks, when he says: "Until the prince Messiah", as if he should say: I do not speak until the birth of Christ, but to the principality of Christ, when he began to rule, to teach, to master, and to set himself up as a duke, who should be followed, as

4) This caption is missing in the Jena edition and in the Latin.

1) Wittenberger: dreissigst, also so in Latin.

2) Wittenberger and Erlanger: ward. Jonas: instaurata est

3) In the editions: "Thamyris". But Justin, *Histor, ex Trogo Pompejo, lib. I, cap. 8*, calls it:

also the evangelists, and especially Marcus [Cap. 1, 14.] and Peter [in the] Acts of the Apostles [1, 22.], mentioned Christ's being after the baptism of John, and Lucas also [Cap. 3, 23.], where it is to be assumed; but there Christ was thirty years old.

85 Now it is undoubted by all who know the Scriptures that Gabriel does not speak here of day weeks, where seven days make a week, but of year weeks, where seven years make a week, as the Scriptures are wont to say, that therefore seventy weeks all make four hundred and ninety years.

86) Now if you count back from the thirtieth year of Christ through the Greek and Persian kingdoms to four hundred and ninety years, you come to the twentieth and last year of Cambyses, the third king, or the other king after Cyro in Persia, who allowed Cyrus to build the temple in Jerusalem, 2 Chron. 36:22 and Ezra 1:1, 2, 3. 36, 22. and Ezra 1, 1. 2. 3. But about six and forty years later Cambyses, and after him Darius Longimanus (who had taken an oath beforehand), allowed the city of Jerusalem to be built, which was done by Nehemiah; as all this is proved in the book of Nehemiah and Ezra; so that the seventy weeks of Nehemiah's journey from Persia, that is, beginning about the seventh year of Darii Longimani, are the same as our Christ.

(87) Gabriel says, "Seventy weeks (that is, four hundred and ninety years) are decreed for your people and your holy city," as if to say, "Your people the Jews and the holy city Jerusalem have four hundred and ninety years left, after which they will both be finished. How this is to be done, he says, "That the transgression may be stopped, and forgiveness be sealed, and iniquity be atoned for, and everlasting righteousness come, and prophecy and vision be fulfilled," that is, that enough may be done for all sin, and forgiveness of sin be proclaimed, and the righteousness of faith be preached, which is everlasting in the sight of God, of which all the prophets and all the Scriptures say, as Paul Rom. 1:17 and Peter Acts 2:17 and following. 2, 17. ff. testify; for until then there was only sin and works righteousness, which is temporal and not valid before God. I

But I know well that the Hebrew word Hatuth [xxxxx] is interpreted here by some for sin, which I have interpreted forgiveness, as Moses uses it, and Ps. 51, 4, not without cause.

88. Then he shows when the seventy weeks began, saying: "From the time that the word went out to rebuild Jerusalem (that is, in Nehemiah's time, in the twentieth year of Cambyses) until Messiah the Prince (that is, until Christ's baptism in the Jordan), there are seven weeks (that is, nine and forty years, during which Jerusalem was rebuilt in fearful times, as Nehemiah's book teaches) and "two and threescore weeks" (that is, after Jerusalem was built, 434¹⁾ years), which together make nine and threescore weeks, that is, 483 years, there is still one week missing, that is, seven more years, so that the full seventy weeks, that is, 490 years; what shall now happen in the same week, he shows and says:

89. "And after two and threescore weeks (hear, about the first seven weeks of anxious rebuilding) shall Messiah be cut off" (this did not happen in the beginning of the last week, but immediately in the middle, for Christ preached four and a half years), and he speaks "cut off," that is, taken from this life into the immortal life, by death and his resurrection. "And they shall not be his" (that is, those who crucify him and drive him out of this world shall no longer belong to him and be his people, but [he] shall adopt another people), he declares, saying how they shall not remain unpunished drum, saying:

90. "And the city and that which is holy shall be destroyed by a people of a prince that shall come (that is, Titus, the Roman emperor), and it shall come to an end with tempest" (that is, be disturbed with storm and violence, as with a flood). "And when the strife shall have an end, there shall remain a certain desolation." So all this came to pass. For Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed with terrible severity, and never again in the hands of the Jews nor to their former power, however high it was tried that they had been before, and is now

1) In the editions erroneously: "441".

The people of the world are not going to be able to deny that this saying and the work before their eyes are one thing.

91. but in the one week he will confirm the covenant among many." These are the four and a half years that Christ Himself preached, and four and a half years after that the apostles, during which seven years the gospel (which is the covenant of God with us, that He will be gracious to us through Christ) went forth with the greatest vigor, and has never been so loud and powerful since that time. For soon after the time heresy and error [began to] mingle with it. "And in the midst of the week the sacrifice and meat offering shall cease," that is, the law of Moses shall cease to be in force, because Christ shall fulfill all things by his suffering four and a half years of preaching, and shall cause new sacrifices to be preached thereafter 2c.

92 Now tell me, where shall we find a prince, or Messiah, or king, to whom all these things rhyme, but to our Lord Jesus Christ? Because the Scriptures and history so powerfully coincide with each other, the Jews have nothing to say against it. For they are well aware of their distress, which is immeasurably greater than they have ever suffered; so that they cannot show any sin so great that they would have deserved it, because they do not consider it a sin that they crucified Jesus; otherwise they would have committed greater sins before, and suffered less punishment, and it would be impossible that God should have left them so long without prophets, when it should not be over with them, and all the Scriptures would have been fulfilled.

93 There are also more sayings: as, the Haggai 2, 10. where God speaks of the rebuilt temple: "The secrecy of this last house will be greater than the first", which also mightily smuggles. Item, the Zach. 8, 23.: "At that time ten people from all Gentile languages will take hold of a Jewish man's hem, and say: We want to go with you, because we have heard,

that the Lord may be with you"; 1) and many more; but it is too long to go into all of them in detail, and for the time being these two previous sayings are enough to begin with.

But whether it would offend the Jews that we confess our Jesus to be a man, and yet a true God, we also want to correct it strongly from the Scriptures in time. But it is too hard at the beginning. Let them first suck milk, and at first recognize this man Jesus as the true Messiah; then let them drink wine, and also learn how he is true God; for they are too deeply and too long deceived that they must be dealt with cleanly, as it is all too imaginary to them that God may not be man.

95 Therefore my request and advice is that they be dealt with carefully and taught from the Scriptures, so that some may come to you. But now we only drive them by force and deal with them with lies, blame them, they must have Christian blood so that they do not stink, and I do not know what is more foolish, that they are taken for dogs: what good should we do to them? Item, that one bequeaths them to work among us, to handle, and to have other human fellowship, so that one drives them to proliferate: how should 2) they improve?

If we want to help them, we must practice the laws not of the pope but of Christian love on them, and accept them kindly, recruit and work with them, so that they gain cause and space to be with and around us, to hear and see our Christian teaching and life. Whether some are stiff-necked, what of it? After all, we are not all good Christians either. Here I will leave it this time until I see what I have done. God give us all his grace, amen.

1) Wittenberger: "etc".

2) Wittenberger and Erlanger: should.

48b. Letter of Jonas to Andreas Rem. *)

1523.

Translated from Latin.

Justus Jonas wishes Andreas Rem, citizen of Augsburg, God's grace and peace!

Behold, dear Rem, the little book of Luther, which we have translated into Latin. So far we have noticed that many writings are scattered here and there, which are intended to convince the Jews of the coming of the Messiah; but none has yet come to light that is equal to it, one may look at the spirit or content of it. This booklet is full of such reasons that the Jews will not be able to answer anything thorough against it. Your suggestion, according to which you demand that this Scripture be presented in such a language, the use of which spreads widely among all peoples, Lutherus has not disliked. For there is hope that it will be much more useful in the Latin language than in German. The Jews, as we can see, have suffered the same fate as we have, in that they have been drawn away from the Word of God and from the simplicity of Scripture by the washing of their Talmud, just as we have been drawn away by the Scotist and Tho-

mistic dreams. I have no doubt, however, that those to whom it is given to stick to the pure writings of Moses and the prophets will be not a little convinced and moved by these reasons. The rabbis (for that is their only endeavor, how they may fob off the rabble with an empty hope) invent that the scepter and the republic of the Jews in Babylon are still there, as if they could not be convicted of the lies there. Why do they not rather invent that the Jewish rule has been brought to the cities situated in the moon? But let us pray for this people, especially since there are not all Christians among us who bear the name of a Christian. If only God wanted the work with the Jews to go so happily from place to place, as wonderful the change and as glorious the works of God have been, which we have seen in such a short time with such a fast course of His word. Be at ease in the Lord. Wittenberg, 1523. 1)

1) In the old edition of Walch "1524". Compare the note to the superscription of this letter.

48c. D. Martin Luther's letter to Bernhard, a converted Jew. **)

1523.

Translated from Latin.

1. grace and peace from the Lord. The conversion of the Jews is almost everywhere in the whole world very *infamous (infamus)*, not only among the Christians, but also among the Jews, in that they say it occurs

No one with an honest heart had converted from Judaism to Christianity, but whoever had done so had not been able to remain with the Jews because of a bad reputation due to a disgraceful deed, but those who had done so testified with experience,

*With this letter, Jonas sent to Andreas Rem, a citizen of Augsburg, the Latin translation he had made of the previous writing. The same is found in the Latin Wittenberg edition, Tom. The year 1524, which is found in the Latin Wittenberg and the old edition of Walch at the end of this letter, will not be correct, because De Wette, Vol. II, 450, mentions a single edition of the Latin translation published in octavo in Wittenberg in 1523. We have taken this letter from the old edition of Walch.

***) This letter was added to Luther's *De Jesu Christo, vero Judaeo et semine Abrahae, libellus, Viteb.* 1523. 8. published in Latin by J. Jonas and is found in the Latin Wittenberg edition, Dow. VII, toi. 165 k. Otherwise still in Vermoorten, *Analecta sacra superioris aevi*, p. 221; in Strobel-Ranner, p. 95 and in De Wette, vol. II, p. 450. We here translated according to De Wette.

They were in the habit either of eating again what they had eaten, or of leaving the Jewish religion for some fictitious reason. Strange is the story that is said to have happened under the emperor Sigismund, when a court Jew petitioned the emperor with many requests that he be allowed to become a Christian. Finally he was accepted and baptized, but then he was led into temptation, although before the time and beyond his ability. For as soon as he had received baptism, the emperor ordered a double fire to be built, calling one the Jewish fire and the other the Christian fire, and commanded the baptized Jew to choose in which one he would rather be burned? For now (he said) you are baptized and holy, you will hardly become better in the future. Then this wretched man, as a testimony to his faith, which was either falsely pretended or even weak, chose the Jewish fire, jumped into it as a Jew, and let himself be burned as a Jew. The story of the will of a baptized Jew in Cologne, along with many others, is well-known enough.

2. But I believe that the cause of this evil rumor is not the stubbornness and malice of the Jews, but rather their gross ineptitude and ass-like ignorance; But then also the exceedingly vicious and impudent life of the popes, priests, monks and schools, since they have not inspired a spark of light or fire in the Jews, neither by doctrine nor by Christian conduct, but by everything that can only be repugnant to them, by darkness and error of their human statutes and by the example of their exceedingly evil life, they have turned away their hearts and consciences and made the Christian name alone known to them, so that one can rightly point to them the saying of Christ, Matth. 23:15: "Woe to you, scholars of Christ and Pharisees, who wander over land and water to make a fellow Jew; and when he is made a Jew, you make him a child of hell, more double than you are." Namely, they accuse the

Jews, that they convert in a fictitious way, but they do not punish themselves, that they convert the same in a fictitious and godless way, yes, seduce from one error into another, which is once again so harmful. What honor, I pray you, would that be, indeed what madness would that be of a teacher, who would lecture only the most pernicious doctrines to a boy of good hope and docile head, and then teach him only the most disgraceful conduct in life, and yet afterwards wash his hands of him and say that the boy had not accepted the good from him? In this way, a whore mistress would teach a girl fornication and then accuse her of not behaving like a virgin. That the conversion and teaching of the Jews by our Sophists and Pharisees is completely the same, your own experience also bears witness to this.

But because the golden light of the gospel now rises and shines brightly, there is hope that many of the Jews will be converted sincerely and honestly and be drawn out of the world 1) to Christ, as you and some others, who are the remnant of the seed of Abraham, who will be helped by grace. For he who began it will also accomplish it, and will not let his word come back to him empty. Therefore I have deemed it good to send this booklet to you, for the substantiation and fortification of your faith in Christ, whom [Christ] you have recently learned from the Gospel, and upon whom you have now also been baptized in the Spirit and born of God. And I desire that by thy example and work he [Christ] may be known among other Jews also, that they who are ordained beforehand may be called and come to their King David, who feeds and saves them, but whom our priests and Pharisees, who are ordained that this judgment should come upon them, reject with indescribable fury. Fare well in the Lord, and pray for me.

1) In the Wittenberg: *ex animo* - from the heart.

49. D. Martin Luther's letter to Jesel, Jew at Roßheim, why he denied him written intercession. *)

December 10, 1537.

To the careful Jesel, Jew of Roßheim, my good friend.

My dear Jesel! I would gladly act for you against my most gracious Lord, both with words and writings, just as my writing has served all of Jewry so much. But because your people so shamefully misuse my service and do things that we Christians do not have to suffer from them, they themselves have taken away from me all the support that I could otherwise have received from princes and lords.

2 For my heart has been, and still is, that mail should keep the Jews friendly, thinking whether God would graciously look upon them and bring them to their Messiah; and not thinking that they should be strengthened and made worse in their error by my favor and encouragement.

3. if God gives me time and space, I will write a booklet, if I can win some of your paternal tribe¹) of holy patriarchs and prophets, and bring them to your promised Messiah. Although it is altogether strange that we should provoke and entice you to your natural Lord and King, as your forefathers before, when Jerusalem still stood, provoked and enticed the Gentiles to the right God.

(4) Shall ye not think that we Gentiles are so hopeful and disgusting; for without which Gentiles and Jews are always deadly?

We would not worship even your best king, let alone such a condemned, crucified Jew, if it were not for the power and authority of the right God, who would bring such things to the hearts of us trusting Gentiles, your enemies. For you Jews would never accept a hanged or righteous Gentile after his death for a Lord, you know that.

(5) Therefore, do not take us Christians for fools or geese, and consider for once that God would help you out of the misery that has now lasted for more than fifteen hundred years, which will not happen, because you accept your cousin and Lord, the dear crucified Jesus, with us Gentiles.

(6) For I have also read your Rabbins, and if it had been² in them, I would not have been so horned and stoned, it would also have moved me. But they can do no more than cry out that he is a crucified, condemned Jew, when all your ancestors have left no saint or prophet uncondemned, unstoned and unmarred, which [saints and prophets] must also be condemned, if your opinion should therefore be right, that Jesus of Nazareth is crucified and condemned by you Jews; for you have done it before and have done it all the way.

(7) Read how you have dealt with your king David, and with all godly kings, yea, with all holy prophets and men, and do not take us heathen so much as to be

1) In the editions "Stammen". Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 442, in the table of contents of this letter has: "seeds", which may be the correct reading. The sense, by the way, remains the same.

2) "it" i.e. that Jesus is the Messiah.

*) This letter is found in the Wittenberg edition, vol. XII, p. 203; in the Jena edition (1568), vol. VI, p. 508; in the Altenburg edition, vol. VI, p. 1114; in the Leipzig edition, vol. XXII, p. 566; in the Erlangen edition, vol. 55, p. 186, and in De Wette, vol. V, p. 79 (in the latter two with the wrong date: "den 5. November"). Further, in the "Trostschriften", Jena, Rödingers Erben, sheet Ziijj, with the probably wrong date: "Mondags nach Barnabä", that is, the 18th of June. "Barnabä" fell in 1537 on Monday, June 11, so June 18 would probably have been called "Monday after Viti". It must be read: Monday after Barbara. In the "Trostschriften" there are several variants (De Wette VI, p. 513, note 1), some of which we have included. Otherwise, we give the text according to the Jena edition.

Dogs. For you see that your imprisonment will last too long, and yet you find us Gentiles, whom you consider your greatest enemies, favorable and willing to counsel and help, without our being able to suffer that you curse and blaspheme your blood and flesh, who has done you no harm, Jesus of Nazareth, and (if you could) rob all his people of all they are and all they have.

8 I also will be a prophet, though a pagan, as Balaam was; it shall not be that ye hope, for the time appointed of Daniel is long past; and though ye turn it so strangely, and from the

Text do what you want, so the work is available.

(9) These things shall ye kindly receive of me for your admonition. For the sake of the crucified Jew, whom no one shall take from me, I would gladly do the best for all you Jews, except that you should not use my favor to harden yourselves. You know this very well. Therefore, you may present your letters to my most gracious Lord through others. Hereby commanded by God. Date from Wittenberg, Monday after Barbarä in 1537. year.

Mart. Luther.

50. D. Martin Luther's letter against the Sabbathers to a good friend. *)

March 1538.

Grace and peace in Christ. I have received your writing and the verbal advertisement of your skill, but I have not been able to answer as hastily as I would have liked, because of many unavoidable obstacles. Give me credit for that.

(2) Now that you have shown me how in the countries the Jews are now and then tearing down with their flesh and doctrine, and have already deceived some Christians into being circumcised, believing that the Messiah or Christ has not yet come, and that the law of the Jews must remain forever, and be accepted by all the Gentiles, (2c) I desire to know how this is to be done with the holy Scriptures; this time, until I have more time, I will give my advice and opinion by this letter.

¹⁾ The first part.

Whether Messiah had come.

(3) First of all, since the Jewish people are so hardened by their rabbis that it is difficult to win them over; for when they are referred to the Scriptures, they fall from the Scriptures to their rabbis, and say that they must believe their rabbis, just as you Christians (they say) believe your pope and decrees. This they answered me themselves, when I also once disputed with them, and led the Scriptures against them. Therefore, in order to strengthen the Christians, you should bring out the old argument, which Lyra and many others have used, and which the Jews still use today.

1) This superscription is from the Wittenberg edition.

*This writing appeared in March 1538 (on March 27 Luther sent it to Hausmann) at Wittenberg with Nickel Schirlentz. Then it is found in the editions: in the Wittenberg (1556), vol. V, p. 443b; in the Jena (1568), vol. VII, p. 31; in the Altenburg, vol. VII, p. 32; in the Leipzig, vol. XXI, p. 531, and in the Erlanger, vol. 31, p. 416. The good friend to whom this letter is attributed is, according to the testimony of Mathesius (Luthers Leben, St. Louiser Ausgabe, p. 62), Count Wolf Schlick zu Falrenau. We give the text according to the Erlangen edition, which brings the original print, comparing the Wittenberg and Jena editions. This writing was translated into Latin by Justus Jonas (1539). It is included in the Latin Wittenberg edition, Tom. VII, fol. 215b; we have also used this translation to correct readings.

The people of the world are not able to answer anything honestly from this, although they have disgracefully perverted much scripture about it, even contrary to their own oldest teachers, of which there is neither time nor space to speak now.

4 And this is the argument: The Jews are now 1500 years outside Jerusalem in misery, that they have neither temple, worship, priesthood nor principality; and therefore their law lies with Jerusalem and all the Jewish kingdom in ashes, so long ago. They cannot deny this, because their miserable status and experience, and the place that is still called Jerusalem, which lies desolate and without Judaism before the eyes of all the world, relegates them too well and too grossly. So they cannot keep Mosi's law, because only in Jerusalem, as they themselves must know and confess; because their priesthood, principality, temple, sacrifices, and what Moses has established for them and on them by divine command, they cannot have or hope for outside Jerusalem. That is one thing, and almost certain.

5. Now you shall ask: What is sin, and what is its name, because God has punished them so horribly that they have to live in misery for so long without priestly, princely, that is, without Moses' 1) foundation and rule, without sacrifice, and other ordinances of the law, especially without Jerusalem: For God's promise is there (as they also boast) that their law shall remain forever, and Jerusalem shall be God's own dwelling place, and both princes of the tribe of David and priests of the Levites shall always remain before God; as the prophets and Scriptures are full of such promise, as they know, and (as said) they boast; and has such a glorious, mighty, manifold promise been lacking now for fifteen hundred years, as they unfortunately well feel?

(6) Therefore, since it does not rhyme to blame God for not keeping His promise and lying fifteen hundred years, you should ask what is wrong, for God cannot lie or deceive. To this they will and must answer: it is the fault of their sins; if the same are atoned for

God will keep his promise and send Messiah. Now stand firm (as I said) and ask: How are such sins called? For such terrible, long, horrible punishment indicates that they must have horrible, horrible sin upon them, the like of which has never been heard from the world. For so long a time God has never tormented any of the Gentiles, but has recently executed them; how then should he torment his own people for so long, and so torment them that they still know no end of it, nor can they know 2)?

(7) Now it is nothing for them to say that it is because of their sins, and yet they cannot name those sins; they would just as soon say that they have not committed any sin, because they are not guilty of any sin that they can name, and thus are unjustly punished by God. Therefore, you should press hard for them to name such sin. If they do not do so, you will have gained so much that they will deal with lies and nothing will be left to believe them.

(8) If they call it sin, mark them well, for this argument grieves them. And even if I were a Jew, and Abraham born of his womb, and also most diligently taught by Moses, I would truly know nothing to answer it, and would have to leave Mosaic Judaism and become what I would.

9 Some of their rabbis, to comfort and blind their poor people, answer thus: this sin is that their fathers worshipped the calf in the wilderness, such sin they shall now atone for, until 2c. Is this not terrible blindness? And what is this before those who read the Scriptures? For if this sin should be so great, why did God afterwards do so much good to the people of Israel, for and for such miracles through prophets, kings, also peasants and women, as the books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Kings 2c. testify? Which he would not have done if he had not graciously forgiven all sin, not to mention this one, which was punished at that time. Why did he not at that time, for the sake of such sin, just as much

1) Wittenberger and Erlanger: "Mosisch".

2) "nor know" sehlt in the Wittenberger.

would have left his people, but, regardless of such sin, brought them into the Promised Land and done all good, exalted and honored above all the Gentiles? If he now keeps his Messiah back because of this sin, atoned for at that time, he might also have said at that time: I will not bring you into the land, nor honor you as highly as I have promised; for you have done such sin, which I will never forget, nor forgive.

(10) If at that time he did not let any sin hinder him from keeping his promise, as he had spoken to Abraham, as he 1) has never left his promise for the sake of men's sin: how should he now so long forgive his Messiah for the sake of such sin, whom he has so gloriously promised that David's throne and the priests' sacrifices shall not cease before him? Ah, many other sins happened at that time under Moses, than with BaalPeor, with many temptations of God 2c., on which they are severely punished, as Mosi's books show; why do they not bring them here either? Do you say, dear friend, to such Jews: it is a foolishness, which they themselves know, or should know.

11) For this reason the Messiah was not yet promised to David at that time, so that such a sin of the calf cannot apply here 2). Therefore let them name other sins, because of which they suffer such miserable misery. If they name one or several, then I ask very kindly, you will ascribe them to me quickly, then I will let an old fool and merciful Christian quickly make a stone knife, and become a Jew, and I shall not only have the limb, but also the nose and ears circumcised. But I know that they cannot name any.

12) For the Scripture says that before the Babylonian prison the Jews committed many more and greater sins than they can indicate in the Roman prison, and yet the Babylonian prison lasted no longer than seventy years, with prophets, princes, rulers, and rulers.

I will say later that I am firmly and almost comforted by the heat. But in this Roman prison he is none, and yet the terrible punishment is there before his eyes. Tell me, who can, what is the sin? Dear Jew, tell me, what is the name of the sin for which God is so long angry with you and does not send His Messiah?

13) On the other hand, if the Jews could call the sin that God calls it A or B, which they cannot do, their cause is not helped by it, they must still be understood in the lie. For Jeremiah 31:31-34 is written: "Behold, the days come, saith God, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. Not like the covenant I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand and brought them out of Egypt, which covenant they did not keep, and I had to force them. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the children of Israel after that time, saith the LORD; I will put my law in their hearts, and write it in their minds; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God: and no man shall teach another, nor brother another, saying, Behold, know the LORD: but they shall all know me, both great and small, saith the LORD; for I will forgive their iniquity, and will remember their sin no more."

(14) There are many things in this beautiful saying, but because the Jews like to slip and flutter from one to the other when they feel that they are being hit, you should save all the other things for this time, and stand firm on the thing for which it is now introduced, namely, that the Jews say, "The future of the promised Messiah will be spoiled because of their sins. Against this God says here: "He wants to make a new, different covenant or law", not like Moses' covenant or law, and that nothing should hinder Him that they have sinned; yes, precisely because they have not kept the same covenant, He wants to make a different, new covenant that they can keep, and will not let their sin, or that they have not kept His previous covenant, move them, but will be gracious to them.

1) "he" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) Wittenberger and Erlanger: "nothing here". Jenaer: not here. Jonas: Uue uou sto.

Finally, forgive the sin and remember it no more.

15 You must now rest on this piece and reproach the Jews. For how does it read, how does it rhyme? The Jews say that Messiah's future is hindered because they have not kept God's covenant, but have sinned against it; God says, No, I will not look upon such sin, and that they have not kept my covenant shall not hinder me, but my new covenant shall come all the more because they have not kept that covenant, that such sin may be forgiven and forgotten forever through the new covenant.

(16) Now is the time to ask, Who is the one who is the Jew or the one who is the Lord? For they are against each other. Jew says yes; God says no. But there is to be no question at all, but it is proved that the Jews lie, and their excuse is nothing, that Messiah should be deceived because of their sin; and God remains true that he will not let any sin hinder him, but has kept his promise and Messiah's future, and still keeps it, regardless of their sin, and that they have not kept his covenant.

(17) Here you may also hold up to the Jews the ninth chapter of Deuteronomy, or the fifth book of Moses, in which Moses, with a mighty sermon and many words, tells them how they do not take the promised land of Canaan because of their righteousness, because they are a stiff-necked, wicked, disobedient people, always angry with God, and until this very day, "as long as I have known you (v. 24), you have been disobedient to the Lord. 24.) you have been disobedient to the Lord", but because of this they take it that God wanted to punish the Gentiles who dwelt within, and for the sake of His promise, which He had sworn to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. As you will find further in the same chapter, whoever wants to read and remember it.

18 Therefore, Moses himself testified that the Jews were not brought into the land of Canaan because of their righteousness or repentance, but because of God's promise, which he had sworn to the patriarchs, and he did not let himself be hindered from keeping such an oath, although the Jews deserved by their sins that he should destroy them to the ground where he was.

Moses also indicates in his prayer in the same chapter, v. 27, that he has appeased God's anger with the single word that God should remember Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, who are now long dead, but their memory for the sake of the promise made to them, lived before God, and were able to do everything 2c.

19. If at that time God did not allow Himself to be hindered from keeping His promise and bringing it to the land because of the people's horrible sin, since the people's sin was obviously and clearly named and known, and everyone can read the Scriptures: How then, because of the sin of the people (which they themselves do not know, cannot name, nor know, nor does any scripture show, and no man can conceive), should he now so long delay, or not keep, such glorious mighty promises of Messiah, and become a liar because of the unconscious sin of the Jews?

(20) And how could the good king David come to believe that God's promise, sworn to him by God, should not be kept for the sake of the Jews' sins? because even his own sins, which he had committed and which are clearly mentioned and read in Scripture (as adultery, the murder of his pious servant Uriah, and blasphemy, 2c.), nothing prevented God's promises, which David repeated and praised at his deathbed, among his last words or testament: a firm and certain covenant was made by God to his house, as one reads in the 23rd chapter [v. 5] of the other part of Samuel, and thereby prophesies that the godless, unbelieving Jews shall be cut off and destroyed.

21. much more, how would the chief patriarch Abraham come to think that God's promise, which had been made to him so abundantly, long before no Jew had been born to Israel, let alone sinned, should not be kept to him for the sake of his descendants' sins, when he, holier than David, had not sinned after being called from Chaldea? The same may be said of Isaac and Jacob, to whom he also made and confirmed such a promise, and for this reason calls himself one God, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, throughout all the generations.

Scripture, and certainly for the sake of their disobedient children and descendants (as Moses calls them) could not have ceased to be their GOD, or become a liar; but the Jews, with such lazy excuse, make themselves liars and blasphemers.

22 Lastly, it is written in the first commandment that God will be angry with the disobedient children of Israel, to whom such a commandment is given, to the third and fourth generation. Zero are the Jews fifteen hundred years under the wrath of God, and there is still no end; in which years the account must give far more than three or four members, yet no Gentiles have ever been so long afflicted, who have never had any promise of God: how then should he forget promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David and all the prophets so shamefully, and pardon them so long; nor yet indicate when the misery shall be ended? For the Scripture fully states that God would be and remain God to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and their seed, and would not let David's throne fall or be missing, which has now fallen and been missing for fifteen hundred years, as they themselves must feel and grasp, if they could not see or hear it.

23. Since this is clear and evident that the Jews do not know how to name any sin, therefore God should forgive his promise for so long and thus be a liar in this; and whether they could name one or more, still become liars by God's word, since God convinces them that he will not abandon his promise to send from Messiah and to keep the Chair of David forever for the sake of their sin: it is evident from this that one of the two must be true: either Messiah must have come fifteen hundred years ago; or God must have lied (God forgive me for speaking so shamefully) and not kept His promise. And say it again, Messiah must have come fifteen hundred years ago, when the throne of David, the principality of Judah, the priesthood of Israel, the temple and Jerusalem were still standing, when the law of Moses and his established service of God still lasted, and the people still dwelt in regiment with one another at Jerusalem, before everything had so horribly disintegrated and perished.

is desolate; or, if not, God has lied. This cannot be denied by the Jews, who are otherwise still in their right mind; the stubborn may twist and turn, wrestle and wring, 1) with whatever plots they want or like, so their makeshift and escape speech is nothing against such public truth.

(24) Now that Messiah has come and God's promise has been kept and fulfilled, but they have not accepted or believed it, but have continued to lie to God with their unbelief, What wonder is it then that God's wrath destroyed them, together with Jerusalem, the temple, the law, the principality, the priesthood, laid them in ashes, scattered them among all the nations, and did not cease to afflict them as long as they punished and blasphemed the divine promise and fulfillment in their unbelief and disobedience? For they were to have accepted from Messiah the new covenant promised by Jeremiah, and to have received the Messiah; who was commanded to teach them aright of the throne of David, priesthood, law of Moses, temple, and all things; as Moses writes in the fifth book at the 18th chapter [v. 15.], "A prophet shall the LORD raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear." For God speaks [v. 18.]: "he will put his word in his mouth and speak to them".

(25) Here they might make such a plea, that God has several times withheld His help because of sin; as when He let them be afflicted in Egypt for so long, and afterwards in the wilderness made forty days into forty years because of their sin, and at last left them in the misery or prison of Babylon for seventy years. Yes, when they come with it, they come justly, and ye shall accept this, that ye may seize them again in manifest falsehood and deceitfulness, and so shall ye say:

(26) God punishes sinners and tries His beloved saints with calamity, but He does not make His promise a lie or a lack of it, for He is the Truth Himself, and it is essential that He cannot lie. And therefore, when he had afflicted the children of Israel in Egypt

1) "wingen" in all editions; probably as much as: winching.

and try them, he did not fail to keep his promise. Yes, that is probably more, before the children of Israel were created or born, also before Abraham had a child, God cared for them so diligently that he announced to Abraham, Gen. 15 Cap. [v. 13. ff.] 1) and promised that his seed, which he did not yet have, would be in misery for four hundred years, and after that he would go out with great possessions. He truly kept this promise, and after four hundred years he led them out of the Egyptian misery, even though there were enough sins, because they were strong enough against Mosi, as they themselves boast in 2 Mos. 14, 12: "Is it not that we said in Egypt, Arise, let us serve the Egyptians?"

27. The Jews have never had such a promise from their present misery; In addition, God gave the children of Israel patriarchs at that time who were great prophets, and sent Joseph before, who had to order the inn for them, so that they would be received honestly before the misery, and so God was always with them, and kept his prophecy and promise, so that they were sure how they would be led out of Egypt; as Joseph also said at his deathbed, and therefore ordered his bones to be taken out of Egypt.

But now, in their last Roman misery, there is none; there is no prophet, nor do they have any prophecy from the Scriptures as to how long such misery should last, and must, without a definite time, be so miserably afflicted, and go astray without prophets and God's word, which God has never done before, nor would do yet, if his Messiah had not come and his promises had not been fulfilled. For He promised that David's throne would not be missing, and that the sacrifice of the priesthood would not cease, and yet now, fifteen hundred years later, both David's throne and Mosiah's altar, along with Jerusalem, lie destroyed and desolate, and God is always silent, which He did neither in Egypt nor in the land of Israel.

He has done this to another wretch, and neither will he nor can he do this, that he should leave his promise.

029 So also in the wilderness, when they had been afflicted forty years, he forgot not his promise which he had made unto Abraham, that his seed should come into the land of Canaan, and possess it by inheritance; but brought them in even as he had spoken. But he had not appointed a time in how many days he would bring them in; and if they had not sinned, they would have come in shortly; But when they sinned, he promised them, even in anger, that they should come in at the first in forty years, according to the number of the forty days which the spies had spent in visiting the land, and because of their murmuring they became forty years of the forty days, as the text saith: nevertheless he kept his promise, and after forty years they came in, as he was angry with them.

30. He did not abandon them, but performed many miracles, made clouds and pillars of fire serve them day and night, fed them with bread from heaven daily, gave them water from rocks, meat and birds; He did not let their clothes and shoes be torn, built a tabernacle, ordered the tribes of Israel, was with Moses, Aaron and other prophets, punished Korah, Dathan, Abiram, and such like many good deeds that they might take hold of, that God would be with them, and not forsake them for their sin, but would keep His promise faithfully above and against all their manifold wickednesses, and such their sin and wickednesses are called there, and are not unknown.

But now, in this last misery, there is none. There is no sin named which they can denounce; there is no prophet, there is no appointed time, there is no sign, no miracle, no public benefit by which they might feel God's grace, nor a certain place nor place of their misery (as Egypt and the wilderness were), but always sit on the shovel and shovel; today they nest here, tomorrow they are driven out and their nests are destroyed; and there is no prophet here who speaks: Flee thither, or hither, but must also be uncertain of the place of their misery, and hover in the wind, where it is

1) Here the old editions have erroneously: "Genesis 16. Cap.", which the Erlangen edition has reprinted. Although Walch improved this error and added the verse number, the Erlangen edition still kept the wrong chapter and added Walch's verse number.

they blow away. Such things have never happened before, but Egypt, the desert and Babylon were certain places where they suffered misery, and always had God's word and prophets with them, also God's manifestation; but here it is too desolate, and has lasted too long, that David's throne lies desolate, and the law of Moses is omitted in the temple at Jerusalem, where it was established.

32 Thus, when they were driven into misery to Babylon, God did not forget His promise, nor did He forsake His people, but appointed for them a certain time, namely seventy years, and a certain place, namely Babylon, and made them certain that for seventy years they would return to Jerusalem, and that their principality and priesthood would remain. For this purpose he gave them excellent prophets, such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Daniel and his companions, by whom they were comforted and preserved in the meantime; also by great miracles and benefits, which he did through Daniel, he showed that he was with them and had not left them. For also the royal person of Jehonia was highly exalted with the king of Babylon, above all kings, so that the throne of David and the priesthood did not perish, 1) but also the persons remained until the end of the misery, had also long before through Isaiah called the king Cyrum, who should make them free, Isa. 45, 1. who also prophesied much of the same prison before, and did not conceal the sin, but (as also Jeremiah did) called it clear, that one knows well for what sin they were punished.

Therefore these three punishments or miseries, as in Egypt, in the desert, in Babylon, cannot rhyme with this last Roman miseries, because there sin is manifest, prophecy and promise are there, prophets and persons are there, both of the throne of David and the altar of Moses are certain time there. And summa, this cannot be called abandoning nor forgetting divine promise, where God thus holds and stands against his people, thus diligently seizes and assures them; just as this cannot be called "abandoning", since he took care of the children of Israel in Egypt before they were born.

1) Wittenberger: raid.

Abraham determined the time before he had a child. Read Jeremiah chapter 30 and 31 and you will find God lamenting as if he were a weeping mother that his people of Babylon are in misery, even before they came into misery, regardless of their sin, because of which they were to be driven into misery.

How could he in this misery so miserably forget or omit his promise, or make himself so strange, since they have no sin to speak of, and yet this promise of Messiah is the most glorious and powerful, to which all other prophecy, promise and the whole law is directed, that the other promises (as in Egypt, in the desert, at Babylon) are to be esteemed quite insignificant compared to this main promise of Messiah? Has God so firmly held on to the lesser promises there and then, and so warmly comforted the people in small miseries, determined time, shown Himself to be their faithful God with personalities and benefits and with all kinds of ways, and cared for them without ceasing: how is it possible? how is it believable? How does it make sense that in this terrible, long, great misery he should so completely fail to keep his glorious promise, which he made to David, "that his throne should remain eternal and firm", as David boasts in his last words in the 7th chapter of the 2nd book of Samuel, v. 13, and many more writings of the prophets, as Isaiah's, Jeremiah's, also do?

35 The Jews may say of sins, therefore they suffer what they will, for they lie; so God promised and swore not to their sin nor righteousness, but to David an everlasting throne. And even if he would not keep it for the Jews because of their sin, which they do not call sin, he would not lie to David or fail to keep it, to whom he had promised it, as he also sings in Psalm 89:3, v. 4, 5. Since David's throne now lies destroyed for fifteen hundred years, which, says God, shall not be destroyed nor fall, it is irrefutable that Messiah must have come fifteen hundred years ago,

2) Wittenberger: the minor. Jonas: *minoribus*.

3) In the editions, according to the Vulgate: in the "88th Psalm",

and the throne of his father David and possess it forever; or God would have to have become a liar in his most glorious promise for the sake of wicked people and disobedient Jews. God did not want this, nor will He ever want this; but the Jews lie to God, and deceive themselves, that they blame God: He did not keep David faithful, nor faith, because He did not send the Messiah, in whatever way they would like, and as they pretend 1) and portray it to Him.

(36) Such an argument I know indeed, that, where there are still sensible Jews, must move them, even the hardened, nevertheless, push them a little; for they can muster nothing lasting against it. If they are not moved or pushed, we have nevertheless confirmed our faith that their idle lies and false talk can do us no harm. And if they do not speak to you properly on this argument, but flutter off to the side on other theidings, as they are wont to do, let them go and depart; for you can tell by this that they deal in theidings and lies.

The other, 2)

37) If you write that the Jews boast that their law shall remain forever, and we Gentiles must become Jews, you should answer: First, if it is true that the Messiah has come, then they themselves know that their law is over; for Moses alone shall last until Messiah, as he says Deut. 18:15, that they should hear the prophet whom God will raise up after him. And such a saying also goes among their own teachers: *Cum venerit Sanctus Sanctorum, cessabit unctio vestra*, that is, when the Holy One of all saints comes, your anointing will cease. Anointing means the priesthood and kingdom, instituted by Moses upon them and among them. For Messiah shall establish a new and better thing for the people of Israel and the See of David.

38 Secondly. How does it rhyme that their law should last forever, when it is now five-

1) Wittenberger: paint.

2) Here the Wittenberg edition has the heading: "Das ander Theil. Whether Moses' law should remain forever."

ten hundred years, both with priesthood, temple, principality and worship, lies in ashes? I mean yes, that is, the law ceases, for they cannot keep Mosiah's anointing or laws apart from the land and Jerusalem, as they cannot deny and well know. And surely God would not have let such a law fall nor lie so long, where he would have kept it forever for and for. Therefore you shall say to them, that they themselves first begin to keep Mosiah's laws and become Jews. (For they are no longer Jews, because they do not keep their law.) When they have done this, we will quickly follow, and become Jews also. But they must have begun fifteen hundred years ago, when they were still in the land and in Jerusalem, when they still had temple, priesthood, and government, and must have remained there, or must have done so, so that it would not have fallen or ceased for fifteen hundred years, and thus would not have lost its eternity, and even now would not have become so miserably un-Jews and without Moses.

39 Or if they have neglected to do this and have not done so, let them still go into the land and go to Jerusalem and build a temple, a priesthood and a principality, and establish Moses with his law, so that they themselves may become Jews and possess the land. When this is done, they shall soon follow us, and shall become Jews also. If they do not do this, it is utterly ridiculous that they should try to persuade us Gentiles to keep their law, which has now been rotten for fifteen hundred years and is no longer a law; and we should keep what they themselves cannot keep or keep as long as they do not have Jerusalem and the land. But if they let them dream that they will keep it by and by, when Messiah comes, we will remain free in the meantime, and will not believe in their dream until it comes true.

40 From this, my dear friend, you should understand how the Jews deal with lame, lazy jokes, that their Mosiah's law should remain forever, when it has now lapsed for fifteen hundred years and has not remained, and they do not yet know how long it should remain. But we, Christians, know that it shall remain forever.

and is completely abolished by Messiah, even among the true Jews and David's descendants; but not among us Gentiles, to whom such a law of Moses was never given, commanded or imposed. For since God Himself has let it fall for fifteen hundred years, it is good to reckon that He has left it out of consideration, and no longer inquires about the obedience or service of this law; otherwise He would not have let it fall, or at least have determined the time, and assured and written with new promises, and with prophets and people, how long He would have let it fall (as said above about other things), which He has not done. Therefore the law of Moses is finished, and not an everlasting law has been established, but an everlasting law has been left.

41. But that the Jews fight with the word Leolam, when Moses says: Such and such laws, which he gives them, they shall keep Leolam, that is, forever, they themselves, the peelers, know very well that it is a pure alfenzen to ape the unlearned in the Hebrew language. Because before me or one, which understands also a little Hebrew, they would not be allowed to pretend such Alfenzen, they wanted to joke then, or cause a laughter. Moses himself writes in Ex 21, 5. f., that if a servant, after he has served, does not want to leave his master, but remains forever, the master of the house shall pierce his ear to the post of the door with an awl (as a sign that he wants to remain in the house forever), and shall remain the master's servant forever. Here the Jews know well that neither lord, servant nor house remain forever, but must die, pass away, and everything be changed: nor is it called here Moses Leolam, that is, forever; which they themselves interpret: for and for, and without certain end with the children of men. Such examples are probably more in the Scriptures of the Leolam.

42 But if I were Moses, I would give a good shilling to my disciples the Jews. For I would say, "I have often used not only Leolam, but also these words: Ledorotham, Bevothechem, Ledorothchem, Moschvothechem, that is, as long as you last or remain.

in your dwellings, which cannot be understood otherwise than: it shall be kept by you forever, as long as you tarry or remain in your dwellings. Now they have been driven out of their dwellings, that is, out of the land of their dwellings, for fifteen hundred years, and have not remained the people whom Moses made them, and have had no dwelling place of their own for fifteen hundred years, nor any promise, nor any appointed time, how long they should be in misery and uncertainty without their dwelling place. Therefore Moses took good care of himself, because he did not want his foundation and law to be eternal any longer than his people would remain and keep their dwelling place; therefore, for this reason, Leolam cannot be called eternal, as it is otherwise called, where it is freely called eternal, without qualification, as God's promises are, and he himself is also.

43 Thus we Germans also use the word "eternal" when we say, "Shall I suffer or do these things forever? that is, as long as I live. And under the papacy, many perpetual endowments are established for the dead, that is, as long as it can last. And feudal estates are conferred hereditarily and forever, that is, as long as the estates and heirs remain or last. But where God, who is truly eternal, speaks of eternal things without qualification, there it is also the truly eternal thing; for he is able to make it eternal, like David's throne, Messiah and the eternal blessing that it brought to us lost people. For it changeth not, as the dwellings of the Jews, or the fiefs of the Gentiles, which change as a garment is changed, Ps. 102:27.

44 For this reason the Scripture separates the human leolam or eternal from the divine leolam in such a way that it adds a non, that is, it should not become different. As when Daniel, in the 6th, v. 26, says of Messiah, "His power is eternal, which passeth not away, and his kingdom hath no end." Here the word "eternal" is written; but in order that it be understood not as a human but as a divine "eternal," it is accompanied by the non, not passing away, no end. As also David Ps. 110, 4. prophesies of the eternal priest, Messiah: "God has sworn," that would have been enough of such a Lord's oath; but so that it would not be a temporal oath, it would not be a human oath.

And if this priest is to be eternal, that he is not eternal in a Mosaic or human way, but that there is no end, and that he is truly eternal.

And Isaiah in the 9th chapter, v. 7, where he also speaks of Messiah (as the Jews like to confess): "His reign will be great, and there will be no end of peace on the throne of David and his kingdom" 2c. Here the prophet does not let it be enough that Messiah, the Prince of Peace (as he calls him). Kingdom become great, but "there shall be no end of peace"; as if he wanted to say: He shall not only be eternal, but also unhindered eternal. And who knows (for I am not highly learned in Hebrew) whether the closed meme [x], which in this place shows the Hebrews a great deal of knot, as they think, means just this, that this Messiah's kingdom should be so eternally great; that it is not an open meme, which would like to be temporally eternal, but a closed meme, since nothing else should now come to pass, but which must be truly eternal.

46 But if the Jews here pretend to keep the law of Moses, even until now, as with circumcision; item, that they do not eat some fish and flesh 2c. is not yet fallen because of this; nothing is said. For we speak of the whole law of Moses, which they are bound to keep; especially the right great parts and bodies, as of the priesthood, principality, temple, worship, Jerusalem, and all the land, upon which the law of Moses proceedeth, and which it hath instituted. For whoever wants to keep Mosi's law must keep it completely, or his keeping is nothing, especially in the main parts, and is just as if I asked about the pot, and they wanted to show me the broken pieces or small pieces of the shattered pot. As also Isaiah in the 30th chapter, v. 14, needs such a likeness against them, that they should become like a shattered pot 1) to such small pieces that one may not find a shard of it to make fire or to draw water.

47 So here too we ask: where is the whole law of the priesthood, the temple, the city?

If the people of the country, and how a people should sit in the regiment, remained? then they show us their shattered pieces and small pieces from eating fish and meat 2c. Where 2) has a city or country ever been destroyed, from which slag, lumps 3) and pieces have not been found? Where does a house burn so completely that one would not find pieces, lime, stones, fires, nails, iron, glass, which remains in the ashes? Now if I asked about the house, and someone showed me a fire or two, or nails in the ashes, to persuade me that it was the house, then I asked: Dear, with what eyes should I look at him? Either I would have to take him for a mischievous boy, who mocked me on such a question; or, if I considered him to be without understanding, I would say: Oh, dear friend, such pieces may well indicate that there was a house here, but it is gone and no longer here.

(48) So the Jews, with the rest of their broken pieces and the dross from eating fish and meat, 2c. show us that they had the law of Moses, but it is no longer there, because the house, the government, the land, the city, the temple, and the whole right head and body of the law has been taken away and destroyed fifteen hundred years ago. If then they will not believe that their law is temporal and not eternal, let them take hold of it, as their land, Jerusalem, temple, Moshi's pen and laws are rent asunder, and they also are destroyed and scattered; let them call it an eternal thing. But we see that it has fallen fifteen hundred years, has ceased and come to an end, and will never rise again. For there is no prophet, no promise, that prophesies that it shall come again, as it was at Babylon and in Egypt; therefore the hope of the Jews is lost, because it has no foundation in the word of God.

49.⁴⁾ Thus circumcision is not the law of Moses, but was given to Abraham long before; as our Lord also testifies in John 7, v. 22: "Circumcision is not from Moses, but from the fathers," as the Jews cannot deny. Nor is it

1) In the issues: Pots. Jonas: *lagna*.

2) Wittenberger: How.

3) Grumpen----crumbs, lumps.

4) Here the Wittenberg edition has the superscription: "Of circumcision."

eternal, but had not existed before Abraham, and all was directed to the future Messiah, Abraham's seed; the same they should have heard. And circumcision is no further than to Abraham and his seed. For there are many examples in Scripture that God has accepted great kings and nations among the Gentiles, who are not compelled to be circumcised, much less to follow some of the laws of Moses. First of all, King Pharaoh and his princes and priests, no doubt also many of his people, who learned from Joseph to know the right God, as the 105th Psalm, v. 22, testifies of him, "so that he instructed his (the king's) princes in his own way, and taught his elders wisdom," and thus the Egyptians came to know God through Joseph, and yet were not burdened with circumcision, because they were not Abraham's seed; much less with Mosiah's law, which was not yet given.

50 After this Jonah was sent to Nineveh to preach repentance to them, and the text says: "The king with his princes and people have accepted faith in God and have become 1) devout, so that God will be gracious to them and turn away their punishment. These Ninevites came to grace even without circumcision and Mosiah's law, and received it through their faith and works. This is clearly shown by the prophet Jonah.

51 Thus also the wicked king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar, was so strongly converted by Daniel's preaching and God's punishment that he had a public sermon preached in his name and commanded that the God of Israel should be considered the right God, he would also be the right God [Dan. 4, 31. f.]. Behold, this king will also be a believer in God and devout, no doubt many others with him in his kingdom: yet he will not be circumcised and will not be bound by any law of Moses, which Daniel would not have failed to point out and interpret to him, if he had not known that Mosiah's law was placed on the Jews alone, and circumcision on Abraham and his seed alone, until the right Master, Messiah, came from his tribe.

52. after that the king Darms and Cores in Persia became believers just by the same Daniel and other Jews, who have indicated to him the prophecy of Isaiah at the 45th Cap. V. 1. ff. that God would call the same king Cores by name, and also his own king or anointed one, and that he would gloriously proclaim that he should build his city Jerusalem for him and that he should release his people full of Babylon 2c. As he did, and publicly proclaimed his confession through his country, as God of heaven had commanded him 2c., 2 Chron. 36, 23. and Ezra 1, 2. and yet he is not circumcised, nor forced under the law of Moses, nor anyone in his kingdom of Persia; which Daniel and his assistants would not have allowed to happen, where they considered the law of Moses and the circumcision of the tabernacles necessary to interpret to the Gentiles, who were not Abraham's seed nor Moses' people. For if they had been necessary to keep them, such kings would not have learned enough from Daniel, nor would they have become true believers in God, nor would they have been saved; that would have been Daniel's fault.

(53) So Job, his household and friends were abundantly gifted with the knowledge of God and the faith, and were not circumcised nor forced under the Law of Moses. And there will have been many more of these people in the countries around, as Hiram, the king of Tyre in the time of Solomon, and others, who are not mentioned in the Scriptures, but nevertheless believed in the true God of Abraham, and thus were saved. And it is a wonder to see how Moses, through so many laws, is completely silent about circumcision, after the exodus from Egypt, when his law is concerned, and drives much less law upon the Jews, his people, so vehemently and to excess; as if he should say: Circumcision is not my law. For even in Exodus 12:43 ff, when he speaks of the strangers who want to eat the paschal lamb with the Jews, he says nothing more, except that no one should eat the paschal lamb uncircumcised, but does not force the strangers, either to eat the paschal lamb or to be circumcised, unless they want to keep the paschal lamb. Therefore it is a new thing that the Jews have *proselytes*, fellow Jews, from the Gentiles.

1) "are" is missing in the Wittenberger.

and called circumcision. Moses does not force the Gentiles to any of his laws without their will, because he alone is given to the people, led out of Egypt, as a prophet until Messiah, who should become prophet, master and lord of all the world.

54. Because the circumcision and Moses' law was not necessary to put on the kings and Gentiles in Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia and others 1) much more, who believed in the God of Abraham and were saved, uncircumcised and without the law of Moses, just at the time when it was highest and the people sat in regiment in Jerusalem and in the land: how then should we Gentiles owe zero to keep their circumcision and law, which is now forfeited, and they themselves cannot keep, because they have lost land, city, regiment, and all that Moses instituted, and have no promise that they shall ever get it again? From all this you can see how the Jews are afflicted with blindness, that they pretend to us Gentiles such unspoken lies and folly of their law, how it should be eternal and to be interpreted to all Gentiles, if it is fallen, and yet abandoned by God without all prophecy, finally and eternally; even before it was written, it never went further than it was given by God, except to Moses' people when he brought them out of Egypt, and to Abraham's seed until Messiah.

55: Now here you shall bring again for a conclusion the saying of Jeremiah Cap. 31:31, 32: "The days are coming, says God, when I will make a vain new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not like the covenant I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand and brought them out of Egypt, which they did not keep, and I had to force them, says the LORD. 2c. This saying causes the Jews great distress, because they wonder and struggle how to make their first covenant eternal; yet the text here clearly and brightly says that it should not be eternal, but that it should become another, new covenant. Let them now here 2) gau-

1) In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlangen edition: "ändern". In the Wittenberg and Jena editions: "ander".
2) Jenaer: hin. Jonas: hic.

They may do as they please, but that their law may be renewed in Messiah's day, and be kept by all. Jeremiah does not say that the old covenant should be renewed, but that it should not be the same covenant that they received through Moses in the exodus from Egypt; it should not be that, but a different and new covenant. Now it is well known what covenant Moses made with them at that time; so it is also well known what it means that it shall not be the old covenant; for "not to be" does not mean to renew the old, but to put away the old and establish another new. You must stand firm on this saying, and give no heed to their talk, which they invent out of their heads. For it is said that it shall not be the old, former covenant, nor shall it be renewed; it shall be another, new covenant, and God will have the first covenant no more.

56. Now let us consider whom we should believe more cheaply: the faithful, true God, or the false, lying Jews? God says: Moses' covenant shall not be eternal, but shall end at Messiah's time; the Jews say: it shall be eternal and never end. So God must always be a liar with the Jews, and they still want to be surprised, 4) that they suffer such horrible misery, want to be right, and God shall be wrong.

57 But if they shall flutter here, and so blaspheme: If your JEsus himself said, "He is not come to abolish the law, neither one tittle, nor one letter," 2c., ye shall say, that they abide in the saying of Jeremiah, and give a right thorough answer. For since they believe not our JEsu, they can have no help with him; they shall answer Jeremiah, or resist him, with good appearance and thorough understanding. So it is also a lie, that they bring in our Jesus, that he spoke of the law of Moses, when he says: "The law shall not pass away" [Luc. 16, 17.], because our Lord Christ there speaks nothing, neither of the circumcision nor of the law of Moses or of the pen, as everybody can read, but

3) Wittenberger: by. Jonas: per.

4) So the Wittenbergers. Jenaer, Walch and Erlanger: "still astonish".

the ten commandments. And how should they leave our books unaltered and unpolluted, if all their study is nothing else than to pollute their own prophets and holy scriptures with lies and false poetry? But as for what our Lord Christ says about fulfilling the law, there is neither time nor space to act on it here; so the Jews cannot understand it either, and we would get away from the matter. The Christians should act on such words of Christ, because they understand it and know it well, praise God, what it is.

58.¹⁾ Lastly, we will also speak of the Ten Commandments, for the Jews may also call the Ten Commandments the Law of Moses, because it was given on Mount Sinai, when they were all Jews, or Abraham's children 2c. Here you shall answer: If the Ten Commandments are to be called the Law of Moses 2), then Moses was much too slow in coming, and also took far too few people before him, because the Ten Commandments went not only before Moses, but also before Abraham and all the patriarchs, and also over the whole world. For though Moses never came, nor Abraham born, yet the ten commandments should have reigned in all men from the beginning; as they did, and still do.

(59) For all creatures rightly take God for God and honor His name, just as the angels in heaven do. So we also, all who are men, owe to hear his word, to obey father and mother, not to kill, not to commit adultery, not to steal, not to bear false witness, not to covet our neighbor's house or his own; which all the Gentiles bear witness to in their scriptures, laws and rulings (as you can see before your eyes), yet nothing of the circumcision nor of Moses' laws, which he gave to the Jews in the land of Canaan, is found in them.

(60) But this Moses did before all other writers, in that he revealed by his histories the beginning of all creatures, and how death came into the whole world by Adam's fall or sin; and after that, being a peculiar man in the sight of all other nations, he was the first to write.

1) Here the Wittenberg edition has the superscription: "Of the Ten Commandments."

2) "Law" is missing in the Wittenberg.

When God wants to make law and people (as he was commanded to do), he first introduces God himself, who as a common God of all nations gives the ten common commandments himself, also orally to this special people, which were previously planted in the hearts of all men with the creation, and decorates them finely in his time to his laws, also more orderly and finer than anyone else could order. The circumcision and Mose's law, however, were not planted in the hearts of men, but were first put on their people by Abraham and Moses.

For we and all Gentiles must also keep the first commandment, that we have no other gods apart from the one God, as well as the Jews. But the part, so that he decorates this commandment and shows it only to the Jews, namely: "He who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of Dieus", we Gentiles do not have to and cannot use. For if I were to come before God and say: O Lord God, who brought me out of Egypt, out of your misery, 2c., I would come like a pig to the Jewish school, for God has not done such a work on me; therefore God would punish me as a liar, or I would have to make a fictitious God out of Him. Nor must I say and keep all the other things in the first commandment; I may also say: You are my God, the God of us all, and at the same time Creator, who indeed led the children of Israel out of Egypt, but not me, but led me out of my Egypt and my misery. So the first commandment remains common to both Jews and Gentiles. But the Jews are especially adorned and attracted with the exodus from Egypt, as each one according to his misery can and should call and praise the common God his God and helper.

62 I must make an analogy: If a prince or head of a household wanted to establish order in his country or house, and did so because God had helped him out of a great need, and wanted to show gratitude for it, as perhaps Naaman the Syrian did or could do; he would also begin to teach first of all about God, how one should worship him alone, 4) and how one should be grateful to him.

3) Wittenberger: ins. Jonas: *hominum*.

4) Jenaer: should.

as the right God, who can and will help all who trust and believe in him, regardless of the people; as the first commandment teaches, and also makes no distinction, but says: God punishes or helps all who hate or love him 2c. After that, the same prince or head of household continues with his national or household order.

(63) Therefore, the prince would not have imposed his national order on all other countries to which such help had not been given, nor would he have had the power to interpret it, even though he had first commanded to worship and honor the right God of all countries. In the same way, Moses, when he is to order his people, redeemed from Egypt, 1) first has God himself give his Ten Commandments, which are due to all the world; then he gives his people (but by God's command) his special national order, which is none of the business of other peoples. And just as Moses' people are obligated to obey his order, because God commanded them to do so, so also every country and house is obligated to keep the order of its ruler and master. For these are also the commands of God, who established all the regiments of the world.

64 Thus the third commandment of the Sabbath, which the Jews insist upon, is in itself a commandment common to all the world; but the ornamentation, that Moses may adorn it and appropriate it to his people, is laid upon no one but the Jews in particular; even as in the first commandment no one but the Jews in particular shall believe and confess that the common God of all the world brought them out of Egypt. For the actual meaning of the third commandment is that we should teach and hear the word of God during the day, so that we may sanctify both the day and ourselves. Just as Moses and the prophets were read and preached among the Jews on the Sabbath day from that time until this day. But where God's word is preached, it is necessary to celebrate and be quiet at the same hour or time, and to speak and listen to what God says and teaches us or speaks to us without any other business.

1) Wittenberger: his redeemed people from Egypt 2c.

65) Therefore, it is also entirely 2) due to the fact that one should sanctify the day, more than to the celebration. For God does not say, "You shall keep the holy day, or make it a Sabbath"; that is found in itself; but rather, "You shall keep the holiday or Sabbath holy, so that it is much more important to Him to keep it holy than to keep it holy. And if one thing should or could remain, it would be better that the celebration than the holy should remain, because the commandment is mostly concerned with the holy, and does not give the Sabbath for its own sake, but for the sake of the holy. The Jews, however, value the celebration, which God and Moses do not do, more highly for their own sake than for the sake of the sacred.

66) The fact that Moses calls the seventh day, and how God created the world in six days, so that they should work nothing, is a temporal decoration, so that Moses may show this commandment to his people especially at that time. For this was not written before, neither from Abraham nor from the times of the fathers of old, but is a temporal addition and decoration, placed only on this people brought out of Egypt, which was not to remain forever, any more than the whole Law of Moses. But the sanctification, that is, teaching and preaching God's word, which is the right, true and pure opinion of this commandment, has existed from the beginning and remains forever with all the world. Therefore the seventh day is of no concern to us Gentiles, nor is it of any concern to the Jews themselves any longer than until Messiah; although nature and necessity compel that whichever day or hour God's word is preached, that there, as I have said, one must be silent, celebrate, or keep the Sabbath. For God's word cannot be heard or taught if one is thinking of something else or is not silent.

67 Therefore also Isaiah Cap. 66, 23. speaks, that such a seventh day, or ornament of Moses, as I call it, shall cease in Messiah's time, when the right Holy One and God's word shall come abundantly: "It shall be," he speaks, "one Sabbath on another, a new moon on another," that is, it shall be a Sabbath only and no special seventh day, or

2) Wittenbergers...completely.

six days between them; for the Holy One, or God's Word, will go daily and abundantly, and all days will become Sabbaths.

68 But what the Jews say about this, and how they treat this text of Isaiah, I know very well; but I cannot now put it all into this letter, which I intend to do against the Jews, who so shamefully tear and pervert the prophets. But no Jew (that I may be brief) will tell me how it is possible that all flesh worships before the Lord at Jerusalem, all the moons and all the Sabbaths; as yet the text, most sharply and exactly translated according to their opinion, gives, because some men or flesh dwell so far from Jerusalem; that they may not come thither in twenty, thirty, a hundred Sabbaths, and they themselves, the Jews, have not worshipped at Jerusalem now fifteen hundred years, that is, twelve times fifteen hundred months (I will be silent of the Sabbaths). But now I cannot do it all in letter way.

69) So also of the first commandment's piece and ornament: "He who brought you out of the land of Egypt," Jeremiah also says in chapter 23, v. 5: "Behold, the time is coming, says the Lord, that I will establish for David a plant of righteousness, and he shall be a king who shall rule well, and establish justice and righteousness in the earth. 2c. And immediately afterwards v. 7. 8: "Behold, the time cometh, that it shall no more be said: As the LORD liveth, which brought up the children of Israel 1) out of the land of Egypt; but as the LORD liveth, which brought forth the seed of the house of Israel (note that it is not the whole house of Israel, but a seed thereof that is mentioned here), and brought them out of the land of the north, and out of all the countries whither I had driven them, that they should dwell in their own land."

Now in this saying there are many beautiful things to be dealt with; but, lest we come to the full of the matter, the Jews are at one with us (where they hold their old doctrine), that Jeremiah here speaks of the Messiah's time. Then he speaks out boldly that at the same time this piece, given in the first commandment of Moses, should be written on

1) "Israel" is missing in the German editions, except Walch. It is in the Latin.

when he says, "He who brought you out of Egypt." For there is the text that one should no longer swear by the GOD who brought them out of Egypt; but by the GOD who gathered them from all countries to the plant of David. If this part of the first commandment does not go further than Messiah, then Moses' law is not eternal, but ceases in Messiah and remains only the law of the ten commandments, which existed before Moses from the beginning of the world and among all the Gentiles, that one should have no more than one God, 2c., and thus, because of the ten commandments, there is no difference at all between Jews and Gentiles. For "God is not only the God of the Jews, but also the God of the Gentiles", as St. Paul says [Rom. 3, 29], and the 2) examples of the kings of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia 2c. prove above.

Item 71: In the fourth commandment, we Gentiles cannot say the part, "That thou mayest live long in the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee," and yet all must keep the first part, namely, "Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother. For Moses, or rather God Himself, is speaking here to the people of Israel, whom He leads out of Egypt into the land of Canaan, and also means in this commandment the same land' Canaan, which He gave them at that time, that they should live long in it and have good days, where they kept the fourth commandment, of the obedience of parents, and again here the common commandment, implanted in all Gentiles, is especially adorned and attracted to the Jews with the land of Canaan. But we Gentiles cannot say, nor believe, that God can suffer us to be brought out of Egypt or into the land of Canaan, where we shall prosper if we honor our father and mother, but must let it remain in the common mind that God wants to give each one happiness and salvation in his own land, who honors father and mother, as we also see that the lands and dominions, even the houses and hereditary estates, change or remain so strangely, according to which one has been obedient or disobedient, and has never been found to be otherwise, except that this is not the case.

2) Jenaer: "in the example ... proved." Jonas: *exempla ostendunt*.

well goes, nor good death dies, which dishonors father and mother.

(72) Therefore this fourth commandment cannot be eternal, that is, according to the blindness of the Jews, be put upon us Gentiles, that we should have the land of Canaan and live well in it, when they themselves must live outside the same land for fifteen hundred years in all unhappiness, as they despised, profaned and persecuted their fathers and prophets, and have not yet ceased to persecute them; therefore the punishment also does not cease. For they will not have the Messiah whom their fathers and prophets proclaimed and prophesied and commanded and commanded to receive, and remain disobedient children to their fathers.

(73) This is what I want to say about the ninth and tenth commandments, which forbid coveting another's wife and house. For with the Jews the letter of divorce had to be a right, which cannot be with us Gentiles; much less the treachery and intrigue to steal away one's wife and house, which with the Jews has been a great will of courage; as the prophet Malachias laments 2c. [Mal. 2, 14. ff.]

74 And so that I may find an end to this letter, I hope, my dear friend, that you have at least so much that you can protect yourselves against the Sabbath keepers and remain pure in your Christian faith. If you cannot convert the Jews, think that you are no better than all the prophets, who are always strangled and persecuted by this wicked people, for the sole glory of being called Abraham's seed. Although they know how many desperate, lost boys are still among themselves, that they would like to realize that something more is needed than to be Abraham's seed, where one wants to be God's child. Thus the law of Moses does not help them, because they have never kept it, as shown above in the 31st chapter of Jeremiah, where God Himself says and complains, but such disobedience helps them much more. 2) To this end, they still keep it today.

1) Wittenberger: that. Jonas: *hoc*.

2) So the Wittenbergers; "enthelfen" - to deprive of help. In the Jena edition (probably a misprint): "enthilft". In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlangen: "enthülft". Jonas did not translate this sentence.

They themselves do not, nor can they, as long as Jerusalem does not become the Jews' royal seat and priesthood.

75 Thus it is known, and they also confess it in part, that they no longer understand the law of Moses itself, especially in the third book and more places; how then can they keep it if they were at Jerusalem right now? And summa, because these fifteen hundred years in misery (since no end is yet certain nor can be) do not humble the Jews nor bring them to knowledge, you may despair of them with a good conscience. For it is impossible that God should let His people, if they were, remain so long without consolation and prophecy; He has never done it before, and also promised that He would do nothing without prior prophecy; as Amos [Cap. 3, v. 7] says: "God does nothing, He reveals it first to His prophets." For all states, all regiments, all works of men must go, stand and come to pass in the word of God, - that His people may know how they are to be with Him, how they are to do, what they are to suffer, what they are to wait for. He has done so from the beginning and continues to do so forever.

Because God did not do this to the Jews fifteen hundred years ago, and still lets them remain in misery forever, and neither speaks nor prophesies anything to them, it is obvious that He has abandoned them, and they may no longer be God's people, and the right Lord, Messiah, must have come fifteen hundred years ago. What more sin can there be for such an abominable plague and silence of God, than that they have not accepted and still do not accept the right seed of Abraham and David, the dear Lord Messiah? Did they, after all, before the misery of Babylon, commit much more horrible sins with the murder of prophets 2c. than they can report afterwards, and yet it is nothing that they have to suffer such misery for fifteen hundred years because of unconscious sin, which they cannot name, when they have not had to suffer for more than seventy years because of much more public, horrible, murderous, idolatrous sin?

3) So all the issues. Maybe: from?

Consolation unslept: if here in this misery not a fly with a wing hisses to them for consolation. If this does not mean abandoned by God, then the devil may also boast that he is not yet abandoned by God.

(77) For according to the reckoning, their present misery under the Roman Empire has lasted longer than their previous existence and rule in the land of Canaan. Calculate, whoever wants, from the exodus from Egypt to the last destruction of Jerusalem, since they are now inside, there are fifteen hundred and ten years. Not much less years have they now been in misery, and will last much longer, because neither until then nor henceforth have they had prophets nor wisdom.

have a statement as to when it should come to an end. But how can it be credible that God should leave his people longer out of regiment than in regiment; longer out of law, temple, worship, Jerusalem, priesthood, principality, lands, than they have been in?

This letter has grown under my hand, that I truly do not provide it myself, because the pen had to run so; because I have more thoughts of this matter, neither I could have brought so running into the pen. Please, take it well this time, because the matter is much too big that it should be put into a letter. Hiemit GOtt befiehlt, Amen.

51 D. Mart. Luther's writing about the Jews and their lies. *)

Written in 1542; issued in early 1543.

I had resolved to write nothing more either about the Jews or against them; but because I have learned that the wretched, hopeless people do not cease to lure us, that is, the Christians, to themselves, I have let this booklet go out, so that I may be found among those who have resisted such poisonous activity of the Jews and have warned the Christians to beware of the Jews. I would not have thought that a Christian should allow himself to be fooled by the Jews, to step into their misery and sorrow. But the devil is the god of the world; and where God's word is not, he has made good, not only with the weak, but also with the strong. God help us, amen.

Preface. 1)

1. grace and peace in the Lord. Dear Lord and good friend! I have received a writing in which a Jew is conversing with a Christian, who takes it upon himself to pervert the sayings of the Scriptures (which we have for our faith, concerning our Lord Christ and Mary his mother), and to interpret them far differently, that he may think to overthrow the foundation of our faith.

002 To this I give you and to him this answer; It is not my purpose to quarrel with the Jews, or to be displeased with them.

1) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and the Jena.

*This writing, which Luther still wrote in 1542, was published at the beginning of 1543 by Hans Luft in Wittenberg under the title: "Von den Juden und ihren Lügen. D. M. Luth." and soon after under the same title with the addition: "Printed for the other time and done more with it." In 1544 and 1613 this writing was printed again in Frankfurt. In the collections: Wittenberger (1556), vol. V, p. 454; Jenaer (1562), vol. VIII, p. 49; Altenburger, vol. VIII, p. 208; Leipziger, vol. XI, p. 544 and Erlanger, vol. 32, p. 99. All collective editions provide the text of the enlarged edition. What is "more to it" in the same is limited to a few, about a dozen sentences. Justus Jonas translated this writing into Latin. This translation is found in the Latin Wittenberg edition, Tom. VII, col. 166. We give the text according to the Erlangen edition, which brings the second above original print, comparing the Wittenberg and the Jena, also the Latin,

learn how they interpret or understand the Scriptures; I know all this well beforehand. Much less do I deal with it, that I want to convert the Jews; because that is impossible. And the two excellent men, Lyra and Burgensis, described to us a hundred and two hundred years ago, among others, the Jews' impolite interpretations faithfully, and they have truly published them. It still does not help with the Jews everywhere, and they have become worse and worse.

(3) Also, because they have become so hard and sluggish 1) that they do not want to get out of the terrible plague, that they are now over fourteen hundred years in misery, and still cannot attain an end or a definite time by such vehement eternal calling and crying out to God (as they think); if (I say) the blows do not help, then it is good to reckon that our talking and interpreting will help much less. Therefore be content as a Christian, and do not quarrel with the Jews, but if you must or want to speak to them, speak no more than this:

4 Do you hear, Jew, do you also know that Jerusalem and your dominion, together with the temple and the priesthood, have now been destroyed over 1460 years? For this year, when we Christians write of the birth of Christ in 1542,2) it is just 1468 years, and so we are entering the 1500th year that Vespasianus and Titus destroyed Jerusalem and drove the Jews out of it. With this nut let the Jews bite and argue as long as they want.

For such cruel wrath of God shows all too well that they must surely err and go wrong; such a child may well grasp. For it is not necessary to think so cruelly of God, that he should have his own people so long, so cruelly, so unmercifully

1) i.e. indifferent to blows.

2) Jenaer: "1542" and immediately following: "1468"; likewise § 153 and § 154, only that there by a printing error (in § 153) "1568" and (in § 155) "1586" stands. In the Wittenberg "1543" and "1469"; in § 153 by the same misprint "1569". In the Erlangen edition, the numbers of the Wittenberg edition are found here, but in § 153 and § 154, those of the Jena edition; but instead of "1586", "1568" is set. - Luther assumes that Jerusalem was destroyed in the 74th year after the birth of Christ. Cf. Chronicon Lutheri, Wittenberg edition, vol. 12, p. 437b.

punish and be silent about it, comfort neither with words nor with works, tune neither time nor end. Who would believe in such a God, hope in him or love him? Therefore this wrathful work, that the Jews, certainly rejected by God, are no longer his people, he is also no longer their God; and goes according to the saying of Hosea in the 1st, v. 9: "LoAmmi; you are not my people; so I am not your God." Yes, it goes to them, alas, thus, and all too much and terribly. They may interpret as they like, so we see the work before our eyes; that does not suit us.

And if there were a spark of reason or understanding in them, they would truly have to think to themselves: Oh Lord God, it does not stand and go right with us, the misery is too great, too long, too hard, God has forgotten us 2c. I am not a Jew, but I seriously do not like to think of such cruel wrath of God against this people; for I am afraid that it will go through my life and limb. What will become of the eternal wrath in hell against false Christians and all unbelievers? Well, the Jews may hold our Lord JEsu for what they will, we see that [it] goes so, as he says Luc. 21, 20. 22. 23.: "When you see Jerusalem besieged with an army, then notice that her desolation has come. For these are the days of vengeance, and there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people."

7. summa, as I said, do not dispute much with Jews about the articles of our faith; they have been brought up from youth with poison and resentment against our Lord, so that there is no hope until they come to the point where their misery finally wears them down and forces them to confess that Messiah has come and is our Jesus; otherwise it is much too early, even in vain, to dispute with them how God is threefold, God is man, Mary is God's mother. For no reason nor human heart allows such a thing, how much less such a bitter, poisonous, blind heart of the Jews! What God Himself does not improve with such cruel blows, we will leave unimproved with words and works (as said). Moses could not make Pharaoh better neither with plagues, nor with miracles, nor with supplications,

He had to let him drown in the sea [Ex 14:28].

(8) So now, to strengthen our faith, let us deal with the Jews in some gross folly in their faith and interpretation of the Scriptures, because they so poisonously blaspheme our faith; if it comes to the correction of any Jew, that he may be ashamed, it is all the better. We do not speak now to the Jews, but of the Jews and of their doings, that our Germans may also know.

The first reason and glory of the Jews against the Christians, that they are Abraham's seed. 1)

(9) They have a reason, they insist on it and defy it out of measure, that is, they are born from the highest people on earth, from Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebecca, Jacob, and from the twelve patriarchs, and so on from the holy people of Israel, as St. Paul also confesses Romans 9:5. Paul Rom. 9, 5. also confesses, and says: *Quorum patres*, that is: They are from the fathers, from whom Christ 2c.; and he himself, Christ, Joh. 4, 22.: "To the Jews comes salvation." Hence they boast themselves the noblest, yea, noblest alone on earth. We "goyim", Gentiles, are not men in their eyes, but hardly worthy to be esteemed by them. For we are not of high and noble blood, tribe, birth and origin. This is an argument, and one of their defiance and glory, truly in my opinion the noblest and strongest.

Therefore God must suffer in their schools, prayers, songs, teachings and whole life, then they come and stand before him and plague him (that I speak thus humanly of God) quite well, then he must hear how they boast, and praise God that he has set them apart from the Gentiles, and let them be born of the holy fathers, and chosen them to be his own holy people 2c. And there is no measure nor end to the boasting of blood and bodily birth from the fathers.

(11) To the end that their frenzied, mad and foolish nonsense is perfect, they praise and thank God first of all for the fact that they have made men...

The first is that they are created men and not animals; the second is that they are Israel and not Gentiles; the third is that they are created men and not women. Such folly they have not from Israel, but from the goyim. For so the histories write that the Greek Plato did such praise and thanksgiving daily to God; otherwise such hope and blasphemy shall be called praise to God. For he also praised his gods for these three things, that he was a man and not a beast, a man and not a woman, a Greek and not an un-Greek or Barbarian; this is a fool's glory and a blasphemer's thanks. 2) Just as the whales let themselves think that they alone are men, all the world is vain unmen, ducks or mice against them.

Now no one can take away the glory of the blood and tribe of Israel. In the Old Testament they lost many a battle in war over it (no Jew understands this); all the prophets chastised them for it (for it is a hopeful, carnal presumption, without spirit and faith), but were also murdered and persecuted over it. St. John Baptist punished them severely for it, saying, "Only do not boast that you are Abraham's seed: 'I tell you, God is able to make children out of these stones of Abraham' [Matth. 3, 9.], and did not call them children of Israel, but serpent spawn. O, that was too close to the noble blood and tribe of Israel, and said he had the devil. So our Lord also calls them serpent-breeders; item John 8:39, 44: "If you are Abraham's children, do Abraham's works; you are the devil's children, he is your father." This they could not suffer, that they should not be Abraham's children, but the devil's; even as they cannot yet suffer it. For if they should deliver up this glory and ground, all their things that are written upon it should fall, and be changed.

013 And I hold that if their Messiah (whom they hope) should come, and take up this their cause and their glory, they should

2) The meaning of this will probably be: This is the thanks of a man, who is a Barbarus in relation to God, that is, a blasphemer. - For the matter compare the "Interpretation of the First Book of Moses", Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. I, 312, § 64.

1) This superscription is in the Wittenberg edition, and the first sentence of it also in the Jena edition.

They would crucify and blaspheme seven times worse than they have done to ours, and would also say that he is not the true Messiah, but a false devil. For they have pictured their Messiah with themselves, so that he should strengthen and exalt such carnal, hopeful conceit from the nobility of blood and tribe, that is, so much so that he should help them blaspheme God and scornfully despise his creatures, even the women, who are also men and images of God, as well as we, and our flesh and blood, mother, sister, daughter, housewives 2c., because they (according to the above-mentioned triple praise) do not consider Sarah (as a woman) as noble as Abraham (as a man). Perhaps they want to honor themselves by the fact that they are half noble, as born of a noble father, and half ignoble, as born of an ignoble mother. But let the foolishness and the smokiness go.

Laying such ground and fame from because of their nobility and blood. 1)

We want to speak of such a reason and glory, and prove conclusively (not to the Jews, for they did not suffer it from Moses, nor from their Messiah himself, as has been said) before God and the world that such a reason is completely void and condemned, and take Moses, Genesis 17:14, which they should believe if they were true Israelites. Since God instituted circumcision, He speaks among other words thus: "Whose child is not circumcised, his soul shall be cut off from his people. With these words, God condemns everything born of flesh, no matter how noble, high or low-born it may be, for He does not exclude Abraham's own seed, which was not only noble and high-born from Noah, but was also pronounced holy, Genesis 15:6. 15. 6. and now Abram became Abraham, Gen. 17, 5. Nor shall any of his children be counted among God's people, but shall be called cut off, that God will not be his God, unless it is also circumcised by birth and taken into the covenant of God.

1) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

. (15) In the sight of the world it is true that one man is nobler than another by reason of his birth, just as one is wiser than another by reason of his reason, one is stronger and more beautiful than another by reason of his body, one is richer and more powerful than another by reason of his goods, and one is better than another by reason of his virtue. For this miserable, sinful, deadly life must have such differences and inequalities, and cannot do without them for the body's need and to maintain the regiments. But to come before God and boast that it is so noble, high and rich in the sight of other men is a devilish hope; yet before Him all birth according to the flesh is condemned at the same time in the aforementioned saying, where His covenant and word does not come to the rescue again, and makes a new, different birth, and thus separates it from the old, first birth. If then the Jews in their prayer before God boast and boast that they are the noble blood, tribe and children of the holy fathers, for which reason he should look upon them and be gracious to them, but condemn the Gentiles as the ignoble and not of their blood: Dear, what will such a prayer obtain? If the Jews were as holy as their fathers, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob themselves, yes, if they were angels in heaven, they would be plunged into the abyss of hell for the sake of such prayer, let alone be brought back to Jerusalem from their misery.

(16) For what does such a devilishly hopeful prayer do other than to prove God false in His word, when He says, "What is born and not circumcised shall not only be base and worthless, but also condemned and not of my people, and I will not be sem-God. Against this the Jews rage with their blasphemous prayer, as if they wanted to say: No, no, O Lord God, this is not true, but you must hear us, because we are born of noble blood of the holy fathers and because of such noble birth set us over all the world as lords and in heaven, or you do not keep your word and do us wrong, because you swore to our fathers to have their seed as your people forever. Just as with us Christians a king, prince, lord,

rich, beautiful, wise, pious, virtuous man wanted to pray before God thus: Lord God, behold how great a king and lord I am; behold how rich, wise and pious I am; behold how beautiful a man or woman I am in the sight of others, and be gracious to me, help me and make me blessed for these things. For other people are not worthy, because they are not so beautiful, rich, wise, pious, noble and highborn as I am. What should such a prayer deserve? It would deserve thunder and lightning to strike from heaven above, and brimstone and hellish fire to strike from below; that would also be right; for flesh and blood shall not boast before God, or, as Moses says, what is born, even of holy fathers and of Abraham himself, shall be condemned before God, and shall not boast of God, as St. Paul, Romans 3:27, John 3:6 also say.

17 The Pharisee in our Gospel also prayed such a prayer, boasting of his good deeds. "I am not like other people" [Luc. 18, 11.], and his prayer was decorated in such a way that he did it with thanksgiving, and made himself believe that he was God's son in his bosom; nor did the thunder and lightning strike him from heaven into the abyss of hell, as Christ there judges in v. 14 and says: "Let that tax collector be just, and this one condemned. Oh, what will we poor filthy sacks, maggots, stink and filth before Him who is God and Creator of heaven and earth, who made us from filth and from nothing, and because of our nature, birth and being, we are still filth and nothing before His eyes, without which His grace and abundant mercy will let us be and have us.

18. Abraham, who was nobler than the Jews, namely, as said, born of the noblest patriarch Noah, who was then the supreme and oldest lord, priest and father of the whole world, together with the other nine following patriarchs, all of whom Abraham saw, heard and lived with, some of whom also survived Abraham long after (as Shem, Salah, Eber), that Abraham certainly lacked nothing in the nobility of blood or birth: nor did it help him that he should be numbered among God's people, but

He has become idolatrous and would have remained damned if God's word had not called him; as Joshua says Cap. 24, 2. from the mouth of God: "Your fathers once lived beyond the water, Thara, Abraham's 1) and Nahor's father, and served other gods; but I brought your father Abraham over" 2c.

19. after that, having been called and sanctified by the word of God and his faith, Gen 15:6, nor does he boast of his birth or virtue when he speaks to God, Gen 18:27. He does not say, "Behold, how noble I am born of Noah and of the holy fathers, and of thy holy people; nor how holy and righteous I am toward other people; but thus saith he, "O Lord, I speak unto thee, though I be ashes and ashes." Yes, this is how a creature should talk to its Creator, and not forget what it is and is esteemed before Him. For so he said of Adam, and of all his children, Genesis 3:19: "Thou art ashes or ashes, and shalt return to the ground," as death convinces us of all these things with a mighty experience before our eyes, if it should otherwise help against the loose, vain, sorrowful hope.

20. Now behold how fine the children of Abrahah the Jews are, how well they have taken after their father, yes, how fine a people of God they are, before whom they boast of their fleshly birth and [of] noble blood of the fathers, and despise all other people, when in all this he holds them as much as dung and ashes and damned birth as all other Gentiles; nor shall God be their liar, they must 2) be right, and with such blasphemous, damned prayer want to rob God of His grace and have Jerusalem again.

21) Furthermore, if the Jews were seven times more blind (if it is possible), they will have to see that Esau or Edom is as noble by birth as Jacob, because he is not only the son of the same father Isaac and Rebekah mother 3), but also the firstborn son, which firstborn is the highest nobility at that time among the

1) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers; Erlanger: "Abrahams Vater".

2) Wittenberger: mügen.

3) i.e. of the same mother, Rebekah, son.

other children was. What did the same birth, even the first birth, do for him, so that he was far more noble than Jacob? Nevertheless he is not counted among God's people, since he was called Abraham his grandfather, Sarah his grandmother, as well as Jacob, and, as I said, much more than Jacob; again, Abraham himself and Sarah had to consider him for their nephew, Isaac, his son, and Rebekah's son, in addition for the first and noblest son, but Jacob for the least. Here tell me, what did the bodily birth or nobility of blood from Abraham help?

22 And if one would pretend here that Esau had become evil, therefore he would have lost the honor 2c. To this is answered first of all: We are now talking about whether the birth of the blood itself is valid before God, so that one can be or become God's people through it? If it is not valid, why do the Jews praise it so highly before other children of men? but if it is valid, why does God not hold over it, so that it does not fail? For if God considers bodily birth sufficient for those to be His people who are born of holy fathers, He should not let them become wicked, lest He lose His people and become ungodly. But if he lets them become evil, then it is certain that he does not respect the birth, that it should make or bring him a people.

(23) Secondly, Esau was not rejected from among God's people because he became evil afterwards, nor did Jacob come to be counted among God's people because of his good life afterwards; but since they were both still in their mother's womb, they were separated by God's word, Jacob being called and Esau not, according to the saying, "The greater shall be under the lesser" (Rom. 9:12). And it did or did not help that they were both under one mother's heart, nourished with the same milk and blood by the same one mother Rebekah, and were born of her at the same time; so that it must be said that flesh, blood, milk, womb, mother, be they all the same, could not benefit Esau, nor hinder Jacob from the grace of becoming God's children or people,

But the word and the calling, if birth respects nothing, separates all things here.

(24) So Ishmael can also say that he is still the true natural son of Abraham, but what does the physical birth help him here? He must still leave the house and inheritance of Abraham to Isaac, his brother. Say: Ishmael is of Agar, Isaac of Sarah; this does no more than strengthen our cause. For that Isaac was born of Sarah was of God's word, and not of flesh and blood, because Sarah, now obsolete, could not of course bear children; yet, speaking of birth, Ishmael is Abraham's flesh and blood and natural son: nor does such holy father's blood and flesh help him anything, but harms him, because he has nothing more than flesh and blood of Abraham, and not in addition also God's word, and prevents Isaac nothing, that he comes from the blood of Abraham, which in Ishmael is nothing, because he has God's word, which separates him from his brother Ishmael, who is nevertheless of the same Abraham's flesh and blood.

(25) And what shall we say much? I want to be as noble (in the eyes of God) as no Jew, yes, even as noble as Abraham himself, as David, as all the holy prophets and apostles; I do not want to thank them for considering me as noble (in the eyes of God) as themselves. And if God does not consider my nobility and birth as good as Isaac's, Abraham's, David's and all the saints', then I will say that he does me wrong and is not a right judge. For I will not be deprived of this, nor will Abraham, David, the prophets, the apostles, nor any angel in heaven, deprive me of boasting that Noah was my right natural grandfather (by bodily birth or flesh and blood), and that his wife (who she was) was my right natural grandmother; for we are all descended from the one Noah, after the flood; from Cain we did not come, which lineage in the flood, and very much from fathers, brothers-in-law, friends of Noah, all finally destroyed.

26°. Item, I boast that Japheth, the firstborn son of Noah, is also my rightful son.

He is my natural grandfather and his wife (whoever she was) is my natural grandmother. For we Gentiles are all descended from him, as Moses says, Gen 10:5. And so Shem, the other son of Noah, with all his descendants, has nothing to claim against his older brother Japheth by birth. Yes, where birth is to apply, then Japheth with his descendants, as the firstborn son and right heir, has to plead against Shem, his younger brother, together with his descendants, who are called Jews or Ishmaelites, or Edomites. Now what does the bodily firstborn help good Japheth and our grandfather? Nothing everywhere. Shem keeps the precedence; not because of the birth (otherwise it would have to be Japheth), but that about the birth God's word and calling is here divorced.

(27) So I will count from the beginning of the world how we are all descended from Adam and Eve, then from Seth, Enos, Kenan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech; for they are our grandfathers as well as the Jews, and all come from them with the same honor, nobility and glory as the Jews, and are their flesh and blood as well as Abraham with all his seed. For we have been in the same holy fathers' loins as they, just as well as they, and there is no difference of birth or flesh and blood here, as all reason must say. Because of this, the blind Jews are gross fools, and neither are the Gentiles more senseless, that they praise their bodily birth so highly before God, when they are nothing better than all the Gentiles, because we are all of the same birth, flesh and blood, according to the very first, best, holiest grandfathers, and neither can reproach the other with something special, nor move it up, which does not also affect him.

28 But that we come from here. David, who throws us all finely and mightily into one heap, Psalm 51:7, where he speaks:

"Behold, I was conceived in sins, and my mother bore me in sins" 2c. Go now, whether you are a Jew or a Gentile, born of Adam or Abraham, of Enoch or David, and boast before God of your beautiful nobility, your high tribe, your ancient lineage; here you will find that we are all carried and born in sins, of father and of mother, excluding no one who is called a man. But what does "born in sins" mean other than born in God's wrath and condemnation, that by nature or birth we cannot be God's people or children, and our birth, fame and nobility, honor and prize is not, nor can be, other than that we (where there will be no more than bodily birth) are badly condemned sinners, God's enemies and in all disgraces? There you, Jew, have your glory, and we Gentiles as well with you as you with us. Now pray more that God will look upon your nobility, tribe, flesh and blood.

29 But I have said this to strengthen our faith, because the Jews will not let them take away this hope and glory of their nobility and blood, as it was said above, they are obdurate; but ours must beware of them, lest they be deceived by the obdurate, condemned people (who punish God with lies, proudly despising all the world). For the Jews would very much like to draw us Christians to their faith, and do so wherever they can. And if God is to have mercy on them, the Jews, they must first remove such blasphemous prayers and songs of their glory and hope from their schools and from their hearts and mouths; for such prayers continually increase and heap up God's wrath upon them. But they will not do this, no matter how deeply they humble themselves, without what individual persons may do, whom God will especially show and deliver from their horrible ruin.

The other reason and glory of the Jews against the Christians is circumcision. 3)

(30) The other glory and nobility, that the Jews rise up and make all men proud and noble.

3) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

1) Wittenberger: blind. Also Jonas is missing here: "blind".

2) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer, Walch and Erlanger: "bessers". Jonas: meliores.

(34) Why do the Jews lie so shamefully in their prayers and sermons before God, as if circumcision were theirs alone, by which they must be set apart from all other peoples and be the holy people of God? They should be a little ashamed (where they could be ashamed) before the Ishmaelites, Edomites, and other more peoples, if they remembered that they are always a small group and

2) In the Wittenberg missing: are.

were scarcely a handful of people compared with other nations, who, being Abraham's seed and circumcised, undoubtedly inherited their father Abraham's commandment to their descendants; but the circumcision

inherited by the one son Isaac is very small compared with the circumcision inherited by the other sons. For it is written that Ishmael son of Abraham became a great nation, begotten of twelve princes. Item, the six sons of Kethurah, Gen. 25, 16, possessed much greater lands than Israel, who undoubtedly kept the circumcision of their fathers afterward.

35 Since circumcision is common to so many peoples from Abraham (whose seed they all are, as well as Isaac and Jacob) according to the commandment of God, Gen 17:10, and in which there is no difference between them and the children of Israel, what do the Jews do when they praise and thank God in their prayers that He has separated them from all peoples through circumcision, sanctified them, and made them His own people? This is what they do, they blaspheme and punish God in His commandment and words, who says Genesis 17, circumcision shall not be commanded to Isaac and his descendants alone, but to all the seed of Abraham, and admits to the Jews (because of circumcision) no separation against Ishmael, Edom, Midian, Ephah, Ephraim 2c. which are told Genesis 25, 4. They are all circumcised and heirs of circumcision, as well as Israel.

036 Now what profit is it to Ishmael that he is circumcised? How does it help Edom that he is circumcised, who was also born of Isaac, who was separated, and not of Ishmael? How does it help Midian and his brothers, born of Kethurah, that they are circumcised? Yet they are not God's people because neither birth from Abraham's blood nor circumcision helps them. If circumcision does not help these to be God's people, how can it help the Jews? Because one kind of circumcision, commanded by one kind of God, from one kind of father, blood and flesh or origin, is common to all.

Ulld

There is sincere equality here, and no distinction or inequality between them all, as far as circumcision and birth

37. Therefore, it is not a clever nor masterful, but a crude, foolish, foolish lie, when the Jews boast of their circumcision before God, as if God should look upon them for it and be gracious to them, when they should reasonably know from the Scriptures, that they alone are not circumcised according to God's command, and therefore cannot be a special people of God, but something more, different and greater must belong to them, since the Ishmaelites, Edomites, Midianites: and other Abrahamic seeds may take no less comfort in this glory, even before God Himself. For they are like them in all respects, that is, in birth and circumcision, as has been said.

38 But whether the Jews would pretend that the Ishmaelites and Edomites 2c. did not keep the circumcision as perfect as the Jews, who, in addition to cutting off the foreskin of the child, tear off the skin of its tail with sharp fingernails, 2) as one reads in their books, and thereby hurt the child beyond measure, without and above God's command, so that the father, who should rejoice in the circumcision, stands there and hears the child crying, his eyes go over, and passes through the heart. To this it is well to reply that such an addition was invented by themselves, yes, inspired by the wicked devil, against God's commandment, since Moses says, Deut. 4, 2. and 12, 32: "Thou shalt neither add nor subtract from the words of the Lord." And with such devilish additions they corrupt their circumcision, so that before God no people keeps the circumcision less than they themselves, because they hang and practice their damned addition against God's word with such free disobedience.

Now let us see what Moses himself thinks of circumcision. Deut. 10, 16. He thus says: "Circumcise the foreskin of your heart, and do not be stiff-necked" 2c. What is this, dear Moses? Shall it not be enough that they are circumcised bodily? Are they

1) Wittenberger: sanctify. Jonas: *in populum elegerit*.

2) In the old editions: "Fingernegelin".

But they are set apart by holy circumcision and are a holy people of God before all nations? and you rebuke them stiff-necked against God, nullifying their holy circumcision and desecrating the holy circumcised people of God. Thou shouldst speak these things in their synagogues: if they had not stones, they would cast thee out into the land with mire and earth, if thou wert worth ten Moses.

40. he also scolds them, Deut. 26, 41: "Until their uncircumcised heart is ashamed" 2c. Go on, Moses, do you know to whom you are speaking? You are talking to a noble, chosen, holy, circumcised people of God; and you may say that they have uncircumcised hearts? that is much worse than if they had sevenfold uncircumcised flesh. For an uncircumcised heart cannot have God, and the circumcision of the flesh is of no avail. But a circumcised heart alone can make a people of God, if bodily circumcision is not there, or cannot be there, as the children of Israel were in the wilderness forty years.

41 Jeremiah also rebukes them in Cap. 4:4: "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and remove the foreskin of your heart, O men of Judah and citizens of Jerusalem, lest my wrath go out like a fire that no one can quench." O Jeremiah, you shameful heretic, you deceiver and false prophet, may you say to the holy circumcised people of God that they should circumcise themselves to the LORD? Do you think that they are circumcised in the flesh before the devil? just as if God did not think anything of their holy bodily circumcision. Thou darest the wrath of God upon them as an everlasting fire, if they do not circumcise their hearts, when they do not remember such circumcision of the heart in their prayers, nor praise or thank God for it with any letter. And you make their holy circumcision of the body so utterly unfit that it is also guilty of the eternal wrath of God and eternal fire? I advise you not to come to her school, all the devils should tear you apart and devour you.

Item Jer. 6, 10: "Their ears are uncircumcised and cannot hear. So, dear Jeremiah, do it roughly and uncleanly enough with the noble, chosen, holy, circumcised people of God. Shall you say,

that such holy people have uncircumcised ears? and, what is even worse, that they cannot hear? What is this said, for so much: they are not God's people? For whoever cannot hear God or His word, nor suffer, is not God's people. If he is not God's people, he is the devil's people, and helps neither circumcision, nor shingling, nor scraping. Stop, for God's sake, Jeremiah! Shall you despise and condemn the holy circumcision so horribly that you set apart the chosen, circumcised, holy people full of God and hand them over to the devil as the exiled and damned? Praise God that He has set them apart by circumcision, both from the devil and from all nations, and made them His own holy people. O that is *blasphemavit*, crucify, crucify him!

43 Jeremiah Cap. 9:25, 26: "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will visit all, whether circumcised or foreskin, even Egypt, Judah, Edom, the children of Ammon, Moab, and all that dwell in the east of the wilderness. For all the Gentiles have uncircumcised foreskin, but all the house of Israel have uncircumcised heart" 2c.

44. Where is the hopeful glory of circumcision, by which the Jews want to be a separate people and holy before other Gentiles? Here God's word pushes them into one heap with the Gentiles and uncircumcised, and wants to punish them at the same time. Name the best part, the noble royal tribe of Judah, and then the whole house of Israel. And the most serious of all, he says, "The Gentiles are uncircumcised according to the flesh, but Judah, Edom and Israel, who are circumcised according to the flesh, are much worse than the Gentiles, because they have an uncircumcised heart, which is much worse than having uncircumcised flesh, as was said above.

(45) These and similar sayings make it clear that the Jews' pride and glory in circumcision against the uncircumcised Gentiles is nothing, and deserves nothing but wrath in the sight of God, since it alone exists. They have (he says) an uncircumcised heart. The Jews, however, do not respect such a foreskin of the heart, but nevertheless think that God should reject their arrogant circumcision.

in the flesh, and to hear and behold the glory of it against all the Gentiles who cannot boast of circumcision. Do not the blind wretched people see that in these sayings God so clearly and brightly judges their uncircumcised heart, and thus condemns their fleshly circumcision, with their glory and prayer. They continue to do so, like the nonsensical, and make the foreskin of their heart thicker the longer with such arrogant glory before God and contempt of all other peoples, and want to be badly God's people alone through such vain hopeful circumcision of the flesh, until their heart's foreskin has become thicker than an iron mountain, which can no longer hear, see, or feel their own revealed scripture, which they read daily with blind eyes, on which such thick skin has grown, as no oak bark is.

(46) If God is to hear and accept their prayer and praise, they must indeed first remove such blasphemous, shameful, false, lying praise and arrogance from their schools, mouths and hearts; otherwise they do nothing but make their thing worse and worse and arouse God's wrath against them. For he who wants to pray before God must not come forward with arrogance and lies, praising himself alone and despising all others, wanting only to be called God's people, cursing all the others, 1) as they do. David says Psalm 5:6, 7: "Thou art not a god to whom wickedness pleases; he that is wicked abideth not before thee. The glorious do not stand before your eyes. Thou art hostile to all evildoers; thou destroyest liars. The Lord hath abhorred of the bloodthirsty and the false," but so it is said (as there follows v. 8.), "I will enter into thy house upon thy great goodness, and worship against thy holy temple in thy 2) fear."

(47) This psalm applies to all people, whether circumcised or not, especially to the Jews, to whom it was primarily given and made (as well as to all other Scriptures), and is also masterfully depicted in it above all other Gentiles. For it is they who

They have always been godless, have practiced idolatry, false doctrine and have had uncircumcised hearts, as Moses himself and all the prophets cry out and complain about them; nevertheless, they have always wanted to please God and have slain all the prophets over it. They are the wicked, stiff-necked people, who have not let themselves be converted from evil to good works by any preaching, reproaching, or teaching of the prophets; as the Scriptures testify everywhere; yet they want to be God's servants and stand before Him. They are the glory preachers, the hopeful pranksters, who to this day can do nothing more than boast of their tribe and blood, praise themselves alone, and despise and curse all the world in their schools, prayers and teachings; nor do they think they can stand before God's eyes as the dearest children.

(48) They are the true liars and bloodhounds, who have not only perverted and falsified the whole of Scripture with their lying glosses, from the beginning until now, without ceasing. And all the anxious sighing and longing and hoping of their hearts is that one day they would deal with us Gentiles as they dealt with the Gentiles in Persia at the time of Esther. [Oh how they love the book of Esther, which is so finely tuned to their bloodthirsty, vengeful, murderous desire and hope: no more bloodthirsty and vengeful people has the sun ever shone upon than those who let themselves think that they are therefore God's people, that they should and must murder and strangle the heathen. And the most noble thing they expect from their Messiah is that he should murder and kill the whole world by their sword, as they proved in the beginning to us Christians all over the world, and would still like to do, where they could, have tried it often, and have been beaten on the snouts.

49. but (of which perhaps hereafter) we return to their false lying boast of circumcision: they know well, the shameful liars, that they are not God's people alone, even if they had circumcision alone before all peoples, even that the foreskin does not prevent them from being God's people; nor do they wilfully come before God, lying and boasting of being God's people alone through bodily circumcision, notwithstanding

1) Wittenberger: despise. Jonas: *excretur*.

2) Wittenberger: der. Jonas: *tu*.

of the heart circumcision; for against it stand mighty examples of the Scriptures. First of all Job, whom they bring from Nahor, to whom and to his heirs God did not impose circumcision, nor does his book indicate that very few of the great saints in Israel were like him and his people. And [2 Kings 5:17] Naaman of Syria, even through the prophet Elishaeum, was not made to be circumcised, yet he became holy and God's child, no doubt many with him.

50. item, there stands the whole prophet Jonah, who converts Nineveh to God and preserves it, with kings, princes, lords, lands and people, and yet not circumcised. Thus Daniel converted the great kings and countries of Babylon and Persia, as Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrum, Darium 2c., and yet they remained Gentiles, uncircumcised, and did not become Jews. As also before Joseph teaches the king Pharaon, his princes and people, as the Psalm 105, 22. 1) testifies, and let them nevertheless uncircumcised. This, I say, is what the desperate, hardened liars know, nor do they exalt circumcision as if no one could be God's people who is not circumcised. And they cause heartache when they deceive a Christian into being circumcised, and then come before God and boast in their prayers (as if it were deliciously well done) that they have brought us to be God's people through circumcision; they disgrace, despise and curse the foreskin as an ugly abomination that will not let us be God's people, but their circumcision alone will do it.

(51) What then shall God do to such prayer and praise of theirs, which they bring forth with such gross blasphemous lies, contrary to all Scripture (as heard)? Yes, he will hear them and bring them back to the land. So I mean, if they were in heaven, only such glory, prayer, praise and lies of the circumcision should plunge them into the abyss of the hell of the moment. But I have also written about this against the Sabbath keepers 3).

Therefore, dear Christian, beware of such damned people, whom God has let sink into such deep abominations and lies that it must all be vain lies, blasphemy and wickedness with them, whatever they do and speak, however good it may be.

52.⁴⁾ And sayest thou, What is the use of circumcision? or, Why hath God commanded it so severely? Answer: Let the Jews take care of it, what do we Gentiles ask for it? It is not imposed on us, as you have heard, nor are we allowed to follow it anywhere, but we can still be God's people, like those in Nineveh, in Babylon, in Persia, in Egypt. So no one can prove that God ever commanded a prophet or a Jew to circumcise the Gentiles. Therefore, let them leave us satisfied with their lies and idolatry, and since they want to be so clever and wise as to master and circumcise us Gentiles, let them first say why circumcision, or why God commanded it so harshly? They are obliged to do so, but they will do so when they return to Jerusalem, that is, when the devil goes to heaven. For they say that God commanded it, that by it one should become holy, blessed and God's people: you have heard that this is a shameful lie, because Moses and all the prophets say that their circumcision (because they were uncircumcised) did not help them, to whom it was commanded; how then should it help us, to whom it is not commanded?

But we Christians, speaking for ourselves, know well for what it was given, or for what it was used. But no Jew knows about it, and if you talk to him right away, it is like talking to a block or a stone. They do not let go of their glory and arrogance, that is, of their lies; they must be right, God must be their liar and be wrong; therefore let them always go and lie, as their fathers did from the beginning. But St. Paul teaches us Rom. 3, 1. 2. thus: that circumcision is not useful nor given, that it alone, as such a work done, makes holy or blessed, or that it is not given for the purpose of making a man holy.

1) Here the Erlangen edition again reprinted Walch's false Bible quotation "Ps. 105, 23.", in addition to twenty-seven others which are found in this writing.

2) "her" is missing in the Wittenberger.

3) No. 50 in this volume.

4) Wittenberger: Thus speak.

He says: "Circumcision has been made almost useful, so that God's word is entrusted to it. This is it, this is it, this is it, that circumcision was given and established for this purpose, that God's word and his promise should be kept and preserved in it, so that not the circumcision as a work in itself should be useful or enough, but that those who have it should be connected with such a sign, covenant or sacrament to obey and believe God in his words, and 1) to inherit all this to their descendants.

But if this *causa finalis*, or cause of circumcision, would no longer exist, then circumcision (as a mere work) would no longer be valid or useful, especially if the Jews would attach another *causam finalem*, or cause, to it. This is also stated in the text of Moses, Gen. 17, 8: "I will be their God," and they shall have such a sign on their flesh. This is just as much as St. Paul says: Circumcision is for the purpose of hearing or keeping God's word. For where His word is not heard nor kept, He is certainly no longer our God, since in this life we must take hold of and have God through the word alone. In His bright majesty, He cannot suffer nor endure this miserable life, as He says in Exodus 33:20: "No man can see Me and live."

(55) How the Jews have held such causes or final opinion of circumcision, all Scripture shows with innumerable examples. For as often as God wanted to speak to them through the prophets, whether it was about the Ten Commandments in which He punished them, or about the promise of future help, they were always hardened, or, as the sayings of Moses and Jeremiah above testify, they were uncircumcised in heart and ear. They wanted to do right and well, the prophets (that is, God Himself, whose word they preached) must have done wrong and evil, they beat them.

They have never let any go unpursued or undamned, except for a few in the time of David, Ezekiel and Josiah; otherwise nothing else has happened throughout the whole reign of the people of Israel and Judah, except to blaspheme God's word, to persecute, to mock, and to strangle prophets, so that, according to the histories, such a people must be called vain murderers of prophets and enemies of God's word; no one who reads the Bible can judge otherwise.

56. now God had (as said) not given the circumcision, nor accepted them thereby to the people, that they should persecute his word and his prophets, mock, murder, and thereby do right and God a service, but, as Moses says in the text of the circumcision 1 Mos. 17, 11. That they should hear God and his word; that is, they should let him be their God, if not, then the circumcision itself should not help them, as the now not God's circumcision, because it argued without God and against his word, would have become a mere man's work, because he had bound himself or his word to the circumcision. Where the two are separated from each other, the circumcision remains a hollow shell or numb husk, since there is no kernel or nut in it.

57. will give you a likeness of us Christians: God has given us baptism and the sacrament of his body and blood, and the keys of this final opinion or *causa finali*, that we should hear his word in it and practice faith in it (that is, he wants to be our God through it, and we should be his people through it). Now behold, what have we to accomplish? We have gone and separated the Word and faith from the Sacrament (that is, God and His final opinion) and made it a mere *opus legis* (or, as they, the papists, call it, *opus operatum*), badly a mere human work, which the priests offered to God and the laity performed as a work of obedience, as often as they received it. What remains of the Sacrament? Only the empty shell and lifeless ceremony, *opus vanum*, since there is nothing divine left inside, yes, a horrible abomination, by which we turn God's truth into lies and worship the right calf Aaron.

That is why God has delivered us into all kinds of terrible blindness and countless false teachings, as well as Mahomet and Pabst, along with all the devils, have come upon us.

(58) It was the same with the people of Israel. They have always separated circumcision as an *opus operatum*, their own work, from the word of God, and persecuted all the prophets through whom God wanted to speak to them (according to the appointed circumcision), and yet they always proudly boasted that they were God's people because of the circumcision. So they clash with each other: God wants them to hear him and to keep the circumcision right and whole; they do not want to do that, but they want God to look at their work of circumcision, that is, the half-circumcision (yes, the shell of the circumcision). He will not do that either; so the longer they go on, the further they get away from each other, and it is impossible to unite or reconcile them.

Now, who will prove God wrong here? Tell me, whoever you are that has reason, whether it is fitting for God to consider the works of those who will not hear His word, or whether He should consider those for His people who will not have Him for their God? According to all justice and equity, God may say that the Psalm sings [Ps. 81, 12. 13.]: "They do not want me, so I let them go"; and Deut. 32, 21.: "They anger me in that which is not God; so I will anger them again in that which is not a people."

60. Just as with us Christians, the papists must no longer be the church, for they do not want to let God be their God, because they do not want to hear his word, but persecute it in the most shameful way; they come here with their empty shells, sheep and chaff, hold mass and their ceremonies; God shall then look upon them, and hold them for his right church, and not consider that they do not hold him for the right God, that is, he shall not speak to them through his preachers, his word shall be heresy, devil and all calamity. Yes, he will do that, as they will learn, much worse than the Jews have learned.

61 From this it is well understood that circumcision has been almost useful and good,

as St. Paul says; yes, not for their own sake, but for the sake of the word of God; for we consider it certain, and it is the truth, that the little children, on the eighth day of circumcision, have become children of God, as the words are written, "I will be their God," for they have attained complete circumcision, the word with its sign, and have not separated them from one another. For God is there, speaking to them, "I will be their God," which completed the circumcision in them. Just as with us the children received the whole, right, complete baptism, the word with the sign, and do not separate it from each other; they receive the kernel in the shell. God is there, who baptizes them and speaks to them, and thereby makes them blessed.

But when we have grown old, the pope comes, and the devil with him, and teaches us to make *opus legis*, or *opus operatum*, separating word and sign from one another, so that we may be saved by our own repentance, work, and satisfaction, and, as St. Peter says in the other epistle in the next chapter, v. 22, "that the sow after the flood rolls again in the dung, and the dog eats again what he has eaten. Thus our sacrament has become a work for us, and is eaten up again by it, which we had spit out. So also the Jews, when they were old, corrupted their good circumcision of the eighth day, and separated the word from the sign, and even made a human or acid work of it, so that they lost God and His word, and now have no more understanding in the Scriptures.

(63) Indeed, God had highly honored them by circumcising them, speaking to them before all the nations of the earth and trusting in His word. And to keep his word with them, he gave them a special land, performed great miracles through them, established kings and reigns, showered them with prophets who not only told them the best of the present time, but also promised the future Messiah, the Savior of the world, for whose sake he proved all these things to them, and told them to wait for him and to be sure of him without delay. For the sake of the same, God was pleased to do everything; for the sake of the same, Abraham was called to be the

He was given circumcision, and the people of Israel so highly exalted, that all the world might know from what nation, country, time, even tribe, family, city, person he should come, that he might not be reproached by devils and men as coming from a dark corner or unknown ancestors, but his ancestors must be great arch-fathers, glorious kings, excellent prophets who testify of him.

(64) But as the Jews (except a few) have kept such promises and prophets, it is said above that they have never been able to suffer a prophet, and have always persecuted God's word for and for, and will not hear God; as all the prophets complain and cry out against them. And as their fathers did, so they still do today, and 1) will never do otherwise. For if even now Isaiah, Jeremiah and other prophets should come among them and preach what they preached at that time, or say that the Jews' present circumcision and hope in the Messiah is nothing, they would just as soon die at their hands as they died at that time. Look at whoever has reason (Christian reason will remain silent), how they so wantonly turn and torture the books of the prophets with their desperate glosses against their own conscience (of which we might want to touch something hereafter). For although they can no longer stone and kill the prophets bodily or personally, they still torture them spiritually, tearing, choking, and slaying their beautiful sayings, which must grieve and hurt a human heart, because one must see how they are so completely handed over to the devil to possess through God's wrath. Summa: They are a prophet-murdering people; if they can no longer murder the living, they must still murder and torture the dead.

After that, when they have scourged God in His word, 2) crucified, spit upon, blasphemed and cursed, as Isaiah 8:21 prophesies, they come trolling along with their

1) "and" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) In the old editions: zergeischelt. Jonas: *flagellarunt*.

They want to be God's people alone and their own, condemning all the world, and their arrogance and glory should please God, giving a Messiah for it, whom they choose and prefigure for Him. Therefore beware, dear Christian, of such a damned, desperate people, from whom you can learn nothing, but to punish God and His Word with lies, blasphemy, perversion, murdering prophets, and to proudly and arrogantly despise all people on earth, so that even if God would let everything else go to them (which is impossible), he could not suffer such unspeakable (though poor and miserable) arrogance. For he is called a God of the humble, as Isaiah 66:2 says: "On whom will my spirit rest? Only on the humble who fears my word."

(66) Enough has been said about the other false glory of the Jews, namely, about the false, null circumcision, which did not help them at the time when they were punished by Moses and Jeremiah because of their uncircumcised heart; how much less is it of any use now, because it is nothing more than the devil's jugglery, so that he mimics and fools them, just like the Turks! For where God's word is no longer there, there is no more circumcision.

The third reason and glory of the Jews is the Law, given to them by God. 3)

Third, they have great pride that God spoke to them and gave the Law of Moses on Mount Sinai [Ex 19:20]. Here we come to the right place, here 'God must let Himself be rightly tortured, and hear how they praise Him and sing Him to pieces, that He sanctified them with His holy law and set them apart and brought them out of Egypt before all nations. Here we poor goyim stink; oh how nothing we are compared to this holy, chosen, noble and highly praised people, who have God's word! Yes, they say (as I heard myself). Dear, what do you want to say, God Himself spoke to us on the mountain.

3) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

Sinai, and with no other people. Here we have nothing to rebel against; for we cannot deny this glory, because Mosi's books are there, and David, Psalm 147:19, 20, also testifies and says: "He shows Jacob his word, Israel his manners and his statutes. So he does not do to the Gentiles, nor let them know his judgments," and Psalm 103:7: "He has let Mosi know his ways, the children of Israel his doings."

68 And here they say, as at the same time at Mount Sinai, the rulers of the people wore wreaths as a sign that they had contracted a marriage with God through the Law and had become His bride, and had held weddings with one another. It is also seen afterwards in all the prophets that God stands and speaks with the children of Israel as a man with his wife; from this also comes the special service of Baal; for Baal means a householder or householder, Bula a housewife; which word Bula has now also become German, as one says: Mein holder Buhle, and: I must have a paramour, which in former times was honestly called a mead, therefore a companion buhlete to marriage; now it has come into a different sense.

(69) Come now, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and all the prophets, and whoever will, be bold and say that such a noble people, to whom God Himself speaks, even whom He Himself takes in marriage by the Law and unites as to a bride, that they should not be God's people. I mean, he should run and see cream; 1) with teeth (where they had no other weapons) they would tear and bite him in pieces, that he would take such glory, praise and honor from them. It is not to be said nor to be understood, what a stubborn, untamed, desperate arrogance is in the people, by this glory in them grown up, that God Himself has spoken with them; no prophet has been able to arise nor stand against them, Moses himself.

1) The expression: "Ram saw" - to run badly, we meet also in Luther's "small answer to Duke Georgen of Saxony next book", Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XIX, 1875; likewise vol. XIII, 937, § 38. Here it is written in the old editions "Rham". It means the word Ram: waste, dirt, use. Jonas translates: *pulcre excepturi essent eos Judaei*.

But not. For 4 Mos. 16, 3. began Korah, and pretended that they were all holy people of God, why Moses alone wanted to rule and teach? At that time they were only Korahites, not true Israelites. For just as Korah persecuted Moses, so they have never left a prophet alive or unpursued, let alone obeyed him.

(70) And she was found to be a bride in disgrace, even a desperate harlot and a wicked brat, with whom God was always struggling, fighting and beating. If he punished or struck them with his word through the prophets, they struck him on the mouth, and killed his prophets, or bit like a bad dog in the stick, so that they were struck, as Ps. 95, 10. says: "I had forty years trouble with this people, and said, They are people whose heart always wants the wrong way, and will not learn my ways." And Moses himself, Deut. 31, 27. says: "I know your disobedience and stubbornness. Behold, because I am yet alive with you, ye have been disobedient against the LORD; how much more after my death?" And Isaiah 48:4, "I know that thou art hard, and thy neck is a vein of iron, and thy forehead is brass": so henceforth, whosoever will, may read for himself; and the Jews well know how in all the prophets through and through the children of Israel are reproached as a disobedient, wicked people, and the most wicked whore, when they praised very highly the law of Moses, and circumcision, and the blood of the fathers.

(71) Here one would say: Yes, let this be said of the wicked Jews, not of the pious ones, as they are now. Well, I am content this time that they must confess and acknowledge that the wicked Jews cannot be God's people, and that the blood, circumcision and law of Moses do not help them. Why then do they praise circumcision, blood and law, even the most wicked ones as well as the pious ones? And the worse a Jew is, the more trustworthy he is, simply because he is a Jew, that is, of Abraham's seed, circumcised and under the law of Moses. For David and other pious Jews have not been so proud as the present desperate Jews; which, how wicked they are.

Nevertheless, they want to be the noblest lords against us heathens, because of their blood or law, which chides them like the worst harlots and knaves, as the sun shines on them.

(72) Further, if they are the pious Jews, and not the Hurian people, as the prophets say, how is it that their piety is so secret that God Himself cannot know about it, nor they themselves? For they have now prayed, cried out, atoned for almost 1500 years (as I said); yet God will not hear them, when we know from the Scriptures that God will hear the prayer or sighing of the righteous, as the Psalter says [Psalm 145:19.]: "He does what those who fear Him want, and hears their prayer," and Psalm 34:18: "The righteous cry out, and the Lord hears them," as He promised, Psalm 50:15: "Call upon Me in the time of trouble, and I will hear you and save you." And many more of these sayings in the Scriptures. For if they were not, who would or could pray? Summa, he says he will be their God in the first commandment, Deut. 5, 6, 9. How is it that he will not hear these Jews? They must truly be the wicked Huric people, that is, not God's people, and their glory of blood, circumcision and law must be a dung. If there were a few pious Jews among them, who would stand with them, he would have to be heard, for God cannot let His saints pray in vain, as the Scriptures give many examples of. From this it is evident that they must not be the pious Jews, but rather the lost bunch of the Horean and murderous people.

73. Also, such piety (as said) is so secret among themselves that they themselves cannot know about it (what should God know about it?). For they are full of all wickedness, of avarice, envy, hatred among themselves, arrogance, usury, pride, swearing against us Gentiles, so that a Jew would have to have very sharp eyes, if he were to recognize a pious Jew, keep silent, that they should all be God's people, as they boast. For they truly conceal their piety very much under their public vices, and yet want to be God's people all the same, none excluded, Abraham's blood, the circumcision and Moses' people, that is, God's people,

against which the Gentiles should be vile, knowing full well that God cannot suffer such things, neither did He suffer them of the angels: neither shall He hear, nor must He hear, their lies and blasphemies, that they will be His people, because of the law which He gave them, which He spake unto their fathers at Sinai.

74. What shall one say much? If the glory were enough that God should esteem them His people, that He spoke to them and they have His word or commandment, then the devils in hell are much more worthy to be God's people, neither the Jews, nor better neither all men. For the devils have God's word and know much better than the Jews that there is a God who created them, to whom they owe all their might to love, honor, fear, serve, not to take His name in vain, to hear His word on the Sabbath and all hours, not to murder nor to do any evil against His creatures. Now what does it help them that they know and have God's commandment? Rather, let them boast that they are God's special, own, dear angels, while other angels must be nothing. How much better it would be for them if they did not have God's commandment, or did not know it! For if they did not have it, they would not be damned; for this very reason they are damned, because they have His commandment, and yet do not keep it, but go against it without ceasing.

75. Likewise, the murderers and harlots, thieves and husks, and all wicked men, may boast that they are God's holy, special people, because they have His word, and know that they should fear Him and be obedient, love Him and serve Him, honor His name, not murder, not commit adultery, not steal, and not do evil; for if they had not his holy right word, they could not sin; but if they sin and are condemned, it is certain that they have the holy right word of God against which they sin. Let them now boast, as the Jews did, that God sanctified them by His law and chose them to be a peculiar people before all men.

(76) It is the same glory that the Jews boast about in their schools, praising and praising.

thank God that He has sanctified them by His law and made them a nation, knowing full well that they are not full of pride, envy, usury, covetousness and all wickedness, and most of all those who want to be very devout and holy in their prayers. For they are so blind that they not only practice usury, but teach it as a right that God commanded them through Moses, in which, as in all other things, they shamefully lie to God, not having time to speak of it now.

77. But whether they pretend that they are not sanctified by the Ten Commandments, because all nations and devils are obliged to keep them, or must be sanctified and condemned by them, they still have the other laws of Moses besides the Ten Commandments, which are given to them alone, and not to the nations, by which they must be sanctified and set apart above all peoples. Oh Lord God, what a lazy, loose, futile makeshift and subterfuge this is! If the Ten Commandments are not kept, then what is the keeping of the other laws but a mere jiggery-pokery and carnival larvae, yes, quite a mockery, so that God is taken for a fool? Just as if a wicked devil's head were to walk about in our country dressed as a pope, cardinal, bishop, or preacher, keeping all the laws and ways of such persons, and under such spiritual adornment would be a real devil, a wolf, an enemy of the church, a blasphemer, who would trample underfoot, curse, and condemn both the gospel and the ten commandments. O how beautiful a saint this should be before God!

78 Or if a beautiful woman in the world were to come in a little cross, and keep all the ways, rights, and customs of virginity, and were among them a nasty, shameful whore, against the ten commandments, what good would her beautiful obedience do her, that she outwardly led all the rights and ways of virginity? It would help her that one would be seven times more hostile to her than to a free public whore. Thus God has always reproached the children of Israel for being such a wicked whore through the prophets, that under the appearance and adornment of the

The outward laws and holiness have practiced all kinds of idolatry and wickedness, as Hosea especially laments, Cap. 2, 4. 5. ff.

(79) Where a virgin or a woman is pious, it is good that she be honestly and cleanly dressed and adorned, and outwardly modestly dressed; but where she is a harlot, the dresses, ornaments, garments and jewels would be much more honest on a sow lying in the dung, as Solomon says: "A golden braid on the sow's nose is a beautiful foolish woman" (that is, a harlot) [Proverbs 11:22]. Therefore, the glory of the outward laws of Moses, apart from the obedience of the Ten Commandments, is worthy of silence; indeed, it makes them sevenfold more unworthy to be God's people than the Gentiles are. For the outward laws were not given to make a people of God, but to adorn and decorate God's people outwardly, just as the Ten Commandments were not given to be boasted of and proudly despised by all the world, as if they were therefore holy and God's people, but were given to be kept and obeyed, as Moses and all the prophets do most vehemently. Let not him boast who has them (as is said of devils and wicked men), but let him boast who keeps them. But he that hath them, and keepeth them not, let him be ashamed and afraid, as he shall surely be damned thereby.

(80) But this is far too much for the blind, obstinate Jews, and if you were to talk to them about it, it would be like preaching the gospel to a sow. They cannot know what God's commandment is, let alone that they should know how to keep it; for they could not hear Moses, nor look him in the face, he had to put a covering over it [Ex. 34:33]; which covering is still there today, and still do not see Moses' face, that is, his teaching; it is covered for them until this day. So they could not hear God's word on Mount Sinai when He spoke to them, but turned back and said to Moses, "Speak to us, and we will hear and do it; the Lord shall not speak to us, lest we die" [Ex 20:19]. It

is even a high prophetic mind, know what is God's commandment and how to keep it.

Moses understood it well when he said, Ex 34:7: "You are the God who forgives sin, and no one is innocent before you," which means: No one keeps your commandments unless you forgive sin. As David Ps. 32, 1. 2. also testifies: "Blessed is he whose sins are forgiven, and God does not impute sin to him"; and in the same Psalm, v. 6.: "All the saints must pray for their sin" 2c., that is, no saint keeps God's commandment. If the saints do not keep it, how will the wicked, unbelievers, evil ones keep it? Again Ps. 143, 2.: "O Lord God, do not enter into judgment with your servant, for before you no living man is righteous." This is spoken clearly enough, that even the holy servants of God are not righteous before God, if he does not remove his judgment and acts with mercy against them, that is, they do not keep his commandment and are not allowed forgiveness of sins.

82. Now to this belongs a man whom we enjoy in this, who bears our sin for us, as Isaiah 53:6 says: "The Lord has laid on him all our sin. Yes, this means to understand correctly what God's commandments are and how they must be kept, namely, when we know, recognize, and even feel that we have them, and cannot keep them nor keep them, because of which we must be poor sinners and guilty before God, and only by sheer grace and mercy obtain forgiveness of such guilt and disobedience through the man on whom God has laid such sin. 1) We Christians speak and teach about this; the prophets and apostles speak and teach about this. And these are they who were and still are the bride of our Lord God and a pure virgin; and yet they boast of no law nor holiness, as the Jews do in their synagogues, but complain of the law and cry for mercy and forgiveness of sins. But the Jews are as holy as the barefoot monks, who have so much of the rest of holiness that they also help other people to heaven with it, and still keep a supply,

of the same much, much to sell. With all of these, this matter is not to be spoken of, for there blindness and hopefulness is as firm as an iron mountain. They are right; God is wrong. Let them go, and let us stay with those who pray the *Misei*, the 51st Psalm, that is, those who know and understand what is law and what is to keep or not to keep the law.

(83) Now from this, Christian, know what you do when you let the blind Jews deceive you. This is certainly true according to the saying: Where one blind man leads another, they both fall into the pit [Luc. 6, 39]. You can learn nothing more from them than ignorance of divine commandments, and yet boast and be arrogant against all the Gentiles, who are much better than they are before God, because they do not have such arrogance of holiness, and yet do much more of the law than they do, the trustworthy, holy and damned blasphemers and liars.

Therefore beware of the Jews and know where they have their schools, that there is nothing else but a devil's nest, in which vain self-glory, arrogance, lying and blasphemy, desecration of God and men are practiced in the most poisonous and bitter way, as the devils themselves do. And where you see or hear a Jew teaching, think no other than that you hear a poisonous basilisk, which also poisons and kills people with its face. They are given to this by the wrath of God, that they think that their glory, their hope, their lying to God, their cursing all men, is a right and great service of God, which befits and is due to such noble blood of the fathers and the circumcised saints (however evil they feel themselves to be in tangible vices), and they want to do well with it. Beware of them!

The fourth reason and glory of the Jews of the land of Canaan. 2)

85] Fourth, they have the great high glory and hope that they have had the land of Canaan, the city of Jerusalem and the temple of God. Now, although God has brought down such glory and arrogance many times, they have not.

1) Wittenberger: learn and talk. Jonas: *docemus et loquimur*.

2) This heading is found in the Jena and partly also in the Wittenberg edition.

especially by the king of Babylon, who led them away and destroyed everything, as the king of Assyria led away the whole of Israel before and destroyed everything, and finally they have been wiped out and devastated by the Romans, now for more than 1400 years, that they might take hold of how God has not looked at nor will look at land, city, temple, priesthood, nor principality, that He would therefore consider them His own special people; still their iron neck (as Isaiah calls them [48, 4.]) has not been bent, nor has their brazen forehead been shamed, they remain blind as a bat and hardened, immobile, still hoping that God will bring them back home and restore everything.

Now Moses had told them many times, first, that they would not take the land before other nations because of their righteousness, because they were a stiff-necked, wicked, disobedient people; and second, that where they did not keep his commandments, they would soon be driven out 2) and perish. And when he chose the city of Jerusalem, he made it very clear in all the prophets that if they did not keep God's commandment, he would destroy and destroy the city of Jerusalem, his seat and throne. Item, when Solomon had built the temple, sacrificed to God and prayed, he said to him 1 Kings 9:3, 6, 7: "I have heard you, and have sanctified this house" 2c. Soon after: "But if ye will transgress, and not keep my commandments, then will I cast Israel out of the land, and will forsake this my holy house, and it shall be a reproach unto all the heathen" 2c. All this unseen and unheeded, they stood, as they still stand, as a rock and as a senseless 3) stone image, on the fact that God had given them the land, city and temple. Land, city and temple had been given to them, and therefore they had to be God's people or church.

(87) They do not hear and see that God has given everything for the purpose of keeping His commandment, that is, to keep Him as their God, so they should be His people and church. Just as they praise their tribe and their God, so they are his people.

But that they should keep his commandment, because of which and for which he chose their blood, they do not see it and do not respect it. Their circumcision they praise; but that for which they are circumcised, that they should keep God's commandment, that is nothing. They praise their laws, their temple, their worship, their city, their land and their dominion, but why they have them they do not respect.

The devil has possessed this people with all his angels, so that they always praise the outward things, their gifts, their deeds and works before God, that is, they sacrifice the empty shells without a core, so that he will look at them and have them as a people, exalting and blessing them above all the nations. But that he will keep his commandment from them and be honored for a god, that they will not consider. So it goes according to the saying of Moses [Deut. 32, 21]: "They do not consider me as God, so I do not consider them as my people", as Hosea, 2, 2. also says.

(89) And if God had not torn up the city of Jerusalem and driven it out of the land, but had kept it inside as before, no one could have persuaded them that they were not God's people, because they still had the temple, the city and the land, no matter how wicked, disobedient and stiff-necked they were, even though the prophets had been snowing daily and a thousand Moses had been standing there shouting: You are not God's people, because you are disobedient and stubborn to God. They cannot yet abandon their nonsensical, frenzied boast that they are God's people, now that they have been driven out, disturbed and rejected for fifteen hundred years. Nor do they hope to get there again for the sake of their own merits. For they have no promise to comfort themselves without what they smear into the Scriptures out of their erroneous conceit.

90 Our apostle, St. Paul, rightly said of them that they "strive for God, but with ignorance" 2c. [They want to be God's people with their deeds, works and outward nature, and not out of pure grace and mercy, as all the prophets and the true children of Israel had to do, as said; therefore there is no counsel nor help. Just like all things

1) "all" is missing in the Jenaer, in Walch and in the Erlanger.

2) "his" is missing in the Jena and the Erlangen.

3) - "senseless" is missing in the Wittenberg. Jonas: mente carens.

Our papists, bishops, monks and priests, together with their followers, want to be God's people and church by force, and God should look at them because they are baptized, have the name and sit in the regiment. There they stand like a rock; if a hundred thousand apostles came and said: You are not the church because you have such a nature, or much of your own works and worship, when you do it at the best; but must despair of all this, and cling only to grace and mercy in Christ; 2c. If not, you are the devil's whore, or school of boys, and not the church. They might murder, burn, and drive out such apostles; but that they should believe them, and leave their own doings, there is no hope, nothing will come of it.

The Turks do the same with their worship, and so do all the sectarians, and all are full of Jews, Turks, papists and sectarians, who all want to be the church and God's people according to their conceit and glory, regardless of the right united faith and obedience of divine commandments, by which alone they become and remain God's children. And even though they do not all lead in the same way, but one takes this way, the other that way, and want to go out in various ways, they are all of the same opinion and final intention, that through their actions they want to come to be God's people, and thus boast and claim that they are the ones whom God will look upon. These are the foxes of Samson, which are joined together with their tails at the end, but with their heads full of each other they run in various ways [Judges 15:4].

92. but this, as said above, is much too high for the Jews, the Turks, Papists also; as St. Paul [says] 1 Cor. 2, 14.: "The cattle man does not hear divine things, there must be spiritual understanding"; otherwise it remains, as Isaiah 6, 10. says: "With seeing eyes they do not see, with hearing ears they do not hear." For they know not what they hear, see, speak, or set, and yet they would not that they should be blind and deaf. Let this be enough of the false glory and arrogance of the Jews, since with vain lies they want to persuade God to consider them His people.

The other part: Whether Messiah has come or not. 1)

Now let us talk about the main part, when they ask God for the Messiah. Here they are the true holy and pious children; here they truly do not want to be liars or blasphemers, but certain prophets that Messiah has not come, but is yet to come. Who will punish them here for being mistaken or lacking? If all the angels and God Himself spoke publicly on Mount Sinai or in Jerusalem in the Temple that Messiah had long since come and that there was no need to wait for Him, God Himself would have to be the devil and all the angels would have to be devils. So certain are these holiest, truest prophets that Messiah has not come, but is yet to come. Much less will they hear us, as they have done until now and still do, since they have been so magnificently overcome by many fine scholars, even from their own lineage, that even stone and wood, if they had half a brain, would have to confess this, and yet they knowingly rage against known truth 2); but their damned rabbis, who know otherwise, so wantonly poison their poor youth and common men and turn them away from the truth. For I hold that where such Scripture should be read by the common man and youth, they should all stone their rabbis and punish them worse than they do us Christians. But the evil-doers prevent it from coming before them, as they faithfully mean to do.

And if I had not experienced my papists, it would have been unbelievable to me that there should be such wicked people on earth, who should knowingly resist public, known truth, that is, God Himself to the face, because I would not have allowed such hardened courage in any man's heart, but only in the devil's heart. But now I am not surprised, neither of the Turks nor of the Jews blindness, hardness, malice, because I must see such in the most holy fathers of the church, pope, cardinals, bishops. O you

1) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

2) Thus the Wittenberg and the Jena. The old edition of Walch and the Erlangen: "Wahrheiten". Jonas: *veritati*.

terrible wrath and incomprehensible judgment of the high divine majesty, how can you be so despised by the children of men that we do not tremble badly to death before you in a moment? How even an unbearable sight art thou, even in the most holy hearts and eyes, as is seen in Moses and the prophets, but these 1) hearts of stone and souls of iron mock thee so defiantly!

(95) However, although we may work on the Jews in vain (for I said above that I do not want to argue with them), we want to strengthen our faith and warn the weak Christians against the Jews, first of all to honor God by acting out their nonsensical foolishness among ourselves, to prove that we believe rightly, and to make them go completely astray in this article of the Messiah. We Christians have our New Testament, which certainly testifies to us and enough to the Messiah. But that the Jews do not believe it, we do not inquire, much less believe their damned glosses, and let them always go and wait for their Messiah; their unbelief does us no harm, but what it helps them and has helped them so far, they may ask their protracted misery about it, which will answer well for us. Whoever does not want to follow, let him stay behind. For they act as if we care a great deal for them, and only pervert us to the annoyance of the Scriptures, when we neither desire nor need anything from their conversion for our advantage, benefit or help, but do everything we do for their good; if they do not want that, let them leave it, we are excused and can well do without them with all that they are, have and are able to do for salvation. We have the Scriptures better than they do, we know that for sure (praise God!), and all devils shall not take them from us, let alone the wretched Jews.

The first saying from which it is proven that Messiah has come. 2)

96 First of all, we take before us the saying Gen 49:10: "The scepter shall not come out of Judah until the Shiloh be removed.

1) Wittenberger: the. Jonas: *his*.

2) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

Come, and the nations will follow" 2c. This saying of the holy patriarch Jacob, which he spoke at the end of his life, the new foreign Jews have been tortured and crucified many times against their own conscience. For they know well that their interpreting and turning is nothing but wantonness and superstition. And I am reminded of their words like an evil, stiff-necked woman who resists her husband and wants to have the last word, even though she knows that she is wrong. So the blinded people also think it is enough if they can bark and babble against the text and right mind, do not ask anything about it, that they are deliberately lying. And beware, they would rather suffer that the sentence were never written than that they should leave their mind; it does them the burnt harm, and they cannot get over it.

97 For the ancient Jews of right had the mind that we Christians have, namely, that in the tribe of Judah the regiment or scepter should remain until Messiah comes: "to him then shall the nations cleave" and fall, that is, the scepter should not then be in the tribe of Judah alone, but (as the prophets afterwards express it) it should come among all the nations of the earth at the time of Messiah. However, until the time of Messiah, the scepter would remain in the small corner of Judah. Such is (I say) the mind of the prophets and the ancient Jews, they cannot deny it. For also their Chaldean Bible, which they must not resist, as little as the Hebrew itself, clearly shows this. It reads in German thus: "From the house of Judah the Shulman shall not be taken away, nor the Sapphra from his children's children forever, until the Messiah come, whose is the kingdom, and the nations shall make themselves obedient to him." This is the Chaldean text faithfully and certainly Germanized, which no Jew nor devil can deny me.

Since now Moses Schebet, 3) [xxx] in Hebrew, we say Scepter in German, the Chaldean interpreter says "Schulttan"; these words we want to explain. Schebet, Hebrew, means Virga, actually here not an

3) In the old editions: "Scheuet". In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlanger: "Schebät".

The German word "Ruthe" means a birch tree, which is used to stump children, and not a staff, which is used to stump the sick and the elderly, 1) but a stick that a judge holds in his hand when he sits in judgment. Which stick, in time, as the splendor of the world increased, became silver and gold, and is now called a scepter, that is, a royal stick. Skeptron is a Greek word, but has now become German; for Homerus, lib. 1, also describes his king Achilles as having had a wooden scepter adorned with silver pins 2); from this one can see what scepters have been, and from where they have finally become completely silver and golden. Summa, it is the staff, be it silver, wooden or golden, which the king, or whoever is in his place, carries. And means nothing else than a dominion or kingdom; there is no doubt in anyone's mind about this.

The Chaldean interpreter does not need the word shebeth, staff or scepter to make this clear; but instead he puts the person who carries the same staff and says, Shultan, that is, a prince, lord or king shall not come from the house of Judah, that is, there shall be a sultan in the house of Judah until Messiah comes. For Sultan is also Hebrew, and is now well known to us Christians, who have had your Sultan Egypti for longer than six hundred years, and have gained little in the way of landmarks. For the Saracens call their king or prince Sultan, that is, lord or ruler, or overlord. Hence the Hebrew word "Schilt," which has become quite pure German from the Hebrew, as if to say that a prince or lord should be the shield, protection and umbrella of his subjects, so he is a true sultan or lord 2c. Some also want to make the Schultes 3) from it, I let that happen and go.

100. is Saphra, which is otherwise called Sopher in Hebrew (because Chaldee and Hebrew

is not far from each other, and almost the same; just as Saxons and Swabians speak the same German, and yet there is a great difference). But we have commonly Germanized sopher: chancellor. Saphra interpret them now allammt, also Burgensis: serious, scribes; such the gospel calls "Schristgelehrte". These are not bad scribes who write for pay or without 4) force. They are the wise, great rulers, *doctores, magistri*, who teach, instruct and maintain the law in the reign. This also includes the chancellery, parliament, courts, councils and everything that helps to govern through wisdom and law. For this is what Moses means by the word Mechokek, 5) which means the one who teaches, issues and judges commandments and orders; as among the Saracens, the sultan's scribes or scholars are his doctores, masters and scholars who teach, interpret and preserve the Alkoran, as the rights of his country. In the papacy, the pope's scribes or saphra are the canonists or assists who teach and preserve his decrees and rights. In the Empire, the Emperor's saphra or scholars of Christ are the Doctores LL. [Legum], secular lawyers, the teach imperial law, give and receive advice. 6)

So Judah also had scribes, that is, Christian scholars, who taught and preserved the Law of Moses, which was their law of the land. Therefore we have translated it: Mechokek, "master", that is, doctor, teacher 2c. And this is also the intention of the little word, Mechokek, that is, the master shall not be taken from his feet, that is, teachers and listeners, who fitzen zun Füßen, shall remain in the proper regiment. For every country, if it is to exist, it must have the two pieces, namely, a power and a right. The country must have a lord, a head, a regent. So it must also have a right, according to which the ruler is held; this is the rod and mechokek or sultan and saphra, as Solomon also shows; when he had received the rod, that is, the kingdom, he asked for wisdom, so that he might rule the people rightly.

1) The old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: "angehen".

2) Pfinchen---Pinnchen, small nails. (Grimm.) Jonas: *clavis*.

3) "Schuttes" (in the Jenaer and Erlanger) or, as the Wittenberger writes: "Schuttheiß" -- Schultheiß, Schulze.

4) "Without" is missing in the Wittenberg. Justus Jonas translates "without violence" by: *privatim*.

5) The old editions offer: Mechokek.

6) "Rath geben und erhalten" is missing in the Wittenberger.

For where there is power without justice, where the sultan does and lets what he wants and not what he should, there is no rule but tyranny, as Nero, Caligula, Dionysius, Heinz and the like are. Again, since law is without power, the wild rabble also does what it wants, and remains no regiment. Therefore there must be both law and power, Sultan and Saphra, that one may help the other.

(102) Therefore they call Saphra the councilors who were to be in Jerusalem from the tribe of Judah, whom they call Sanhedrim. Herod, a foreigner, an Edomite, wiped out all of them and became both sultan and saphra, cane and mechokek, lord and scribe in the house of Judah. Then began this saying of the patriarch to be fulfilled, that Judah had no more dominion nor saphra. Then it was time for Messiah to come and take his kingdom on the throne of David forever, as prophesied in Isaiah 9:7. Therefore let us now consider the saying of the patriarch.

103. "Judah, you are (he says) [Gen. 49, 8.], you will be praised by your brothers" 2c. This, I respect, should not be a gloss, be said clearly enough, that the tribe of Judah should be honored [be] above all its other brothers and have the preference. Further: "Your hand will be on the neck of your enemies" 2c. This is clear enough that the famous and distinguished tribe of Judah must have enemies and opposition, but it must have happiness and victory. Further: "Thy brethren shall bow and bend before thee" 2c. It is clear that this does not refer to the prison, but to the rule over his brothers, all of which is fulfilled in King David. But not only did the same tribe of Judah become lord over its brothers in David, but it also took hold like a lion and forced other nations under it, such as the Philistines, Syrians, Moabites, Ammonites and Edomites.

104 He praises this with these glorious words: "Judah is a young lion; you have come up from the grave. He has lain down like a lion and like a lioness, who

will rise up against him?" That is, he has sat and wrought a kingdom that no one has been able to resist, as such nations around have often and mightily attempted to do.

(105) Now the patriarch has set up, established and confirmed the kingdom, the sultan, the rod, the saphra, in the tribe of Judah, and Judah the sultan sits in the reign; what will become now? This is what will happen," he says, "until Messiah comes; that is, many will rise up against him and want to overthrow the kingdom and bring it to nothing, so that it will be destroyed from the earth; as the histories of the kings and prophets abundantly testify, that all the nations have dealt fiercely with it for and for, and he himself says above that Judah must have enemies. For in the world it is so: Where a kingdom or principality comes up, there is no rest of envy, until it is destroyed to the ground. This is what all histories and examples say.

But here saith the Holy Ghost: This kingdom in the tribe of Judah is mine; let no man take it from me, though he be mighty and wicked, though the gates of hell be; let it be called, *Non auferetur*. You devils and pagans say: *Auferetur*, we want to clean it up, we want to devour it, we want to make it quiet, as the 74th Psalm v. 8. complains very much: but it shall remain devoured, undesolate for me, the Sheba or Sultan shall not come away from the house of Judah, nor the Saphra from his children's children, even if you all become mad and foolish, until Shiloh or Messiah comes.

107. And when he comes, it will be much more different and glorious. For since you did not want the tribe of Judah to suffer in a small corner, I will first make a great lion out of it, who will become sultan and sapphire in all the world. And I will make it so that he shall not draw a sword, nor shed a drop of blood, but the nations shall freely and gladly make themselves subject and obedient to him. This shall be his kingdom. For it is the kingdom and all his.

Grasp this mind and thought,

and go with it to the text, Hebrew and Chaldee, what does Saying: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah" 2c., is it matter, whether your heart will not say to you together as bright and clear as that: "God created heaven and with the letters: By the dear God, this is the truth, this is earth. And the work, namely, that now at fifteen hundred the patriarch's opinion. Then go to the histories, and see years the scepter has departed from Judah, is as tangible if it has not happened and is not happening, and is still and obvious as heaven and earth are; that one happening, then you will have to say again: It is truly so. understands sufficiently how the Jews neither err nor are For it is undeniable that in the tribe of Judah the Sultan deceived, but maliciously and wantonly deny and and Sapphira remained until Herodem, even though it was blaspheme the recognized truth against their conscience. sometimes weak and not without great resistance; it is still Let no one esteem such a man worthy to speak a word to preserved. But under Herod and after Herod it was ruined him, even if it were from Marcolfo, keep silent about such and destroyed, but it was taken away, so that even high divine words and works.

Jerusalem, where the throne of the tribe of Judah was, (111) But whoever feels like being unfunny with me, I and the land of Canaan no longer remained, and so the will serve him with this, and show the Jews the gloss on saying was fulfilled that the Sultan had gone and Messiah this saying. First of all, those who do not fall away from the had come. text, but remain with the text, especially with the Chaldean

Now I do not have the time to show how rich a source text, which no sensible Jew may deny, thus turn out: God's this saying is, and how the prophets have taken so much promise is certain, but misery's sins prevent what is from it about the fall of the Jews and the profession of the promised from coming to pass; therefore we still wait for Gentiles, of which these new Jews and Bastards know His promise until we have atoned 2c. Is this excuse not nothing at all. This time we have it brightly and powerfully lazy, even blasphemous enough? Just as if God's promise from this saying that Messiah must have come about the stood on our righteousness, or coexisted with our sin, that time of Herod; or must say that God did not keep his, God would have to become a liar for the sake of our promise and thus lied. No one should do this except the sin, and again, become truthful for the sake of our wicked devil and his servants, the false bastards and righteousness. How could one speak more shamefully of foreign Jews. They do it without ceasing, God must be God than that He would be a reed that wavers, that can their liar, they want to be right, that Messiah has not yet be moved, according to which we fall or stand?

come, since God says that Messiah should come before If God did not promise us before and make us a the scepter of Judah is even gone; who has now been promise, because we were without sin, He would not have gone almost fifteen hundred years, as there are the clear been able to promise or make anything from the words of God, plus the obvious work and fulfillment of beginning. For thus says David, Ps. 130, 3: "Lord, wilt thou these same words. consider what sin is, who can abide before thee?" And Ps.

Now what is it that you would argue about this with a 143:2: "O Lord, enter not into judgment with thy servant, stubborn Jew? It is just as if you wanted to talk to a foolish for before thee no living man is righteous"; and of man and prove that God created heaven and earth, Proverbs much more. Hence the example of the children Genesis 1:1, and you showed him heaven and earth with of Israel in the wilderness, whom God leads into the land your fingers, but he still chatted that this was not heaven of Canaan without their righteousness, even with their or earth, which Genesis 1 speaks of, or not heaven and great sins and disgraces, only for the sake of His promise, as Moses says, Deut. 9:5, 6: "Know then that you are not earth, but something else, 2c. For this a righteous man.

Now that you are not brought into the land because of your righteousness, because you are a stiff-necked, disobedient (I mean, that means sinning) people, but that the Lord promised your fathers" 2c. As a sign he often wanted to destroy them, where Moses would not have prayed for them; so firmly did God's promise stand on their holiness.

It is true that when God promises something with a condition or proviso, saying, "If you will do this, I will do this," the promise is on our actions. As when he says to Solomon, 1 Kings 9:6, 7: "If you keep my commandments, this house shall be my sanctuary; if not, I will destroy it." But this promise of Messiah is not of this kind. For he saith not thus, If ye do this and that, Messiah shall come; if not, he shall not come: but freely he giveth it away, saying, Messiah shall come at the time when the scepter shall be removed from Judah. Such a promise is only based on divine truth and grace, which neither respects nor considers our actions. Therefore, this evasion of the Jews is rotten and quite blasphemous.

The others, who fall from the text, take before them and torture every word especially. And though they are not worthy to have their slobber and filth heard, yet, that their shame may be made manifest, we must have a little patience until we hear their courage also. For because they fall from the light text, they are already condemned by their own conscience, which compels them to obey the text, without wanting to charm the Hebrew words before our eyes, to our annoyance, as if we did not know the Chaldean text.

(115) Some are saying that Shiloh is the name of the city of Shiloh, where the ark of the covenant was, Judges 21:19. 21:19 [1 Sam. 4:3], that the opinion is, The scepter shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come, that is, until Saul be king and anointed at Shiloh. This is too much of a rotten joke. Before Saul the king, not only Judah had no scepter, but all Israel had none. How could it have ceased when Saul became king? But the text says that Judah was master of his brethren before, and that he was the king of Israel.

He became a lion after Saul and thus received the scepter. So also before Saul no judge was lord or prince over the people of Israel, as Gideon said to the people, Judges. 8:23, when they wanted to make him and his heirs lord over them: "I will not be lord over you, neither will my son; God shall be lord over you." Neither was there any judge from the tribe of Judah, except Athniel, the first after Joshua; the rest all, except Saul, were from the other tribes. And though Athniel is called Caleb's youngest brother, it is not certain that he is of Judah; he may be of another father's descent. And it is not to be feared that Shiloh should be a city here, or that Saul should be crowned in Shiloh. For Saul was anointed by Samuel at Ramath, 1 Sam. 10:1, and confirmed at Gilgal.

116) Also where does it rhyme that the Chaldean says: of 1) Shiloh is the kingdom, and nations will be obedient to him? When did the city of Shiloh or Saul come to such honors? Israel is one people, not many nations, as they have one right, one worship, one name. But many nations are those who have other and different 2) rights, names and God. Now Jacob says that not the one nation Israel (which is before or under Judah's scepter), but other nations are to fall to Shiloh. Therefore this idle talk is nothing but an indication of the great courage of the Jews, who do not want to give victory to Jacob's saying, as they nevertheless feel that they must do in their conscience.

117) Others say that Shiloh is the king Jeroboam, crowned in Shiloh, to whom ten tribes of Israel fell, from the king Judah Roboam, 1 Kings 12:15. 3) Therefore this is the opinion of Jacob: The scepter will not come out of Judah until Shiloh comes, that is, until Jeroboam comes. This is indeed as rotten as that; for Jeroboam is not crowned at Shiloh, but at Shechem, 1 Kings 12:20. 1. Thus the scepter of

1) Jenaer: "the".

2) Jenaer: all sorts. Jonas: *aliud*.

3) The Jews try to bring out the opinion that Jeroboam was crowned in Shiloh by misinterpreting 1 Kings 12:15, although nothing like that is written there.

Judah was not taken, but the kingdom of Judah remained, and the tribe of Benjamin, along with all the children of Israel who lived in the cities of Judah and Benjamin, as it is written in 1 Kings 12, along with the entire priesthood, worship, temple and everything. Jeroboam also never gained control of the kingdom of Judah, much less other nations, as is said to have happened to Shiloh.

118) The third ones thus declare that Shiloh was sent, and that he was king Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, saying, The scepter of Judah shall not depart until Shiloh come, that is, the king of Babylon sent to take away Judah, and to destroy it. This is no good either, and a child who learns letters can overthrow it. For Shiloh and Shiloh are two different words. Shiloh may mean sent. But here it does not say Shiloh, sent, but Shiloh, which is, as the Chaldean says, Messiah. Now the king of Babylon is not the Messiah who is to come from Judah, as the Jews, indeed all the world, well know. Nor was the scepter of Judah taken away, whether the Jews were led captive to Babylon. For there was only one distemper seventy years: but there were great prophets, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel, which endured, and determined the time, even Jechoniah king of Judah, 1) which was kept as a king in Babylon. And many that were carried away came again in their life, Hagg. 2. This is not called putting away the scepter, but a little prodding. For even though they had to be deprived of the land for a little while as a punishment, God pledged His precious word to them so that they would remain secure in the land. And much more surely is that which is promised, though it is not yet, than that which is and is not promised. For that must surely come; this is not certain for an hour. But these fifteen hundred years not a dog, let alone a prophet, said that they would be sure of the land. Therefore the scepter of Judah is finished, of which I have written against the sabbath keepers.

119. The fourth crucify the word Shebeth,

1) In the old editions the name "Jechanja" is written here, against it later in §132 "Jechonja". Also in the Bible both spellings occur.

And they interpret it thus: The rod shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh (that is, his son) come, who shall weaken the Gentiles. These call the rod the punishment or misery, since they are now in, and Messiah shall come and slay all the Gentiles. This also is a great wantonness, which putteth the Chaldean text freely out of sight, which they shall not do, nor may they do, and interpreteth the word Shebeth of his pleasure, and regardeth not that which goeth before, when Jacob maketh Judah prince and lion, or king, and saith quickly without remedy thereon, The scepter, or Shebeth, shall not depart from Judah. How could such an alien mind of punishment follow the glorious words of principality or kingdom so without means? The sins that deserved the punishment would have to be reported beforehand. But here nothing is reported before, 2) but praise, honor and glory of the tribe of Judah.

(120) And if the word shewbeth be called a rod of punishment, (3) what good is it? For the judge's or king's rod is also a rod of punishment over the wicked. Yes, the stick of punishment cannot be other than a judge's or sultan's stick, because the punishment is only due to the authorities, Deut. 32, 35. MIHI VINDICTA: 4) so remains for the

still this opinion firmly that the scepter or stick should remain Judah, even if it is a punishment stick. But this Rabbi Muthwille interprets a foreign stick, which does not lie in Judah's hand, but on Judah's back from a foreign hand. And if that would be possible to understand so, as not is, where remains the other piece, from the Saphra or Mechokek to his feet? That would also have to be a strange master's mechokek and strange people's feet. But because Jacob says that it should be Judah and his feet Mechokek, the other piece, the staff, must also be his tribe's regiment.

2) Thus in the Wittenberg and in the Jena. In the old edition Walch's and in the Erlangen: "too previously reported".

3) Jenaer and Erlanger: "means". Jonas: *significaret*.

4) We have corrected these words according to Rom. 12, 19, in the Vulgate. In the old editions *vindictam*, while in the 5th book of Moses, 32, 35, it is written: *Nva sst utio*.

Some martyr the word *DONEC*, "until that", and should mean "therefore that"; the scepter of Judah will not come away *DONEC*, *id est*, therefore that Messiah will come. This is a delicious master, he should be crowned with donkey's feet, put the hindmost to *DONEC* vörderst, in this way: Messiah will come, therefore the scepter will remain. But Jacob set Judah a prince and a lion beforehand, to whom he gave the scepter before Messiah; and he gave the scepter to Messiah afterward. Thus Judah retains neither principality, nor lions, nor scepter, which Jacob grants him. In addition the fool makes from the word "until that" a new word "therefore that" out of pure courage, which the language does not admit to him.

Last of all is a rabbi who marshals the word "come," which to him must mean "setting," as the sun is Hebrew for "coming" when it sets. This one is rumbling so fine that I don't know if he wants to go on your head or on your ears. For I do not understand where to be waiting, since he thinks the scepter will not come away from Judah until Shiloh (the city) goes down, then David the Messiah will come. Where has the scepter of Judah been before Shiloh or Saul, as heard above? But so shall they rumble who rage against their conscience and known truth. Summa, Lyra says right, if they invent this and such a lot of glosses, the Chaldean text pushes them all to the ground, and convinces them that they are wanton liars, blasphemers, and transgressors of his word. But I wanted to bring it to us Germans, so that we can see what kind of fruit the blinded Jews are, and how mightily the truth of God stands against them.

(123) Seeing then that such evasions and vain pretexts are false, they confess that Messiah is come about the time when Jerusalem is destroyed; but that he is secretly in the world, and sitteth in Rome among the beggars, repenting for the Jews, until the time come that he should break forth. These are not the words of the Jews or of men, but the words of the arrogant, mocking devil, who through the Jews mocks us Christians with our Christ in the most bitter and venomous way, as if he should

The Christians boast much about their Christ, but they have to suffer and be tortured under the Romans and be beggars in the world, not only in the time of the emperors, but also in the time of the pope; they can do nothing in my kingdom in the world, I will remain their lord. Yes, mock, you wretched devil, and laugh at it enough, you shall tremble enough for

124 Thus it is with this saying of Jacob, as it is with the saying of Christ in our time, "This is my body, which is given for you. The scribes also tortured each word in a special and manifold way, putting the hindmost first, before they wanted to accept the text in its right sense, as we have seen. But it seems here that the Christians, as Lyra, Raymundus, Burgensis and their like, were nevertheless diligent, and would have liked to convert the Jews, they weeded from one word to another, as one weeds the foxes. But if they have been hunting for a long time, the Jews have finally persisted in their obstinacy, and knowingly want to err, and not depart from their rabbis; so we must also let them go, and not respect their poisonous blasphemy and lies.

It happened to me in the same way: Three learned Jews came to me, hoping that they would find a new Jew in me, because we began to read Hebrew here in Wittenberg; they also pretended that because we Christians began to read their books, things would soon get better. . When I now disputed with them, they did according to their manner, gave me their glosses; but when I forced them to the text, they escaped from me and said: They must believe their rabbis, as we believe the pope and doctors 2c. Now I had mercy on them, gave them an intercession to the escorts that they should let them go free for Christ's sake. But I learned afterwards how they had called Christ a Thola to me, that is, an executed thief. Therefore I will have nothing more to do with any Jew; they are, as St. Paul says, given over to wrath, the more one wants to help them, the harder and angrier they become; let them go.

But we Christians can strengthen our faith very much from this saying of Jacob.

ken that Messiah must be present, and have been present, now at fifteen hundred years. Not, as the devil scoffs, a beggar in Rome, but a reigning Messiah, otherwise God's word and promise would become a lie. And if the Jews wanted to let the Holy Scriptures be God's word, they would also have to give a Messiah from the time of Herod, let him be where he is, and wait for no other. Before they do this, they would rather tear up the Scriptures and turn them upside down, so that they are no longer Scriptures. As it is in truth with them, that they have neither Messiah nor Scripture, as Isaiah 28:7 prophesied of them. That is enough according to the saying of Jacob.

The other saying, from which it is proved that Messiah is coming. 1)

127 Let us take another before us, whom the Jews did not, nor can they, so bruise. Among the last words of David, 2 Sam. 23, 2. 3., he speaks thus: "The Spirit of the LORD has spoken through me, and his word has come through my tongue. The God of Israel has spoken to me, the mighty one in Israel" 2c. And soon after v. 5: "What is my Hans with God" (or that I give it actually and exactly from the Hebrew), "my house is not like this" 2c. That is, my house is not worth, it is too high and too much that God does so much with me poor man. "For he hath established with me an everlasting covenant, which shall be established and kept in all places." Mark well these words, that David boasts with so much and (as it seems) with superfluous words, that the Spirit of God spoke through him, and God's word was done through his tongue. Item: "The God of Israel has spoken to me, the Mighty One in Israel" 2c. As if he should say: Dear one, listen, hear who can hear. Here is God who speaks, listen 2c. What is it that you urge us to hear? What is God speaking through you? What does he want to tell you? What do you want us to hear?

128] This you shall hear, that God has made an everlasting, firm agreement with me and with my house,

1) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

(of which my house is not worthy), yes, it is 2) nothing against God; nevertheless, he has done it. What then is such an everlasting covenant? Open your ears and hear, my house and God have sworn together and joined forever; this is a covenant, a promise, which must remain forever. For it is God's covenant and promise, which no one shall break, nor hinder, nor be able to hinder; my house shall be called forever, established and refined in all things, as the word "Aruch" gives, that [it] shall not lack a hair, nor be wanting. Have you heard this? Do you also believe that God is true? Yes, without a doubt. But do you also believe that He can and will keep His word?

Now then, if God is true and almighty, and has spoken these words through David (as no Jew may deny), then David's house or rule (which is the same as much), since the time he spoke these words, must have remained, and still, and forever, that is, remain forever, or God must be a liar. Summa, we must have David's house or heir, who reigns from David's time until now and forever; or David died as a desperate liar at his last end, since he says these words with so much useless gibberish (as it seems) "God speaks," "God speaks," "God promises." For it is no good that we, with the Jews, want to prove God false, as if He had not kept such theUre words and promises. We must have (I say) an heir of David from his time, so that his house will not stand alone, even where he wills. For his Hans must remain forever, and remain forever. There is God's word that there shall be an everlasting, firm, sure covenant, in which nothing shall be lacking, but all things shall be Aruch, made perfect, as God makes perfect all His things, Ps. 111:3: "All His works are perfect and glorious."

130 Now let the Jews give such an heir to David, for they must give him, for it is written, David's house is eternal, which no man shall break nor hinder; but as the sun breaketh forth in the morning, which no cloud can withstand nor hinder, so there also

2) "is" is missing in Walch's old edition and in the Erlanger.

stands. If they do not give an heir to David's house, this sentence has condemned them to the ground that they are certainly without God, without David, without Messiah and without everything, lost and eternally damned people. And they cannot deny that David's kingdom or house existed for all time until the Babylonian prison, yes, even through the Babylonian prison and after it until Herod's time. It did not exist by its own power or merit, but by virtue of this everlasting covenant, which was established with David's house. For they had several evil kings and rulers, who practiced idolatry, killed prophets and lived shamefully, such as Rehoboam, Jehoram, Joash, Ahaz, Manasseh, 2c., who made it worse than all the nations or the kings of Israel, so that they often deserved that both David's house and tribe were cut off, as finally happened to the kingdom of Israel. But this covenant, established with David, held fast, as the books of Kings and the prophets boast, that God gave a lamp or light to the house of David, and would not let it go out, as 2 Kings 8:19 and 2 Chron. 21, 7. It says: "The LORD would not destroy Judah because of his servant David, to whom he had spoken to give him a lamp among his children forever." Item 2 Sam. 7, 12. f.

131 And look at the kingdom of Israel, which never remained in one tribe or house until the third member, unless Jehu brought it into the fourth member in his house by special promise. Otherwise, it always fell from one tribe to another, sometimes barely remaining on one member, and not long after that, until it was completely extinguished. But the kingdom of Judah always remained on the tribe of Judah and on the house of David, by great miracles of God: for it had such great opposition from all the nations around, from Israel itself, from its own rebellions, from great idolatries and sinners, that it would not have been a miracle if it had perished in the third member under Rehoboam, or at least under Joram, Ahaz and Manasseh. But it had a strong restraint, which did not let it perish nor extinguish its light. It was promised to him, it should remain firm and eternal, firm and certain. So it also remained, and must remain until

therefore remain and abide forever; for God does not lie and cannot lie.

(132) But the fact that the Jews drool over the Babylonian prison, as if it had perished there, is nothing, as we also said above. For it was only a small distemper that was certain to last for seventy years, and God had pledged His word for it, and had obtained it through excellent prophets. Also Jechoniah of Babylon was exalted above all kings. Daniel and his companions ruled not only over Judah and Israel, but also over the empire of Babylon. And though they were not in Jerusalem for a little while, yet they reigned in another place much more gloriously than in Jerusalem. So that it may be said that the house of David did not perish at Babylon, but 1) shone more gloriously than at Jerusalem; but they had to leave the place for a little while, as a punishment. For where a king lies in the field out of the land, he shall not be called a king that is gone out, though he be not at home, especially where he hath great victory and fortune against many nations; but he shall be called shining more gloriously out of the land than at home.

133 If then God has kept his covenant from the time of David until Herod, so that his house has not perished, he must have kept it from then on and keep it forever, so that David's house has not perished, nor can it perish forever. For we must not reproach our Lord God half truthfully and half deceitfully, that he has kept his covenant true from David until Herod, and that he has kept David's house faithful; but after Herod's time he began to lie and to be unfaithful, and has dropped and changed his everlasting covenant; but the house of David, as it remained and shone until Herod, so it must remain under Herod's time and after Herod, and shine forever.

134) Now we see how this saying of David is in harmony with the saying of Jacob the patriarch: "The 2) scepter shall be taken from Judah.

1) "habe" is missing in the Jenaer and Erlanger.

2) The Jena and Erlangen editions have here and in some other places: "das Scepter", but we have retained throughout with the Wittenberg the prevailing spelling: "der Scepter".

not come away, nor Mechokek from his feet, until Messiah come, whom the Gentiles will obey." What can be said here that is brighter and more different than that David's Hans should shine until Messiah comes? Then the house of David shall shine not only over Judah and Israel, but also over the Gentiles and other nations and more; that is, it shall not be extinguished, but shall shine more gloriously and more widely than before its coming. And so it has become an everlasting kingdom and an everlasting covenant, as David says. Therefore, it was decided that Messiah would come when the scepter of Judah was taken away, because we do not want to blaspheme God that He did not keep His covenant and oath. If the stiff-necked, obstinate Jews will not accept it, our faith is herewith firmly and strongly proven, and ask nothing of their foolish glosses, spun out of their heads; we have the clear text.

135 These last words of David are based on God's own word, when he speaks to David (as he boasts here at his end), 2 Sam. 7, 5. and says: "Should you build me a house to live in? You may read further, that there follows, how he tells one after another, that he had not dwelt in any house until then; but he had chosen him to be the ruler of his people, to whom he would give a firm place and rest. And he curses, "I will build you a house," that is, neither you nor anyone will build me a house to live in; I am far, far too great, as Isaiah also says in 66:1; but, "I will build, and I will build you a house." For thus saith the LORD (saith Nathan), "The LORD declareth unto thee, that the LORD will make thee an house." Now it is well known what is meant by a house built by men, namely an erected heap of stones and wood, quite perishable. But a house built by God means a father of a house, who has descendants and heirs of his blood and tribe, as Moses says in Exodus 1:21, "that God built houses for the midwives," because they let the children live against the king's commandment and did not strangle them. Again, the houses of the kings of Israel he breaks and destroys in the other member.

136 Therefore David has a house built by God, which shall have heirs for ever and ever; not a bad house, but "I have made thee prince over my people. Therefore it shall be called a princely, royal house, that is, the house of David the prince and king, wherein thy children shall reign for ever and ever, and be princes, as thou art. Now all this is proved by the books and histories of the kings, down to the time of Herod. Until then we have the scepter and saphra in the tribe of Judah.

137 Now follows the other piece, before 1) Silo. How long shall my house stand like this, and my heirs remain in my rule? Then he answers thus [2 Sam. 7, 12-16.]: "When your time is past, that you sleep with your fathers, I will raise up your seed after you, which shall come from your body (utero, that is, from your flesh and blood), to him I will confirm his kingdom, he shall build a house for my name, and I will confirm the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. Where he does iniquity, I will punish him with the rod of men and with the blows of the children of men. But my mercy shall not be turned from him, as I turned it from Saul, whom I put away from before thee. But thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before me, and thy throne shall be established for ever." 2) This saying almost in the same words is also found in 1 Chron. 18, 11. ff. You may read that.

Whoever would interpret this saying as referring to Solomon would have to be a malicious interpreter. For although Solomon was not yet born at this time, nor did his adultery with his mother Bathsheba take place, he is not the seed or son of David, who was born after David's death, of whom he says: "When your time is over, and you sleep with your fathers, I will raise up your seed after you. For Solomon was born in the time of the living David. And it would be foolish, even ridiculous, that "raise up" here should be interpreted that Solomon was born after David.

1) The old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: "vom".

2) The following words to the end of the paragraph are missing in the Wittenberg.

Death was to be raised up to be a king, or to build the house; for there are three other chapters, 1 Kings 1:39, and 1 Chron. 23, 9. and 1 Chron. 30:22, which testify that Solomon was not only made king by the life of his father, but that he also received orders from David his father, and the whole pattern of the temple, with all the furnishings, with all the food, and also the whole order of the kingdom. It is clear that Solomon did not build the temple or set up the kingdom and the priesthood from his own head, but from David's head, who set it all before him and ordered it even while he was still alive.

139. also is a great disparity, and many other words 2 Sam. 7, 5. against the words 1 Chron. 23, 9. and Cap. 29, 6. 7. There God will build David an eternal house; here Solomon shall build a house in God's name. There it says freely without addition: "It shall stand forever, and no sin shall hinder it"; here it says, as long as Solomon remains pious and his descendants, when he did not remain, and therefore not only lost the ten tribes of Israel, but was also cut off in the seventh generation. The latter is *promissio gratiae*; the 1) is *promissio legis*. There David thanks God that his house shall remain forever; here he does not thank that Solomon's temple shall remain forever! Summa, it is spoken at another time and of other things and house there and here. And even though God calls Solomon his son here, and wants to be his father, it is still spoken with the addition, as long as he is pious. Such addition is not there. And is it not strange that God calls his saints, even the angels, his children. But that son, 2 Sam. 7, 14, is a different and special son, who should keep it without addition, and no sin should hinder him.

140 And so the prophets and psalms have taken before them the saying of 2 Sam. 7, which speaks of the seed of David after his death, and have left out the saying of 1 Chron. 23 and 29, which speak of Solomon. For thus says Psalm 89:2, 3, 4, 5: "I will sing of the grace of the Lord forever, and declare his truth with my mouth for ever and ever. And say, an everlasting grace shall be built, and thou castest thy

1) It should be read "this". Jonas: *altera* - *altera*.

Keep truth faithfully in heaven. I have made a covenant with my chosen one; I have sworn to David my servant: I will surely create seed for you forever, and build your throne for and for. "2c. These are also clear words that God vows and swears to give eternal grace to David, and to build and keep his hall, seed and throne forever.

141 And then in the 19th verse, the most beautiful prophecies of the Messiah, which cannot be understood by Solomon, because he was not the highest over all the kings of the earth, nor did he set his hand over the sea and the water; and here no one is allowed to speak. Also the kingdom did not remain on Solomon's house, because he did not have a certain promise, without being pious; but David's house has the promise, who had more sons than Solomon. 2) And as the histories testify, sometimes the scepter of Judah passed from brother to brother, from cousins to cousins, but always remained in the house of David. As, Ahaziah left no son, Ahaz left none, and brother's children had to be called heirs and son, according to the holy scripture way.

Now, that one would deny such bright and mighty sayings of the Scriptures about the eternal house of David, which the histories prove in their works, how always kings or princes have been for and for until Messiah, no one else would have to do that but the devil himself, and whoever is his member. For I suppose that if the devil, or whoever he is, would not let Messiah be, they would have to let David have an eternal hall and an eternal throne. For he cannot deny the bright words of God, since God swears that His word shall not be changed and that He will not lie to David, even for the sake of no sin, as the above Psalm mightily and clearly sings.

143) Now such an eternal house of David is nowhere to be found where one does not put the 3) scepter before the Messiah and the Messiah after

2) Wittenberger: "had". Jenaer, Walch and the Erlangeners: "hat". Jonas: *habuit*.

3) Here all outputs have: "that"; likewise immediately following "the".

the scepter together and join them together, namely that Messiah came when the scepter was gone, and thus David's house preserved in his eternity, and God found true and true in his word, covenant, and oath. . For it is evident that in the time of Herod the scepter of Judah fell completely; but rather that the Romans destroyed Jerusalem and the scepter of Judah. If David's house is to be eternal and God is to be true, then the right king of Judah, Messiah, must have come at the same time: no reading, interpreting or glossing can help against this, the text is too powerful and too bright. Whether the Jews do not want to confess this, we do not ask anything about it, we have enough:

First, that our Christian faith is herewith most strongly proven, and only such sayings give very great joy and comfort, because we also have such strong testimonies in the Old Testament. On the other hand, we are sure that even the devil and the Jews themselves have nothing to say in their hearts against this, and are overcome with their own consciences, which can be well and surely noticed by the fact that they torture Jacob's saying from the scepter (like all other Scriptures) so many times, as they feel convinced and overcome, but do not want to confess. Just as the devil knows that God's word is the truth, and yet out of deliberate malice contradicts and blasphemes: so the Jews feel that these sayings are vain rocks, but their interpretation is vain straw or cobwebs, but out of deliberate malicious intent they do not want to confess it, yet they want to be and be called God's people, solely because they are the blood of the fathers; otherwise they have nothing to boast about. But what blood alone does, is said above; just as if the devil wanted to boast that he was created angelically, therefore he wanted to be an angel and God's child alone, even though he is God's enemy.

The third saying, from which it is proved that Messiah has come. 1)

According to these sayings, let us hear what Jeremiah says; he makes it very strange.

1) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

We know that he was a prophet long after the kingdom of Israel had been taken away and destroyed, and only the kingdom of Judah still existed, which also soon had to go to Babylon, as he prophesied to them, and also saw that it happened. So he is still allowed to say Cap. 33:17 ff: "Thus saith the LORD, There shall not be cut off (I must speak Hebrew) from David a man that sitteth upon the throne of the house of Israel: neither shall there be cut off from among the priests, nor from among the Levites, a man before me, that offereth burnt offerings, and burneth incense, and slayeth sacrifices for ever."

146. "And the word of the LORD came unto Jeremiah, saying, Thus saith the LORD, If my covenant be broken with thee day and night, that there be neither day nor night in his days; then shall my covenant also be broken with David my servant, that he have not a son to be king upon his throne; and with the priests and Levites my servants. 2c. And the word of the LORD came unto Jeremiah, saying, Hast thou seen what this people speak? saying, Hath the LORD also rejected the two tribes which he hath chosen, and they have embittered my people, as though they should no more be my people? Thus saith the LORD; If I keep not my covenant of day and night, nor the ordinance of heaven and earth; then will I also reject the seed of Jacob and David my servant, that I take not of their seed to rule over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For I will turn away their captivity, and have mercy upon them."

147 What shall we say to this? Let him interpret who can interpret, for it is written that not only David shall endure forever, but also the Levites; item, Israel, the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And especially David shall have a son, who shall sit on his throne for ever, as day and night for ever. But Israel is taken away, and Judah after; Israel is not brought again, as Judah is brought again. Tell me, how does this rhyme? God's word must not lie; but as He keeps the course of heaven, that without ceasing there is day and night: so must David (that is, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) also without ceasing have a

Son on His throne; for God Himself gives such a likeness. It is impossible for the Jews to put it together, who see before their eyes that neither Israel nor Judah has a regiment, now at fifteen hundred years, but Israel far beyond two thousand years; nor must God be true, we do as we will. The kingdom of David must reign over the seed of Jacob, Isaac and Abraham, as Jeremiah says here, or Jeremiah must not be a prophet but a liar.

We let the Jews here rhyme and interpret what they will or can: the saying is certain to us, that David's house shall be forever, and the Levites also, and Abraham's seed, Isaac's seed, Jacob's seed, under the Son of David, as long as day and night (which is said, as long as sun and moon) endure. If this is true, then Messiah must have come when David's throne and reign ceased, and thus David's throne became more glorious through Messiah, as Isaiah 9:6 says: "To us a child is born, to us a son is given, whose dominion is on his shoulder, and will be called Paele, Jomez, El, 1) Gibbor, Abigad, Sarsalom. His kingdom shall be great, and there shall be no end of peace in the throne of David, and in his kingdom to establish it, and to strengthen it from henceforth even for ever" 2c. Now we let stand (perhaps we will do it afterwards) how the blind Jews torture the six names of Messiah; they allow the saying, and must allow it to speak of Messiah. Therefore we will lead him to the fact that Jeremiah says that David's house must reign forever, first by the scepter until Messiah, and then much more gloriously by Messiah. So that it is certain that David's house must not fall until this hour, and henceforth may not fall until eternity. 2) But now the scepter of Judah 3) lies fallen fifteen hundred years, so Messiah must have come fifteen hundred years ago, or, as said above, a thousand four hundred and eight and threescore years ago. This is all powerfully proven from Jeremiah.

1) So in the Wittenberg and in the Jena edition correctly. The Erlangen edition, after Walch's old edition, offers: "Jomez El" without an intervening comma.

2) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer and Erlanger: "still henceforth . . . may fall."

3) "Judah" is missing from the Wittenberg.

149. But if any of us may be moved, how it is possible that in the days of Jeremiah, and afterward unto Messiah, there should have been under the tribe of Judah, or the throne of David, and should have remained the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; yet Judah alone remained, and Israel was carried away: Who shall know that 4) the kingdom of Israel is taken away and destroyed, so that it is not returned, nor shall it come again for ever; but Israel, or the seed of Israel, is ever remaining among Judah, and is caught with Judah, and is returned. You may read about this in the first book of Kings 12, 17. and 2 Chron. 30, 11. 31, 1. f., where you will find that the whole tribe of Benjamin, as "a good part of Israel, remained with Judah, also the whole tribe of Levi, also many of Ephraim, Manasseh, Asher, Jesashar, Zebulou, who remained in the land after the spoiling of the kingdom of Israel, and went to Ezekiel to Jerusalem, and helped to cleanse the land of Israel from idols, and many Israelites dwelt in the cities of Judah.

150) Now if we have so much of Israel under the son of David, then Jeremiah is no liar, since 5) he says, Levies and seed of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob shall be found under David's house. These are all, or even partly, led with Judah to Babylon and come again with them, as Ezra counts and calls them, and no doubt many others more- which are led away under Sennacherib, because the Assyrian or Median empire was brought under the Persian empire by Cyrum, that Judah and Israel could well' have come together and go up with each other from Babylon to Jerusalem and to the land of Canaan; for these words are written Ezra 2, 70. I know this for certain: "and all Israel (or all that was of Israel) dwelt in her cities." How will they dwell there, where they have not returned? And in the days of Herod and Messiah the land was full of Israel again; for they had gathered in the seventy weeks of Daniel, that is, in 490 years, but had not gotten a kingdom again.

Therefore the present Jews are very rough teachers and industrious students of the Scriptures, pretending that Israel has not yet returned,

4) "that" is missing in the Jena and Erlanger.

5) Jenaer and Erlanger: "that".

Just as if they all had to return, but Judah did not return all, but a small number, as Ezra counts them all, that several parts stayed in Babylon, also Daniel, Nehemiah, Mordecai himself. Also, several parts of Israel remained in Medes, but perhaps came to Jerusalem at the high feasts and returned home, as Lucas writes in Acts 2:9 ff. But that the kingdom or scepter of Israel should return, as the scepter of Judah, that God had not promised; but to Judah He had promised it, who also had to get it again, in virtue of such a promise that God would build David's house and throne forever and not let them go out. For, as Jeremiah says here, God will not suffer it to be said of Him that He has rejected Judah and Israel altogether, that they should no longer be His people, and that David's throne should come to an end, as if He had forgotten His promise, since He promised and swore to David an everlasting house, even though they should now go to Babylon for a little while, yet it (says He) should remain an everlasting house and kingdom.

I say this to the honor and strength of our faith, and to the shame of the stubborn unbelief of the blinded, stiff-necked Jews, to whom God must always and forever be a liar, as if he had let David's house go out, and had forgotten his covenant and oath that David swore. For if they wanted to keep God true, they would have to confess that Messiah would have come fifteen hundred years ago, so that David's house and throne would not have had to be desolate as long as they respect it, since Jerusalem has lain in ashes for so long without a throne and David's house. For if God has kept His word from David until Babylon's prison, and from then on until Herod's time, when the scepter ceased, then He must also keep it from then on, after Herod's time, forever and ever, or David's house would not have been eternal, but a perishable one, which would have ceased with the scepter in Herod's time.

153. But God will not suffer this (as said), but David's house shall be for ever, as the day and the night, and the course of heaven and earth, saith Jeremiah. Now it cannot be eternal unless the son of David,

Messiah, when the scepter of Judah fell in the days of Herod, and sat on David's throne, and became Lord of the world. Otherwise, if the Jews were right, David's house would have been missing these thousand, four hundred, eight and sixty years, against God's promise and oath. This will not suffer. Well then, this is a thorough explanation of the matter, so that no Jew can really protest against it, even though he may outwardly pretend not to believe it, but his heart and conscience have nothing to say against it.

And where would God have preserved honor to His divine truth, since He promised David an eternal house and throne, and should have let it stand longer desolate, neither built? For, let us reckon, according to the opinion of the Jews, from David until Herod there was not completed a thousand years: so long did David's house or throne stand, including the seventy years in Babylon (but we reckon over a hundred more). But from Herod's time, or let us take (which is not much out of the way) from the destruction of Jerusalem to this year 1542 are 1468 1) years, as is said above; so according to David's house and throne four hundred or five hundred years longer desolate than built. Now ask stone and block if this is called an eternal house, especially built by God and preserved by His supreme faithfulness and truth, which stands a thousand years and lies in ashes fourteen hundred or fifteen hundred years?

Let the Jews be hard, and harder than any demant: such lightning and thunderclap of such bright, public truth should shatter them, if not soften them. But, as I said, our faith is gladly strengthened, made sure and certain, that we have the right Messiah, at the time when Herod took away the scepter from Judah and Sapphira, surely come and appear, that David's house may be eternal, and have a son on his throne forever, as God has spoken to him, sworn to him, and joined himself to him.

1) In the Wittenberg: "1569". In the Jena and Erlangen "1568". Compare the note to § 4 of this paper. - In § 154 the Wittenberg has: "1469" while the Erlangen retains "1568", as does Walch. Also Jonas has: 1568.

And if a slippery Jew would reproach me with my book against the Sabbaths, since I have proved the word eternal, Leolam, that it often means no more than a long time, not quite eternal, as Moses says, 2 Mos. 21, 6: "The master of the house shall pierce his 1) servant, who wants to stay with him, with an awl through the ear to the door, and so he shall be his servant forever. Here eternal means a human eternal; that is, as long as he lives. But I have also said there that when God sets an eternity, it is a truly divine eternity, and there He uses to add a word: "and shall not change," as Psalm 110:4: "God has sworn, and He will not repent"; item Psalm 132:11: "God has sworn to David a truth, which He will not change," 2c. Where such a thing is not added, it will certainly never be otherwise, as Isaiah 9:7: "There will be no end of peace." And Daniel 7:14: "His power is eternal, and his kingdom shall have no end." That means Eternal (not before men, who do not live eternally, but before GOD, who lives eternally).

157 Now it is written in this promise that David's house and throne shall be eternal in the sight of God, saying: "Before me, before me, a son shall sit on your throne forever. He also adds the word "not" to it, Psalm 89:36-38: "I have sworn once, by my holiness, I will not lie to David; his seed shall be forever, and his throne before me, like the sun, like the moon, it shall be preserved forever. And as the witness in clouds shall he be sure, selah." Such are also the last words of David, when he says [2 Sam. 23, 5.]: "God has made a covenant with me, eternal, sure and steadfast," or preserved. Such "sure" and "firm" is as much as a firm, sure eternal, which shall never be lacking. Likewise the saying of Jacob Gen. 49, 10: "The scepter shall not depart." Not to come away is eternal, until Messiah comes; that means quite eternal. For to Messiah all the prophets give an everlasting kingdom that shall not cease.

But let us suppose that it is a human or temporal eternity, or uncertain length.

of time (which is not possible), that would have to be the mind: Your house shall be eternal before me, that is, your house shall stand as long as it stands, or as long as you live. Hereby David would be sworn and given as much as nothing; for even without such an oath David's house would stand forever, that is, as long as it stood, or as long as he lived. But let such foolishness go, which no one but a blinded rabbi should think of. The Scripture shows that they [the prophets] all understood it from the right eternity, since it boasts that God did not want to destroy Judah because of the sins that happened under Roboam, so that David would remain a light, as God had spoken to him about his house.

159) The Maccabees may also be mentioned here, who, after Antiochus the Noble had horribly laid waste the land and the people, that the princes of the house of David departed, and the Maccabees, who were not of the house of David, but of the priestly tribe, sat in the reign, and so that the scepter of Judah had fallen, and not a son of David had eternally sat on the throne of David, because of which the eternal house of David nevertheless could not truly be eternal. Answer: The Jews may not dispute with us about this, and we may not answer them about it; for there is nothing about it in the Scriptures, because Malachi is the last prophet, and Nehemiah the last historian, who lived until Alexandrum, as his book indicates. Therefore, for both parts, for the sake of this piece, we must leave it based on Jeremiah's saying that a son sat or ruled on David's throne for and for, because apart from the Scriptures, whoever does not want to leave it, may consider it a delusion whether the Maccabees themselves ruled or served the rulers. But to the histories we want to indicate hereafter, what one may think of it.

160 But this methinks not from the scripture to be a contemptible little thing, because in the days of Athaliah the queen there sat not a son of David upon his throne six whole years, but she herself, Athaliah the tyrant, for she had slain all the male seed of the house of David, save one Joash, which was a child of a quarter of a year, or half a year old, and was secretly carried away under her hands, in the tem-

1) In all editions: his.

pel was brought up in secret by the noble woman, Jehosheba, the wife of Jehoiada the high priest, 1) who was the daughter of King Jehoram and sister of King Ahaziah, whom Jehu slew [2 Kings 11:3 ff]. Verily, here the everlasting covenant of God, made with David, was in great danger, and stood on a single, young, hidden child, silent that he should sit on the throne of David; and his house, verily, at this time looked like a dark lantern, because the light in is gone out, because the strange queen of the Gentiles of Zidon sitteth and reigneth on David's throne; but she also burneth the butt graciously.

All this does not mean that the scepter has been taken away or that the eternal covenant of God has been broken. For although the light of David does not shine brightly here, it still glows in the child Joash, who is to shine brightly and reign again in the future, and who has already been born a son of David, so that these six years are nothing but a trial, a temptation, since God often presents Himself as if He wanted to forget His word and leave everything undone, as He did with Abraham. As he did with Abraham, when he burned the dear son Isaac to ashes [Gen. 22, 2], in whom he had promised the eternal seed; as he also 2) led the children of Israel out of Egypt. Yes, he led them to death, because they had the sea in front, on both sides high rocks, behind them the enemies, who had blocked their way and their escape. Still it went according to God's word and promises that the sea had to open, flee and give space. If the sea had not done so, the rocks would have split open and given way, and squeezed and crushed Pharaoh between them, as they drowned the sea. For all creatures must be destroyed a thousand thousand times before God's word should fail and be false, however strange it may seem. So Joash is king by and in the word of God, and sits on the throne of David before God, even if he lies in the cradle, even if he lies dead and buried under the earth; for he would have to come forth, like Isaac, from the ashes.

1) Walch and the Erlanger: Jojoda.

2) Instead of "as he also" in the Jena and the Erlangen: "and". Jonas: item.

162 So one would like to answer for that from the Maccabees also. But it is not necessary, and even has a different opinion. With the prison of Babylon it would have also a mind; but it goes there much more gloriously by excellent prophets and miracles. But Jehoash was an abominable torment to the house of David against the covenant and oath of God, even though the house and regiment of David still stood strong; only the regent, or head, is in need, and God is weak in His covenant. But it is the way of his divine grace that he sometimes plays and jokes with his own, hides and disguises himself, so that he tries us whether we want to be firm in faith and love toward him, as a father sometimes does with his children. But such jesting of our dear Lord hurts beyond measure, because we do not understand it. But this does not belong here. Let this be said of the saying of Jeremiah.

The fourth saying, from which it is proved that Messiah has come. 3)

Further, we take before us one of the last prophets. It is written Hagg. 2, 7. ff.: "Thus saith the LORD, it is yet a little while, that I will move heaven and earth, the sea and the dry land; yea, all nations will I move: then shall come the consolation of the nations, Chemdath. 4) And I will make this house full of glory, saith the LORD of hosts. For I have silver and gold enough, saith the LORD of hosts: the glory of this last house shall be greater than that of the first, saith the LORD of hosts. And I will give peace in this place, saith the LORD of hosts."

This is also one of the sayings that causes the Jews the burnt suffering, trying, twisting, interpreting and torturing almost all words, as in the saying of Jacob, Gen. 49, 10, yet it does not help, their conscience pales before it, and feels that their glossing is nothing. Lyra does well, as he urges her with the word *ADHUC MODICUM*, "yet."

3) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

4) In the old editions written: "Hermdach".

a little one", and they cannot escape from him. This is what we want to see. A small short time (he says) cannot mean a great long time. Lyra is certainly right in saying that no one can deny, not even a Jew, that they are to be denied as hard as they always can. Now shall the consolation of the Gentiles come, saith he, for a little time after the same temple is built, that is, it shall come while the same temple is yet standing. And the glory of this last temple shall be greater than that of the first; and that in a little while, that is, for a little while.

165. For it is good to reckon, where the consolation of the Gentiles, which the old Messiah interprets, did not come while this temple was still standing, and is yet to come (as the Jews are now waiting for 1468 years after the destruction of the same temple, and cannot be called a short time, because they do not yet know the end of such a great time), it will never come, because it has missed the small short time, and has come into the great long time, where nothing will ever end; for the prophet speaks of a small time, not of a great time.

But here they turn out like this: Because they cannot deny the short little time, they take the word, comfort of all Gentiles, Hebrew Chemdath, before them, and crenellate it, as they did above to the saying of Jacob, with the word Shebet and Shilo, wanting it not to mean Messiah, but it should mean gold and silver of all Gentiles. Because the word Chemdath actually means desire or lust according to the grammar, as the heathen desire to have lust and love. And shall the text thus stand: Still over a short, then shall come the desire of all the Gentiles. What is this? What do the heathen desire? Gold, silver and jewels. Perhaps you would like to ask why the Jews are making such comments here? I will tell thee, Their breath stinketh for the gold and silver of the heathen: for there is no nation under the sun more covetous than they have been, 1) nor are, nor ever shall be, as is seen in their accursed usury; and they comfort themselves, when their Messiah cometh, that he shall take gold and silver from all the earth,

and divide among them. Therefore, where they can draw the Scripture on their insatiable avarice, they do so with all sacrilege. You may think that God and his prophets knew nothing else to prophesy, but how to satisfy the unjustified avarice of the damned Jews with the gold and silver of the Gentiles.

But according to this stingy mind, the prophet did not speak wisely, but should have said thus: Over a little while shall come the covetousness of the Jews. For it is the Jews who desire gold and silver more than any people on earth, so that it should be called the desire of the Jews more than the desire of the Gentiles. For though the Gentiles covet gold and silver, yet the Jews are there who covet such desires of the Gentiles, and wait for it to be brought to them, and devour it, and leave nothing for the Gentiles. Why? Because they are the noble blood, the circumcised saints, who have God's commandment and do not keep it, but are stiff-necked, disobedient, prophet-killers, hopeful, usurers, and full of all unrighteousness, as all Scripture and their present nature testify. For to such saints belongs the gold and silver of the Gentiles, who earn it with such honesty and integrity, as the devil earns paradise and the kingdom of heaven.

168. further, how is it that such highly knowledgeable masters and wise, holy prophets do not also extend the word desire (chemdath) to all other desires of the heathen? For the pagans desire not only gold and silver, but also pretty damsels, and the women pretty youths. And where among the heathen there are not vain Jews (I wanted to say miserly), who do no good to their own bodies, they also desire beautiful houses, gardens, cattle, goods; item, good days, clothes, eating, drinking, dancing, playing, and all kinds of joy. Why then do they not interpret this saying of the prophet, that such desires of all the heathen also shall come shortly to Jerusalem, that the Jews alone may fill their bellies, and feed on the pleasures of the world? For Mahomet promises such a being to his Saracens, and in this he is a true Jew, and the Jews true Saracens, according to this interpretation.

The pagans have another desire:

1) In the Wittenberg: gewest ist.

How have these wise, intelligent interpreters of the same forgotten? I am surprised, the Gentiles die and have much sickness, poverty, all kinds of hardship and fear, and there is no one who does not desire most of all not to die, not to suffer hardship, misery, sickness, or to be rid of them soon and be safe; such desire is so strong in them that they would gladly give up all the other desires, as one sees daily in experience. Why don't they then indicate that such desires of all Gentiles should also recently come to Jerusalem into the temple? Fie on you here, fie on you there, and where you are, you damned Jews, that you are allowed to drag these serious, glorious, comforting words of God so shamefully onto your mortal, maddening avarice, and do not be ashamed to show your avarice so grossly. You are not worthy to look at the Biblia from the outside, let alone to read it inside. 1) You alone should read the Biblia, which is under the sow's tail, and eat and drink the letters that fall out of it; that would be a Bible for such prophets, who rummage up the word of the divine majesty, which should be heard with all honor, trembling and joy, so sourly, and tear it up so swinishly.

170] Further, since the prophet says, "The glory of this last house shall be greater than that of the first," let us hear the noble and circumcised (I say circumcised) holy and wise prophets, who would make us Christians Jews. The great glory of the last temple over the first is this, that the last, that is, this temple of Haggai stood ten years longer than the temple of Solomon 2c. Oh, that they would have had a good astronomer here, who would have calculated it a little more exactly, he would have found perhaps that to the ten years still three moons, two weeks, five days, seven hours, twelve minutes and ten half minutes would have been over it. If there were some stuff that was on sale in Schamroth, I could give the Jews a few guilders, so that they would go and buy a pound of Schamroth.

But they still spread it on their foreheads, eyes and cheeks, because they did not want to spread it on their insolent hearts and tongues. Or do they mean that they talk with sticks and blocks, as they themselves are, the unlearned, coarse asses?

There were many gray old men and women, and beggars and wicked men, in Jerusalem, when Solomon, a youth of twenty years old, became a glorious king; should they therefore have greater glory than Solomon? Perhaps the mule of David, whereupon Solomon became king, was older than Solomon; should he therefore be more glorious than Solomon? But so shall they run, fall and fall, who without ceasing reproach God with lies, and want to be right themselves; they are not worth better than that, that they vainly write such glosses, foolish works and their own disgrace over the Biblia (as they do with great diligence). Therefore beware, dear Christian, of the Jews, whom you see from this, how they have been handed over to the devil by God's wrath, who has robbed them not only of the right understanding of the Scriptures, but also of common human reason, shame and senses, and through them only makes a vain mockery of the holy Scriptures, so that henceforth one can neither trust nor believe them in any other piece, even if a true word sometimes escapes them. For whoever may so mock and shamefully play with the terrible word of God, as you see here, and also saw above in the saying of Jacob, must have no good spirit with him. Therefore, where you see a true Jew, you may with a good conscience put a cross in front of you and speak freely with certainty: There goes a devil in the flesh.

172. The desperate peelers know well that their ancient ancestors understood this saying of Haggai of the Messiah, as Lyra, Burgensis, and others testify; They still fall from it wilfully, and make their own biblia out of their own foolish head, that they keep their wretched Jews with them in their error, against their own conscience, to our chagrin, just as if they were doing us great harm with it, and as if God would still reward them, where they serve Him (as they dream) us Gentiles, even in publicly recognized

1) In the Jenaer, with Walch and in the Erlanger: sollet. Jonas: *Debebatis*.

Truth, resisted. So it goes with them, as you have seen, that they disgrace themselves, do us no harm, and lose God and His Scripture over it.

Now this is the saying: "Over one small thing, I will move heaven and earth, the sea and the dry land (that is, the islands in the sea), and Chemdath shall come to all the nations," that is, Messiah, the desire of all the nations, which we have translated "comfort. For Begierde is not intelligible enough, because in German it means the inward lust and desire in the heart, *active*. But here it means desire, the outward, *passive* thing that a heart desires; if it were also translated as: "aller Heiden Freud und Wonne," it would not be wrong either. Summa, it is Messiah in whom the unbelieving, hardened Jews should have vain displeasure, disgust and abomination, as Isaiah 52:14 prophesies of them. But the Gentiles should welcome him as their heart's joy, pleasure, all desire and lust. For he brings them salvation from sins, death, devils, hell and all evil forever. Yes, this is the desire, heart's desire, joy and comfort of the Gentiles.

174 This agrees with the saying of Jacob, Gen 49:10: "And the nations will obey Shiloh, or Messiah," that is, they will accept him with joy, hear his word, and become his people without sword, without restraint, as if he should say, "The base, uncircumcised nations will do this; but my noble fruits, my circumcised lost children, will not do it, but will become furious and senseless against it. Isaiah 2:2 ff. and Micah 4:1 agree with this: "In the last days the mountain where the Lord's house is will be made higher than all mountains, and will be exalted above all hills, and there all the nations will run to it (no doubt without restraint, out of lust and desire), and many peoples will rush to it and say, 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of Jacob the God, that he may teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths. For out of Zion shall go forth a law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem'" 2c. And indeed the prophets speak of Messiah's kingdom among the Gentiles.

175 Yes, that's the trouble, that's the trouble.

This makes the Jews mad and foolish and drives them to such a damned mind that they have to pervert all the sayings of the Scriptures so shamefully; namely, they do not want it, they cannot stand it, that we Gentiles should be like them before God, and the Messiah should be our comfort and joy as well as theirs. Before they suffer this, I say that we Gentiles, who are spat upon, maledicted, cursed, blasphemed, desecrated by them without ceasing, should partake with them in the Messiah, be called joint heirs and their brothers, crucified before ten more Messiahs, and kill God (if it were possible) themselves, with all the angels and all the creatures, and deserve a thousand hells for one: so even an incomprehensible hard pride is in the noble blood of the fathers and circumcised saints. They want to have the Messiah alone and be lords of the world; the accursed goyim shall be servants, give their desire, that is, their gold and silver to the Jews, and let themselves be slaughtered like the poor cattle; before they leave this sense, they rather remain knowingly and eternally lost.

They have imbibed such poisonous hatred against the Goyim from their youth, from their parents and rabbis, and still drink in themselves without ceasing, that, as the 109th Psalm, v. 2 ff. says, it has gone through their blood and flesh, through their marrow and bone, has become their very nature and life. And as little as they can change flesh and blood, marrow and bone, as little can they change such pride and envy, they must remain and perish like this, where God does not perform particularly high miracles. And if I wanted to cause a Jew great, great annoyance and anger, I would say: Do you hear, Jehudi, do you know that I am a true brother of all the holy children of Israel, and a joint heir in the kingdom of the true Messiah? There is no doubt that I should see Rahm; 1) if he could look at me with the eyes of a basilisk, he certainly would, and what he would wish for me, all the devils would not be able to do, I truly know, if God would allow them to. But I don't want to do it, and I also ask that no one does it.

1) Compare the note to § 69 of this paper.

for the sake of Christ. For the weather would go with under our protection and umbrella, need land and streets, cursing and blasphemy in the heart and mouth of the Jew market and alleys; in addition, the princes and authorities against the name of Jesus Christ and against God the sit, snore and have their mouths open, let the Jews take Father; so we should do well, and not give cause where from their open bag and box, steal and rob what they want, we can avoid it, just as I should not provoke a possessed that is, they let themselves and their subjects toil and be man when I know that he will blaspheme and curse God, sucked dry by the Jews' usury, and make beggars of Otherwise the Jews hear and see more than enough in themselves with their own money. For the Jews, being in us, that they blaspheme the name of Jesus, and curse in misery, should certainly have nothing, and what they have their hearts every moment, as they are possessed. must certainly be ours: so they do not work, earn us

For, as I have said, they cannot bear to hear or see nothing; so we do not give or give it to them; nor do they that we cursed Goyim Messiah should boast of our have our money and goods, and are thus our masters in Chemdath, and be as good as they are, or make our own lands, and in their misery. If a thief steals ten themselves to be. Therefore know, dear Christian, and do guilders, he must hang; 1) if he robs in the street, his head not doubt that, next to the devil, you have no more bitter, is lost. But a Jew, if he steals ten tons of gold and robs by poisonous, fierce enemy than a true Jew who earnestly his usury, he is dearer than God himself.

wants to be a Jew. There may be some among them who 180. and for a sign they confidently boast, and believe what the cow or goose believes, but they all have strengthen their faith and venomous resentment against the blood and circumcision attached to them. Therefore, us, saying among themselves, Hold fast, behold, how God they are often blamed in the histories for poisoning wells, is with us, and does not forsake his people even in misery. stealing children, and keeping them in a state of We do not work, we have good days, we have bad days; cultivation, as in Trent and Weissensee 2c. They may say the cursed Goyim have to work for us, but we get their no to it, but whether they do or not, I know well that there money; thus we are their masters, but they are our is no lack of full, complete, ready will among them, where servants. Hold fast, dear children of Israel, it will get better, they could do it, secretly or obviously. Be sure of this, and our Messiah will still come, if we continue like this and act accordingly. have brought all the Gentiles Chemdath to us through

But if they do something good, know that it is not out usury, and otherwise. Well, this we suffer from them under of love, nor for your benefit, but because they must have our protection and shield; still they curse us, as said. But room to live with us, they must do something out of more of this hereafter.

necessity, but the heart remains and is as I have said. If Now we act as they cannot suffer us to be joint heirs you don't want to believe me, then read Lyra, Burgensem in the kingdom of Messiah, nor to have our Chemdath in and others, honest, truthful men. And if they did not write it, as the prophets abundantly give it to us. But what does it, the scripture says that the two seeds, the serpent and God say to this? He says: He wants to give the Chemdath the woman, are enemies, and God and the devil are not to the Gentiles, and their obedience shall please Him, as one. Also one finds it in their writings and prayer books Jacob, Gen. 49, 10., says, and all the prophets, and again roughly enough. wants to be so hard against the hard head of the Jews that

A person who does not know the devil might wonder He wants to reject them before they 2) choose and accept why they are so hostile to Christians before others, since the Gentiles, un- they have no reason to be, since we do everything good for them. They live with us at home,

1) In the old editions: hencken.

2) Wittenberger: she marriage.

whether they are not full of the noble blood of the fathers, nor circumcised saints. For thus saith Hosea Cap. 2, 23. "I will call that, which is not my people, my people, and they shall call me their GOt." But to the Jews he says [Hos. 1, 9.]: "LoAmni, you are not my people, and I am not your GOD", which also Moses sang to them long before in his song: "They provoke me to anger with that which is not God, and they provoke me to anger with their useless doings: so again I will provoke them to anger with that which is not my people, and with a foolish people I will provoke them to anger [5 Mos. 32, 21.]. This saying has now gone strong for fifteen hundred years, that we foolish Gentiles, who were not God's people, are now God's people. That makes the Jews mad and foolish, and have become over it not-God's people, who nevertheless should have been God's people and should be fair.

(182) Now that we have finished the saying of Haggai, it is here proved with authority that Messiah, the Chemdath of the Gentiles, came at the time when this temple stood; as the ancients understood, and the present Jews also bear witness to their lazy, vain sayings, because they know nothing to say against it, except that in which they speak their own shame. For he who gives an idle, cold and loose answer testifies and judges of himself that he has a lost cause, and it would be better for him to be silent with less shame than to answer idly with great shame. So now Haggai says: "Still over a little one, then I will move heaven and earth, sea and dry land, yes, I will move all nations, and shall 1) come the desire of all nations." This I understand after my simple sense thus: There has been from the beginning of the world enmity between the serpent's seed and the woman's seed, and have for and for with each other caused turmoil, but one time greater than the other.

For where the seed of the woman is or comes, it brings with it a jumble and a tumult, as it says in the Gospel, "I have not come to send peace on earth, but sword and dissension," and takes away the household goods of the strong-armed man who had peace in his court [Matt. 10:34].

1) Jenaer, Walch and Erlanger: should.

Luc. 11, 22]. He does not like it, because angels and devils are stirring in the air, and men are stirring with men on earth, all for the sake of the seed of the woman. And although without this there is also much and great rumbling, war and unrest in the world, but because it is not because of this seed, it is a small thing before God, since all angels have to do with this rumbling.

Because it was now high time for this seed or Messiah to come, he said, "Yet a little," that is, until now the rumbling has been in my people Israel alone, that is, in a small corner, which the devil has always wanted to devour, and all the kings around have set against them. For he knew well that the promised seed was in this people, which should do it to him; therefore he has always wanted to wear it out, to accuse one unrest, displeasure, war, rumor after another. Well, there is still a small thing to do, so I will give him enough rumors. And I will stir up such a tumult, and it shall be good; not only among my people Israel in the narrow corner, but as far as heaven and earth, sea and dry land, that is, where it is wet and dry, whether in the land, or in the islands, or by the sea, or by the waters, that is, where men are (or, as he says): "All nations will I stir up," that all angels may fight with all devils in heaven or in the air, and all men may quarrel with all men on earth over the seed.

For I will send Chemdath to all the nations, and they will love him and cling to him, as Gen 49:10 says: "The nations will fall to him," and they will become enemies of the devil, the old serpent, and fall from him. Then it will happen as it should happen, when the god and prince of the world has become angry, mad and furious, so that he has to grant Chemdath and Shiloh, the seed of women, his kingdom, his Hans, his household, his services, his power. Read the histories from the time of Christ, whoever wants to, how first the Jews and pagans, then the heretics, last the Mahomet, and now the pope vows and still rages against God and his Messiah, Ps. 2, 1, so

2) "an" is missing in the Wittenberger.

he will understand what Haggai says here about rumors. There has not been a corner in the world, nor a place in the sea, where the gospel has not sounded and brought Chemdath, as Ps. 19:4, 5 says: "There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their sound goes out into all the earth, and their speech to the end of the world." And the devil was truly found at home with murders by tyrants, with lies by heretics, and with all his devilish wiles and powers, as he still does to hinder and resist the gospel. This is the rumor.

I will begin this rumor with the tender fruit of Antioch the Noble. For from Haggai to Antioch are about 300 years. That is the small time in which they had peace. For the kings of Persia did them much good; so Alexander did them nothing, and stood well with his descendants, except for this unruly man, Antioch, who began the strife and misfortune, and the devil sought through him to extirpate the seed of the woman; he washed away 1) Jerusalem, temple, land and people, desecrated the temple, and raged as his god the devil drove him. And there almost all the happiness of the Jews was gone, and never came back to the former state until this day, and never comes again.

187 This is so that the Jews may be understood correctly when they say: Chemdath of all the Gentiles, that is, gold and silver have come into this temple; that is, if the previous kings have put something into it, this one has taken it away purely; and reverses their gloss thus: Chemdath of all the Jews brings Antiochus among the Gentiles; so that this saying of Haggai cannot be understood from the shirt nor coat of all the Gentiles. For after these 300 years, or little time for and for, from that time on, they got not much from the Gentiles, but had to give much to the Gentiles, until the Romans came in soon after, and made it all over, and set Herodem king over them; what he gave them they well invented; and so is with

1) "Flush" here and at the beginning of § 188 as much as: rob, plunder. Cf. § 254 at the end. Jonas: *diripuit*.

From Antioch on, they were left with very little peace. And Daniel also stops at this Antiocho, as if he should say: Now it is at the end and everything is over, now the Messiah is before the door, who will make the rumor the longer the greater.

(188) Not only did the wicked Antiochus wash and desecrate the temple, but he also oppressed the Shebeth or Sultan, the prince of the house of David, that is, the last prince John Hyrcanum, so that none of his descendants came again to the throne of David or to the regency, without the Saphra or Mechokek remaining until Herodem, that from now on David's house was to be looked upon as if its light had gone out, and there was no longer a shul or scepter of Judah. It was also now at the end, and still about 150 years approximately up to Messiah. But it is common that what is to break must first crack or crack a little; what is to sink must first sink or sway a little. Thus the scepter of Judah also did at its last end; it became weak, cracked and crumbled for 150 years, until it fell completely at the hands of the Romans and Herod. And so the princes of Judah remained the 150 years without regiment among the commoners, perhaps even impoverished. For Mary, Christ's mother in Nazareth, boasts that she was a poor, miserable little girl [Luc. 1, 48].

But it is also true that the Maccabees fought against Antiochum and won (as Daniel 11:34 says of a little help) and thus came to the throne of David, who were priests of the tribe of Levi and Aaron. Now one can say with good reason that the royal and priestly tribe are mixed. For so we read 2 Chron. 22, 11. about Josabea, daughter of King Joram and sister of King Ahaziah, that she was the wife of the high priest Jehoiada, from the royal tribe of Solomon, grafted into the priestly tribe as a graft. One trunk and tree with him. Because of this, she became the descendant of Jehoiada, the priest's archmother, and a right Sarah of the priestly lineage. Therefore the Maccabees may well be called David's blood and children, from the mother's line. For that which comes from the mother,

belongs to us just as closely as it comes from the Father. Which way goes also in other countries. As, our emperor Carolus is king in Hispania from the mother, not from the father; his father Philip was duke of Burgundy, not from the father Maximiliano, but from the mother Maria.

190 So David called all the children Jehoiada and Josabea his natural children, sons and daughters, because Josabea was descended from his son Solomon, and by the Maccabees Solomon's tribe returned to the regiment and the scepter, according to the female line, from which he had fallen by Ahaziah, according to the male line, and remained until Herod, who cut off and cut off all of them, both Shulman and Saphra, or Sanhedrin. There now lies the scepter of Judah and Mechokek; there stands David's house in darkness, both from the male and female line. Therefore Messiah must be there, the right light of David, the right son, who shall preserve his house until now, and now continue to preserve and shine forever, as God has said that the scepter of Judah shall remain until Messiah comes, and David's house shall endure forever and not go out. But God must (as said) nevertheless remain the liar of the Jews, as the Messiah has not yet sent, as He has promised and sworn.

Further, God says through Haggai: "I will make this temple full of glory; I have gold and silver, and the glory of this last house shall be greater than the glory of the first house. It is true, great glory happened to this temple in the three hundred years before Antioch, when the Persians and Alexander's descendants, the kings of Syria and King Philadelphus in Egypt gave great goods to it; but it is still nowhere equal in glory to Solomon's first temple with all of it, there must be another glory, or that temple of Solomon's 1) far surpasses it. For there was also gold and silver in abundance, and the ark, and the mercy seat, and the cherubims, and the tables of Moses, and Aaron's rod, and the bread of heaven in the golden vessel, and Aaron's garments; and the Urim and the holy things.

1) Erlanger: "overview", which is not a misprint because "übersticht" is given as a variant. Jonas: *superat*.

Thummim, the holy oil with which the kings and priests were anointed (Dan. 9). And when Solomon dedicated the same temple, fire fell from heaven and consumed the sacrifice. And the temple became full of mist (that is, it), divine majesty, which shows itself present in it, as Solomon speaks there: "God has said that he will dwell in the mist" [1 Kings 8:12]. For this is what He did in the wilderness over the tabernacle of Moses.

192. none of these glories (which are far above gold and silver) have been in this Temple of Haggai; yet God says that there shall be greater glory here than there. Then let the Jews whistle, who has been this greater glory? They can't murmur here, because, as the text says and the old Jews, their ancestors, confessed, that the Gentile Chemdath, Messiah, came at the time of the same temple and honored the temple with his presence; as we Christians know that our Lord Jesus Christ, the right Chemdath, sacrificed inside by his mother, and he himself often taught inside and did miracles; that is the right mist, his tender humanity, in which God showed himself present and let himself be heard and seen. Whether the blind Jews scoff at this, yet our faith is strengthened with it, until they give another glory of this temple, greater than this Chemdath of all the Gentiles. This is what they will do when they build the third temple, that is, when God is a liar and the devil is the truth, and they will possess Jerusalem again, and not before.

193 Josephus 2) writes that Herod had demolished the temple of Haggai, as it was not built splendidly enough, and built it anew, as splendidly or more splendidly than Salompn's temple had been. I want to believe the histories gladly; but still it lacks the pieces, which are told above of the high old sanctuary, namely, the ark, mercy seat, Cherubim 2c., if it would have been equally vain Demant and Rnbin. Moreover, because Herod had no command from God to do such things, but, as an ungodly enemy of God and His people, out of vain, he did not do them.

2) Antiquit., Lib. XV, cap. XI, § 3.

If Zerubbabel, for his own glory and pride, did such construction, all his building and work was not as good in the sight of God as the smallest stone that Zerubbabel placed in the Temple by God's command. And no doubt he did not deserve much mercy, that he wanted to build the commanded temple, erected and consecrated by God's word, broken down, desecrated and much more glorious, without God's word and command. Although God, for the sake of the place 1) that He had chosen for the temple, allowed such things to happen and suffered, that He rather gives an evil interpretation with His breaking down, that henceforth the people of Israel should lose the temple, God's word and everything, and instead practice the vain splendor of the world under the appearance of God's service.

194 This temple was not only less glorious than Solomon's temple, but it was also more defiled in every way than Solomon's temple, and often made full of shame. First of all, against the will of the Jews, when Antiochus took everything that was inside and put an idol on the altar, sacrificed pork, and made a real pigsty and idolatrous mess out of the temple, he made an abominable strangulation, as if he were the devil himself, in Jerusalem, 1 Maccab. 1, 57, as Daniel 11, 31. had proclaimed. No less dishonor was practiced by the Romans, and especially by the disgraceful Emperor Caligula, who also placed his abomination in the temple, of which Daniel 9:27 and 12:11 tell us. Such dishonor and disgrace was not done to that temple of Solomon by pagans and foreigners, that it would be a trouble, how the word of Haggai is true: "I will make this temple full of honor, which shall be greater than the honor of that temple"; so one would like to say against it, that it was full of disgrace and more than that temple, where one wants to speak of outward, physical honor. Therefore another glory must come to it, if Haggai is right.

Secondly, they themselves, the Jews, have also defiled this temple more than it has ever been defiled, namely, with spiritual idolatries. Lyra writes, and others more in many places, that the Jews, after the

Returning from Babylon, they have not committed idolatry, nor as grave a sin with the murder of prophets as before; so that he will prove that this cause of their misery must be a greater sin than idolatry, prophet murder 2c., namely, that they crucified Messiah. This argument is right, good and strong; but that they did not murder prophets, the fault was not in their evil will, but they had no more prophets to punish their idolatry, avarice and vice; therefore they could not murder prophets. Although the last prophet Malachi, who began to rebuke the priests, hardly escaped, if he escaped otherwise.

But they practiced idolatry more abominably in this time than in the time of the temple; not the crude, tangible, foolish idolatry, but the subtle spiritual idolatry, as Zechariah paints it on the 5th, v. 1 ff. under the name of the flying letter and the traveling bushel, and finally, chap. 11, 13. and 12, 10. prophesies a shameful thing: "as they sell and pierce God for thirty pieces of silver". Elsewhere. Is it not great shame enough that at the same time the priests most shamefully perverted the ten commandments of God? Tell me, what idolatry is like this abomination that turns God's word into lies? That is, to set up false gods under God's name and appearance, as the other commandment says: "You shall not take the name of your God in vain.

197. Yet their Talmud and Rabbis write that killing is not sin if a Jew kills a Gentile, but if he kills a brother in Israel; and if he does not keep an oath to a Gentile, it is not sin. Item, stealing and robbing (as they do by usury) the goyim is a service to God; for they hold, because they are the noble blood and circumcised saints, but we are cursed goyim, so they cannot make it 2) rude with us, nor sin against us, because they are lords of the world, and we are their servants, yea, their cattle. Of this you may read further yourself Burgensem

1) Wittenberger: Worts.

2) Wittenberger: so. Jonas: non satis esse scelerati.

additione Isa. 34. and Zachariä 5., there you will find what the rabbis teach good, and you will say that I write much too mildly against them.

198. Summa, as their rabbis taught, our evangelists also tell us. Matth. 15, 6: that they abrogated the fourth commandment, to honor father and mother, and Matth. 23, 13. ff., practiced many shameful teachings without what Matth. 5, 20. ff. Christ says, how they preached and interpreted the ten commandments so harmfully, and had established in the temple changers, merchants, and all kinds of covetousness, that our Lord Christ said: they had made of God's house a den of murderers [Matth. 21, 12. Luc. 19,45.]. Now you count what a beautiful honor this is, how full of glory Hans has been, that God must call His own house a pit of murder, because so many souls have been murdered by their stingy false doctrine, that is, by perverse idolatry. Even today, the Jews persist in such teachings, and do as their fathers did, perverting God's word, being stingy, usurious, stealing, murdering (wherever they can) and always teaching their children to do so.

This is not yet the greatest disgrace of this temple. This is first of all the true abomination of all abominations, shame above all shame, that at the time of this temple some high priests and a whole sect were Sadducaean, that is, Epicurean, who held no angel, devil, heaven, hell, or life after this life. And such fellows should go to the temple in priestly office and garments, sacrifice for the people, pray and burn incense, preach to the people, and govern? Tell me, how much worse could Antiochus have been with his idol and pork sacrifices than these Epicurian sows and ferch mothers 1)? Where is Haggai's word that the glory of this temple shall be greater than Solomon's temple? A physical sow's stall can be a royal one in the sight of God and reason.

Hall against this temple, for the sake of such great, abominable, monstrous pillars.

How much more honestly do the pagan philosophers and poets write and teach, not only about God's rule and the life to come, but also about temporal virtues, since they teach that a man is by nature obliged to serve others, to believe even his enemies, and especially to be faithful and helpful in times of need, as Cicero and his peers teach. Yes, I think that in three fables of Aesopi, in half of Catone, in several comedies of Terentii there is more wisdom and teaching of good works than is found in all Talmudists' and rabbis' books, and may fall into all Jews' hearts.

If anyone thinks that I speak too much. I do not talk too much, but much too little, because I see their writings: they curse us Goyim and wish us all misfortune in their schools and prayers, they rob us of our money and goods by usury and, where they can, they prove to us all evil trickery, want to have done right and well in this, that is, to have served God, and teach to do so. No Gentiles have done this, nor does anyone, except the devil himself, or those he has possessed, as he possessed the Jews.

Burgensis, who was a very learned rabbi among them, became a Christian by God's grace (which is strange), is almost moved by this piece, that they curse us Christians so horribly in their schools (as Lyra also writes), and concludes that they must not be God's people. For if they were God's people, they would do as the captive Jews did in Babylon, to whom Jeremiah wrote: "Pray for the king and for the city where you are captives, for in its peace you also have peace" [Jer. 29:7]. But our bastards and false Jews think they must curse us, hurry, and do all harm where they can, when they have no cause; therefore they are certainly no longer God's people. More about this later.

203. Now that we come back to the temple of Haggai, it is certain that no greater, more shameful disgrace has happened to a house than to this holy house of God by such disgraceful

1) In the Wittenberg: "Ferchmütter" - piglet mothers, sows. The same expression: "Farchmutter" is also found in Luther's letter to Gabriel Zwilling of 3V. Sept. 1535, Walch, old edition, vol. XXI, 383. The Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger offer here: "Sewmütterre."

The house of Christ is called the House of God because brought, and the visions and prophecies sealed, and the the four poles are his. Nor is it called Christ's house, Most Holy One anointed." [Dan. 9, 24.]

because the four poles are his. Therefore, against such 206 We cannot now deal with this rich saying, which great dishonor, there must have been great and different is, of course, one of the most distinguished in all of glory inside, neither silver nor gold. If not, Haggai's Scripture, and all have (how rightly) been taken up around prophecy will not stand, that the glory of this temple will it. For he not only predetermines the time of Christ, but be greater than Solomon's temple, and no glory can be also prophesies what he shall do, namely, to take away found in such overpowered disgraces, except that of sin, and to bring in righteousness, and that the same by Chemdath, who is to come shortly and surpass such his death; and makes Christ the priest, which taketh away disgrace with his glory; the Jews cannot show any, and the sin of all the world. These things, I say, we must now must stifle here. leave in abeyance, and consider the time (as we have

I must break off and leave the last part of Haggai, determined), whether such a Messiah or priest has come, where he prophesies: "In this place (says the LORD) I will or is yet to come, to strengthen our faith against all devils give peace"; whether this should be understood from the and men.

time of Antiochus until this time, when the Jews have suffered all misfortunes and are still in misery, for there shall be peace in this place, says God. The place is and still stands, the temple and peace is gone; the Jews will know how to interpret it. The histories tell me that before Antiocho there was little peace for 300 years, and after that none, until this hour, without what existed in the time of the Maccabees; I leave that, as I said, to others. Summa, this peace must not be a physical one, but the peace of Messiah or Chemdath, that is, the peace in the kingdom of God, which is eternal, which Messiah brought and taught, Is. 11, 2. Zach. 9, 9.

The fifth saying, from which it is proved that Messiah has come. 1)

Lastly, we must listen to the great prophet Daniel, with whom a special, so-called angel, Gabriel, speaks, the like of which is not found in the old Scriptures. This must be something special, since the angel is named; he speaks to Daniel thus: "Seventy weeks are determined over your people and over 2) your holy city, so that the transgression is prevented, the sin is sealed, the iniquity is reconciled, an everlasting righteousness is established.

Of the seventy weeks of Danieli. 3)

(207) First, it is agreed that these seventy weeks are not weeks of days, but weeks of years, that one week is called seven years, and makes 490 years in all; that is one. Secondly, it is also one that these seventy weeks were completed when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans. In these two matters there is no doubt in anyone's mind, although there are countless doubts as to when and where such seventy weeks actually began and were completed; which we do not need to dispute here, because it is unanimously decided that they were completed and finished around the time of Jerusalem's destruction, which is enough for us this time.

If this is true, as it must be, because after the destruction of Jerusalem there is not a week left of the seventy weeks, then Messiah must have come about the time before the destruction of Jerusalem, when there is still something left of the seventy weeks, namely, the last week, as the text hereafter speaks clearly and powerfully. After the seven and sixty-two weeks (that is, after nine and sixty weeks), namely, in the last or seventieth week, Christ will come

1) This superscription is in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.
2) "about" is missing in the Wittenberger.

3) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.
4) "der" is missing in the Jenaer and in the Erlanger.

be killed, but in such a way that he will come back to life. For "in the same last week he shall make a covenant with many" (says the angel), which he cannot do as long as he is dead, he must be alive. For "to make a covenant" can mean nothing else than to fulfill the promise of God made to the fathers, namely to spread the blessing promised in Abraham's seed among all the Gentiles, as the angel Kroben says: "the visions and prophecies shall be sealed or fulfilled." There belongs a living Messiah, who nevertheless is to be killed before. But the Jews do not want to know about this; therefore we leave it this time and stick to the fact that Messiah must have come around the time of these seventy weeks, which the Jews cannot deny.

209 For there are their books and certain histories which prove that not only a few Jews, but all the Jews at that time, were of opinion that Messiah should come or be present at that time; this we will hear. When Herod became king by force of the Romans in Judah and Israel, the Jews saw that the scepter of Judah would be taken away by force, and they fought hard against it, and during the thirty years (that is how long they resisted) many thousands of Jews were slain and much blood was shed, until they grew tired and surrendered. But the Jews looked around for their Messiah, and there was a cry that the Messiah had been born, which was true, for in the thirtieth year of Herod our Lord Christ was born. But Herod put a stop to this cry by force, strangled all the young children around Bethlehem, so that our Lord had to be fled into Egypt. He also strangled his own son (because he was from the Jewish mother), fearing that the scepter of Judah would rise again through him and gain the followers of the Jews, because such a rumor of the born Christ (as Philo writes) had spread.

210) More than thirty years later John the Baptist comes out of the wilderness and preaches about the Lord, that he was not born alone, but that he was on his way to rule among them, soon after him, as our evangelists describe. Suddenly he is

Even there, he preached great miracles, so that the Jews hoped that after the fallen scepter would come Shiloh. But the chief priests, rulers and their followers were offended by the fact that he did not come as a mighty king, but as a poor beggar. For their thoughts were that Messiah should gather the Jews together, and not only thrust the foreign king from the scepter, but also subdue the Romans and all the world with the sword, and make them great rulers over all the Gentiles. Since such a thought was lacking, the noble blood and circumcised saints were spurned, as to whom the kingdom was promised, and could not come to it through this beggar. So they despised him and did not accept him.

211 But he, when they despised and blasphemed John and his preaching and miracles as the deeds of Beelzebub, spoiled it, and salted it altogether, chastising and reproving them severely (which he should not have done), that they were stingy, wicked, naughty children, false teachers, seducers of the people, 2c. Summa, serpent-breeders and devil-children, on the other hand he was friendly to the sinners, tax collectors, pagans and Romans, so that it could be seen that he was an enemy to the people of Israel and a friend to the pagans and husks. Then the fire was kindled against him, and they were angry, bitter, venomous, and foolish against him, and at last poured out the bells to kill him, and so they did, crucifying him as cruelly as they ever could, and so they cooled their little troubles, that even Pilate the Gentile perceived and testified that they innocently condemned and killed him out of hatred and envy, without a cause.

212 Since they had executed this false Messiah (when they wanted to have considered it), they nevertheless did not leave the delusion that Messiah must be present or near. The Romans were always grumbling about the scepter. Soon the rumor came that Jesus, whom they had killed, had risen again, and was now preached for Messiah freely and openly, and the people in the city of Jerusalem fell to him, also the Gentiles in Antioch and everywhere in the country. Here they got to do; they should,

To resist this dead Messiah and his people, so that he would not be believed to be the resurrected Messiah, and also to resist the Romans, so that their Messiah, whom they hoped would not come eternally from the scepter; there arose a stranglehold against the Christians, there unrest against the Romans. This they did for forty years, until the Romans were forced to disturb the country and the city. And they lost over this delusion of their false Christ and for persecution of the true Christ eleven times a hundred thousand men, as Josephus writes, along with the land, city, scepter, temple, priesthood and everything they had in the most terrible way.

This great cruel defeat, which is terrible to read and to hear, should have made them cheap and humble. Yes, they became seven times harder, angrier and more proud than before; it helped that they, scattered around, had to see how the Christians grew and increased daily with their Messiah, and the saying of Moses, Deut. 32:21, came over them with full force: "They have angered me. They have provoked me to anger against that which is not a God; so will I provoke them to anger against that which is not a people"; and Hos. 2:23 [Cap. 1:9]: "I will call that which is not my people my people; but ye shall not be my people, neither will I be your God." And putting on their heads and horns, they wanted to have their own Messiah, of whom 1) the Gentiles should not boast, and to cut off this Messiah, of whom both Jews and Gentiles boasted; They went all over the world through the Roman Empire, where they could strangle a Christian in a corner, they dragged him out to the judges, and cried out over him (because they could no longer, since they had no court nor power), until they killed him, shed thereby a lot of Christian blood and made countless martyrs, also outside the Roman Empire, in Persia, and where they could.

214. but they still held fast to the delusion that the time of Messiah must be at hand, because the seventy weeks of Daniel were over, and the temple of Haggai destroyed, and yet not liking the person of JESUS of Nazareth, they continued

They had a rabbi or Talmudist, named Akiba, who was very highly learned among them and held above all rabbis, an old, gray, honest man, who was fervent about the sayings of Haggai and Daniel, and also Jacob, Gen. 49:10. They chose one whose surname was Kochab, which means a star in German (Burgensis calls his real name Heutoliba), who is almost well known in all histories, and called him Ben Kozba 2) or Bar Kozban; this one had to be their Messiah, and he was quite happy to do it. Then all the rabbis and all the people fell down, confidently gathered themselves together and armed themselves strongly, and wanted to clean up both Christians and Romans from the world. For they now had the Messiah of their liking and mind, of whom the above Scriptures proclaimed.

This displeasure began about thirty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, under the emperor Trajan. And Rabbi Akiba was the Kochab's prophet and spirit, who blew, drove, and incited him fiercely, bringing all the sayings in the Scriptures of Messiah upon his person before all the people, saying, Thou art Messiah. He especially made use of the saying Balaam, Numbers 24:17, 18, 19, because of his surname, that he was called Kochab, that is, Star. For thus Balaam saith in the spirit there, A Kochab (star) shall come forth out of Jacob, and a scepter shall arise out of Israel, and shall smite the princes of Moab, and destroy all the children of Seth. Edom he shall take, and Seir shall be subject to his enemies; but Israel shall have victory. Out of Jacob shall the ruler come, and destroy the remnant of cities."

That was a right sermon for such an angry, restless mob to lead them on, as it happened. And so that it would be certain and could not be lacking, the high, noble Rabbi Akiba (the old fool and hunch) made himself a satellite.

- 2) About this change of the name from Barcochba compare § 218.
- 3) Scripture - Scripture passages.

1) Wittenberger: "the".

If I haven't got it right in German, someone else will do it better; it should be the one who is first at the king's or prince's side in the field or battle, be he on horseback or on foot, although here there is something more, because he is also a prophet and (as happened with us) a coiner. Now the scepter of Judah and Messiah are sitting there, and they are sure of the things. Nevertheless they did this for thirty years, so that Kochab always let himself be called King Messiah, slaughtered many Christians who did not want to deny our Messiah Jesus Christ. His captains also attacked the Romans wherever they could, especially in Egypt, where they once defeated the Roman captain under Trajano; indeed, their hearts, brains and stomachs swelled; now God had to be with them and with them, and they took a city near Jerusalem, called "Bitter", which is called Bethoron in the Scriptures.

Here they knew no other way, because their Messiah, King Kochab, would now be master of the world, and would have won the Christians and Romans under him and everything. But the emperor Adrianus sent his army against them, besieged Bitter, won it and killed Messiah and prophet, star and eclipse, lord and ruler, so that they themselves complain in their books that there were twice eighty thousand men at Bitter, who blew the trumpets, and were over a large number of captains, and that forty times a hundred thousand men were slain, without what was slain at Alexandria, which is said to have been twelve times a hundred thousand. But methinks they throw the axe much too far. So I will interpret it: That the two times eighty thousand trumpet-blowers were brave men, able to defend themselves in battle, that each of them was able to lead large and many troops in the field.

218. after this defeat, which was very good, they themselves called Kochab, their lost Messiam, Kozab; that rhymes and reads close together. For so their Talmudists write: You shall not read Kochab, but Kozab; therefore he is now called Kozban in all histories. Kozab means: wrong. Because it had lacked, and was a false, "light

a true Messiah. Just as we Germans would rhyme: You are not a German, but a deceiver, not a Welshman, but a forger. And of a usurer I may say: You are not a citizen, but a strangler; as such rhyming is common in all languages. Of such histories also writes our *Eusebius*, eccl. hist. lib. 4, cap. 6, calls Barcochabas, and says that there was a cruel great battle, that the Jews were so completely driven out of the country that they could no longer have seen their fatherland with their godless eyes, even from afar, if they had climbed the highest mountains.

219. such terrible history gives sufficient testimony that the whole Jewry had such a mind that the time of the Messiah must be there, when the seventy weeks had ended, the temple of Haggai had been destroyed, the scepter had been taken away from Judah, as the Proverbs of Jacob, Gen. 49, 10., Haggai 2, 8. and Daniel 9, 24. had clearly pointed out and proclaimed, that we Christians (praise God!) are sure and certain of our faith.) are sure and certain of our faith that the true Messiah, Jesus Christ, has come at that time; because not only his excellent miracles, which the Jews themselves cannot deny, stand as a testimony, but also his opponents, who wanted to cut him off together with all his own, so terrible a fall and misfortune over the name Messiah. 1) How else could they have started such misery over themselves, if they had not been sure that the time of Messiah must be here? Well, I mean, that is to say, they ran and pushed themselves, now for another time, "against the stone of offence and rock of trouble," as Isaiah 8:14, 15 says, since so many times a hundred thousand wanted to devour Jesus of Nazareth, and were themselves crushed, disintegrated, broken, entangled and caught, as Isaiah says there.

1) It seems to us that according to the context "name-Messiah" stands for "false Messiah". In all editions the words "names" and "Messiah" are written separately. A hyphen in compound words was not yet in use at Luther's time. Jonas, we believe, also did not understand this passage correctly, for he translates: *propter nomen Messiae*. It should be noted that in none of the German editions does it say: "Messiä", but: "Messia".

220 Since they had lacked such two dangerous and If you want to know how masterfully the Jews interpret the cruel entrenchments in the most horrible way, the first one Scriptures, so that they may not have a certain in Jerusalem under Vespasiano, the other one in Bitter understanding.

under Adrians, they should have been struck in So they have also martyred this saying of Daniel. I themselves, become soft and humble, and thought: Help cannot tell all their shameful glosses. I will take one before God, how does it happen, the time of Messiah has me, which Lyra and Burgensis consider to be the most appeared and passed according to the word of the famous and meanest of the Jews, from which the Jews prophets, and we are so cruelly and terribly struck over it! must not depart at the loss of their souls, which reads How if our thoughts of Messiah, that he should become thus:

such a worldly cook, had deceived us, and had come in 223. "Seventy weeks are appointed (says Gabriel to another way or form, how if it were Jesus of Nazareth, to Daniel) over thy people and over thy holy city, that whom so many Jews and Gentiles fall, and do many great transgression may be increased, sin sealed, iniquity miraculous signs daily? Yes, they have become seven atoned for, and everlasting righteousness brought, vision times harder and angrier than before. Their thoughts of and prophets sealed, and the most holy anointed." This is the worldly Messiah must be right and not wrong; they the text. Now follows their beautiful gloss: 3) must lie and be wrong before the appointed time and all There are still seventy weeks, then Jerusalem will be the prophets; they do not want Jesus, and if they pervert destroyed, and the Jews will be led into misery by the all the Scriptures, have no God, and never get a Messiah, Romans, and the same therefore, that through such misery they let go of their 4) sins, and therefore 5) are they will have it.

221. Therefore, from that time on, they have opposed punished, repent and make atonement or reconciliation, the Scriptures (because they were now beaten by the and thus become eternally pious, so that they deserve Romans, powerless and defenseless), and they have that the prophecies 6) of Messiah are fulfilled, and the been able to take them from us with other people's minds holy temple is rebuilt 2c.

1) and to use them; have fallen from all the forefathers Here you hear, first of all, that the immense holiness of and prophets, and from their own understanding, because the Jews misses that God will fulfill His promise of the of which they lost so many hundred thousand men, land Messiah not out of pure grace and mercy, but according and city, and have come to all miseries; these fourteen to their merit and repentance, and for the sake of their hundred years they have done nothing else, except where great exuberant piety. And how should and can God, the they learned a saying from the Christians, understood by poor man, do otherwise? For when He promised the our Messiah, They took him before them, scourged him, Messiah to Jacob, David, and Haggai out of pure mercy, tore him apart, crucified him, tortured him, so that they He did not think nor know that after the seventy weeks might put on him a different nose and a different body, and and disturbance of Jerusalem such great saints would acted in the same way as their forefathers acted against come to merit the Messiah from Him, that He would not our Lord Christ on the silent Friday, so that God might be fulfill anything out of mercy, but for the sake of their great found to be a liar, but they might be found to be the truthful ones; as you heard above, how they followed the saying of Jacob, Gen. 49, 10., 2) by ten noses, and likewise by many noses to the saying of Haggai, in which you may find two certain examples.

1) The Wittenbergers and the Jenaers offer: "nemen". Erlanger: "nennen".

2) In the old editions: "Jacob 49."

3) This sentence is missing in the Wittenberg; in Jonas it is translated.

4) Marginal gloss of the second Alisgabe, which is found in the Wittenberg and Erlangen, but is missing in the Jena: "Sins; of which they have done none, the holy children of God, nor crucified the Son of God, but committed vain worship."

5) Jenaer and Erlanger: in favor.

6) Thus the Jena. Wittenberg and Erlangen: prophets. Jonas: proksoiao.

The Jews had to give the Messiah when, where and how they wanted for the sake of purity and holiness. Such a mighty thing is it about the Jews, who after the seventy weeks have repented and become devout.

226 You can also easily think that before and during the seventy weeks they did not atone, nor were they pious, nor did they need it, and the priests at Jerusalem all died of hunger, because there was no repentance, no sin offering, no guilt offering (on which they had to feed), but everything was saved for repentance and holiness to begin after the seventy weeks. Even where there is no repentance or nothing to atone for, there is no sin. But it seems strange that after the seventy weeks, when they have atoned for all their sins by the sacrifices of the priests (who were ordained by Moses) all the days, they have to atone for them, and now they have to atone for them after the seventy weeks, when the temple, the office and the sacrifices for sin are no longer there.

But this is much more subtle: Gabriel speaks (as they gloss it), the Jews will repent and become pious after the seventy weeks, so that Messiah will come by their merit. Well, that is out; if Gabriel speaks right and does not lie, then the Jews have atoned, have become pious, have earned the Messiah since the time after the seventy weeks. For he says that these things shall come to pass from the Jews after the seventy weeks. Where now? They confess, yes, they complain, that Messiah has not come in the seventy weeks, nor until then, probably 1468 years, and they do not yet know when he will come: so they must also confess that these 1468 years after the seventy weeks they have never atoned for any sin, nor become godly, nor earned the Messiah. Otherwise, 1) the angel Gabriel must be lying, who promises by God that after the seventy weeks the Jews will repent, become righteous and merit the Messiah'.

228. if the angel Gabriel lied that the Jews have not atoned for 1500 years after the seventy weeks, which is a long time to atone for, then

he will lie for eternity, and the Jews will not repent for eternity. For whoever does not repent in 1500 years, nor become pious, if he intends to do so, will certainly never repent nor become pious.

229) Moses also clearly proves that they never atoned for their sins after the seventy weeks, 3 Mos. 26, 44. 5 Mos. 4, 30. 31. and 30, 1-6. where he promises with many glorious words, where they will turn from their hearts and confess their sins, God will bring them back to their homeland, even if they were scattered to the ends of the heavens 2c. Moses speaks such words because of God, whom one does not have to punish with lies. Since they are not brought back into the land until then, it is certain that they have never atoned for any sin after the seventy weeks from their hearts, and it must be a lie that Gabriel should speak of their repentance, as they falsely interpret.

230 Thus we also know that God is so kind by nature that the hour a man repents or repents from the heart, his sin is forgiven, as David says, Ps. 32:5: "I said: I will confess my sin unto the LORD; and thou wilt forgive me the iniquity of my sin." So we also read, when the prophet Nathan punished David's sin, and he then said, "I have sinned"; immediately Nathan absolved him and said, "God has forgiven your sin" [2 Sam. 12:13]. And even though he often does not take away the punishment as soon as it happens, as happened to David, he nevertheless lets the forgiveness of sins be certain for the person, and if there were not a prophet or priest, an angel would have to come and say: Your sins are forgiven you; so that the sinner in his repentance and under the punishment does not despair or despair. As we also see in the Babylonian prison, how graciously and fatherly he comforts those who confess their sin, so that they may endure the punishment; and even the punishment cannot last the length of time, but must have its definite time, measure and end, where there is right repentance and penance.

231 But here with these Jews there is no forgiveness of sin, no prophet to comfort them and make them sure, no appointed time of punishment, but only unending wrath and unmercifulness without all mercy, so that they may be forgiven.

1) "Wo anders" is only in the Erlangen edition, but is also in Jonas: Huiä si seeus rss kaderst.

is not only false, but also impossible to understand to that which is not; so shalt thou merit grace, as they merit Gabriel's promise of their repentance, much less of their the Messiam.
merit and righteousness.

232. ah, what shall we lose much words and time? even the very coarse outward life should convince them
The land of Canaan has hardly been a beggar's piece or well, what they do for repentance. For they are full of
a plate compared to the whole world's kingdom; nor have sorcery and witchcraft, of signs and figures and of the
they earned it by their repentance, contrition or name Tetragrammaton (that is idolatry), full of envy and
righteousness, as Moses says, Deut. 9:4, 5. That they did pride, in addition vain thieves and robbers, who daily
not take the land by their righteousness, but as the stiff- neither eat a morsel nor wear a thread, which they have
necked and disobedient (that is, with great sins and not stolen and robbed from us by their damned usury; thus
unmerit), only by the gracious promise of God; and yet they live daily by vain theft and robbery with wife and child,
they were at that time the most pious and best, as Hosea as the arch-thieves and land-robbers in all impenitent
and Balaam, Numbers 23:21-23. 23, 21-23. They had security. For a usurer is an ore thief and land robber, who
Moses, Aaron, worship, prophets, God Himself with His should hang on the gallows seven times higher than other
miracles, bread from heaven, water from the 1) rock, thieves. Indeed, of such beautiful repentance and merit
clouds by day, pillars of fire by night, imperishable God would have to prophesy from heaven through His
garments and shoes 2c. And these saddened yeast, nasty holy angel, and thus become a shameful, blasphemous
yeast, withered foam, moldy basic soup, and evil 2) liar, for the sake of the noble blood and circumcised
cesspool of Judaism should deserve with their repentance saints, who boast themselves sanctified by God's
and righteousness of the whole world kingdom, that is, commandments, and yet trample all of them underfoot
Messiah and the fulfillment of the prophecies, since they and do not keep any of them.
do not have anything, nothing but a rotten, stinking,
discarded yeast of the fatherly blossom.

Summa, Moses and all right Israelites understood the 236 Then follows in the saying of Daniel: "Know
sayings of the Messiah, given by pure grace and mercy, therefore, and mark, that from the time that the
without repentance and merit, as we have seen in the commandment goeth forth, that Jerusalem shall be built
the above-mentioned sayings of Jacob, David, and Haggai; again until Messiah the prince be seven weeks, and
for Daniel also does not ask, desire, or think that such a threescore and two weeks, then shall the streets and the
glorious promise of the seventy weeks should be revealed walls be built again, though in a small time. And for two
to him; but far, far beyond his desire, it is proclaimed to and threescore weeks Messiah shall be slain, and have
him by grace. nothing."

From this you can see what repentance the Jews have 237] How ridiculous it is to the circumcised saints that
done and are still doing after the seventy weeks, which we cursed goyim have interpreted and understood this
they began with lies and blasphemy and continued to do, saying, especially because we have not read their rabbis,
and still do without stopping. If anyone desires, let him Talmudists, Kochabists, which are more resounding with
take here an example of the repentance of the Jews, and them than all the Scriptures, for they do it much better,
lift up and say: God and his angels are liars, talking about namely, "Know therefore and know of the origin of the
word that Jerusalem is to be rebuilt; that is, remember and
understand it well, that a word has gone out how
Jerusalem is to be rebuilt.

1) Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: den. Jonas: *de petra*.
2) Jenaer, Walch and Erlanger: *mörsichtiger*.

3) In the editions: rigidly blind.
4) In the Wittenberg and Jena editions: "das sich". In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlangen: "das sie". Jonas: *qui se* - "the themselves". We have assumed the latter.

are to be built; that is one. Further: Up to Messiah the prince, that is up to king Cores, are seven weeks; that is again one. Next: And two and threescore weeks shall the walls and streets be built again, though in a little time; which is once more one. And after sixty-two weeks, Messiah (that is, King Agrippa) shall be slain, and shall not be (that is, shall not be king 2c.).

238 It is indeed vexatious to deal with such confused lies and fools' remarks; but I must give ours cause to consider the devilish will of the rabbis in this beautiful saying. Well, here you see how they divide the text, which is to be attached to each other, and, since it is to be divided, attach it to each other. Namely, they shall hang one upon another, "Know and mark that from the beginning of the word, how Jerusalem is to be rebuilt until Messiah, there are seven weeks and sixty-two weeks. These things, I say, shall hang one upon another, and be a whole text. Follows: "then shall the walls and the gates be built again in a little while." This piece, which is divided, is attached to the previous piece (sixty-two weeks), so that walls and streets are built for sixty-two weeks.

These are called "arch-knave pieces". I am immediately reminded of the boy, of whom I heard say, when I was a young monk, how he had torn and disjointed the Lord's Prayer in this way: Our Father, hallowed be thy name in heaven, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Or as that unlearned priest read the lection in the Vigil, 1 Cor. 15:55, 56: *Ubi est mors stimulus, Tuus stimulus autem mortis, peccatum est virtus vero, etc.* 240. Such tearing up of the text is done by the Jews only because they want to destroy the text of Scripture for us Christians, even though it is of no use to them in this way. For it teaches them nothing, comforts them nothing, gives them nothing, and remains vain words, so that the angel does as much as if he had spoken nothing. But they want to go without such comforting, blessed words and suffer harm before they should be of use to us. Like ground

stein [Carlstadt] also sacrilegiously tore up the words of the Sacrament, so that they should not be useful to us. But it shall not help the rabbis, yes, the Nachtraben and Huhu; we want to give up their howling and lying with God's help, and want to take one piece after the other.

241 First, I will let the Hebrew scholars be instructed whether the word *intellige* is also constructed with the word *de in the* Scriptures; I have not found it, and it seems to me to be a matter of opinion. If it is to be called *de*, as *de subjecta materia*, the Hebrew has *praepositio Al*, as also the Latin, *multa super Priamo* etc.. But this I know well, that the Jews cannot prove such construction in this place, and the examples of Scripture here agree that it stands *absolute sine regime*. But to freely attribute something to God, which is not certain nor can be proven, is just as much as trying God and punishing him for lying.

242 Now let us see how they tear up the text: Know and mark the end of the word, that Jerusalem shall be built again. This piece is not to give the beginning of the seventy weeks, but an understanding of the outgoing word, after which follows: Until Messiah the Prince there are seven weeks. Now it is the way of all languages that this word *donec*, until, must have a beginning; but the Jews do not give it one, do not want to suffer it to be called: from the beginning of the word until Messiam. I must give a simile 1).

If someone said to you here in Wittenberg in the marketplace of St. Galli, "You have heard a sermon about God's word that the church is holy; think about it and notice it well. Well, you look him in the mouth, what he wants to say more, because he wants to say more. So he suddenly starts: Until Michaelmas are seven weeks, or: Until Halle are three miles away, Here you would look at him and say: What, art thou foolish? Shall the seven weeks now begin at the market, or the three miles from Wittenberg? No, he would say, you must understand this, from St. Lorenz to Michaelmas,

1) In the editions: "Gleiches"; but the Wittenberg and the Jena have as marginal gloss: "Gleichniß". Jonas: *simile*.

and from Bitterfeld to Halle. Here you would like to say: Kiss me the sow on the Pacem under the Pirzel, 1) where did you learn to talk like that? And where do the seven weeks rhyme with that, since you tell me that I should well remember the sermon of God's word heard in Wittenberg 2)?

The rabbis do the same with the word of the angel Gabriel, who must begin, "Until Messiah, there are seven weeks. Would Daniel now say, What then, my Gabriel, shall the seven weeks begin now that thou speakest unto me? No, saith he, thou must understand this, to begin from the destruction of Jerusalem. Yes, thanks be to you, you noble circumcised rabbis, you are masters over God and all the angels, that you teach the angel Gabriel to speak in this way, as if he could not tell the beginning of the seven weeks as well as the middle and the end. But Daniel shall understand it. I thought, he is to pass away it in it or to miss it. Fie on you shameful rabbis, that you may ascribe your foolish speech to the angel of God, so that you disgrace yourselves and convince yourselves that you are liars and blasphemers in the words of God. But that is only the Grammatica, now let us see the Theologica 3).

They say, the holy circumcised ravens, that the seventy weeks shall begin from the first destruction, and end in the second destruction of Jerusalem. How can they get away with it, because their eyes and ears are closed, they have not looked at the Scriptures or the histories, but they have spoken out of free conceit: It seems to us thus, and wanting thus, therefore God and his angel must have spoken thus? how can it fail? we are the ravens, who can master God and angels.

246 Well, this may be called a wicked, fretful, blasphemous people, who can merit the Messiah by such their repentance. But let us hear their prudence: The seventy weeks looked on from the destruction of Jeru-

salem, from the king of Babylon; that is out. From that time there are seven weeks until Messiah the Prince, that is, until King Cores; that also is out. Now tell me, where is this written? In the ranch hole. Who said it? Marcolfus. Who else could say it or write it?

247 There is the bright, clear text of Daniel in the beginning of this 9th chapter, that this revelation of the seventy weeks happened to him in the first year of Darii, the Mede, who had won the kingdom of Babylon, since the first destruction of Jerusalem had happened seventy years before; as Daniel clearly says there that seventy years of desolation were fulfilled, according to the word of Jeremiah 29:10, likewise 2 Chronicles 36:22. 36, 22. Nor must such bright two sayings of the Scriptures, as Daniel 9. and 2 Chron. 36, 22, are liars to the rabbis, but they are right, that the seventy weeks must have begun seventy years before they are revealed to Daniel. Isn't that fine? Now believe the rabbis, the coarse unlearned asses, who regard neither Scripture nor history, and spout out of their wicked mouths against God and angels, as they please.

248 Because their lies and false courage are now publicly convinced that the seventy weeks, which were revealed in the first year of Darii, could not have begun seventy years earlier, from the destruction of Jerusalem, all their lies, which were built on this foundation, have fallen down and must let Daniel's saying about the seventy weeks remain pure and unadulterated without their thanks, but they have to pay eternal disgrace for their courageous, obvious lie. For this lie is followed by another lie, that they point Messiah the prince to the king Cores, who is supposed to have come seven weeks after the destruction, when he probably came ten weeks, that is, seventy years after the destruction, as 2 Chron. 36, 22. and Dan. 9, 24., Ezra 1, 1. is written.

(249) Even if we suppose (which is impossible) that the seventy weeks began from the destruction of Jerusalem, yet the gross lie will not be mended, and here falls the third lie after it. For they say that Cores came fifty-two years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

1) "Pirtzel" - rump, tail. The old edition of Walch and the Erlangen offerü: "and the Pirzel". - Pacem", euphemistic for *podicem*, also for its incense, Walch, old edition, vol. XVII, 1299, § 32.

2) "zu Wittenberg" is missing in the Wittenberg specification.

3) In the Jenaer, with Walch and in the Erlanger: Theologia. Jonas: Theologiam.

of destruction, they make seven weeks and three years, which is eight and a half weeks; so they take three years, or half a week, out of the sixty-two weeks, and put them with the seven first weeks; just as if the angel were so much a fool or a child that could not count seven, and spoke seven, when he should speak eight and a half. Why do they do this? Because they want to see how they handle lies, how they tear apart and pervert God's word. Therefore Cores must have come to them eight and a half weeks, which they call seven, after the destruction, when he came ten weeks, that is, seventy years after, as is said.

(250) Neither suffereth the angel that the weeks should be so divided and broken, 1) That thou shouldest take from one three years, that she may have four years only; and that thou shouldest divide to another, which hath seven years, the three years, that she may have ten years, or a week and a half. For he saith, The seventy weeks are actually numbered, and counted, or reckoned.

251 He suffers much less from this fourth lie, that Cores should be called Messiah here, if the other lies were true, that Cores would have come after seven weeks (that is after fifty-two years). For there stand the bright dry words of the angel: "Seventy weeks are determined over your people and your city", wants to say: I have spoken in other chapters of foreign people and kings; but now in this saying of the seventy weeks I speak of your people, of your city and your Messiah. And he that saith otherwise of other people and kings is a wanton, desperate liar.

252 After this fourth lie comes the fifth, when they tear the seven weeks from the sixty-two weeks. For they shall cleave one to another, and there is no cause why they should be severed one from another, especially because the lie of the king Cores was omitted, for whose sake they severed the seven and sixty-two weeks one from another, that they might give him seven, that is, eight and a half. And is the scripture wise thus in

Hebrew, to count the years. First the one number, then the other number of years, but all together, as Gen. 5, 6. 7. and 11, 16. 17. the examples much stand, in the fathers, so died; namely: "Seth lived five year and hundred year, and begat Enos. After that he lived seven years and eight hundred years." Item Gen. 11, 17: Eber lived after the birth of Peleg thirty years and four hundred years. And Gen. 25, 7: Abraham lived a hundred years, seventy years and five years. From this it can be seen that it is pure courage to separate the number of seven years and sixty-two years in this saying.

253 The Latin and German language finely resists such tearing, because it does not repeat the little word year so often, but attaches it to each other and says: Abraham lived a hundred and five and seventy years. So here also, from the beginning of the word to Messiah, the prince, are seven and sixty-two weeks. This number is to be attached to each other and be one number until Messiah, But the angel has reason why he calls the whole number, seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, when he could have said nine weeks and sixty weeks, and many other ways call such number, as five weeks and sixty-four weeks, item, six weeks and sixty-three weeks 2c. For he must have the seven weeks to build the walls and streets of Jerusalem, and the sixty-two to the last week, for which all things are to be done, in which Messiah shall die and make the covenant 2c.

254 The sixth lie follows, when they say that the walls and streets of Jerusalem were rebuilt for sixty-two weeks (not including three years), that is, until the last week, after which (as they lie for the seventh time) Jerusalem is destroyed again. For with the last week the seventy weeks are over. And therefore Jerusalem should not have been built longer than one week, that is, seven years. Deny, Jew, confidently, and do not be ashamed. Nehemiah, on the other hand, stands with his book and testifies that he built the walls, set the gates, divided the city, and consecrated it gloriously, so that the temple was ready in the seventh week.

1) "zermerkeln" probably as much as: zermergeln. Jonas: truncentur - verstümmele.

sixth year Darii, Ezra 6, 15.; also Alexander Magnus found the city of Jerusalem ready for a long time; still much more found it ready after him and the temple very rich the noble fruit Antiochus, who plundered it horribly.

The eighth gross lie falls after this, because they interpret this word of the angel: "And after sixty-two weeks Messiah will be killed, and will have nothing": Messiah is the king Agrippa, he is killed, and after his death he has had nothing, and no king has come after him. Why is not Messiah more the emperor Nero, who is killed at this time without heirs? Yes, I fear they would take Marcolfum or Thersitam for Messiam before they suffered the right Messiam. How should God suffer such a shameful public lie, who loves the truth and is the truth itself, if such a lie is offensive to a man who is a liar or false, or who does not love the truth so much? And this eighth lie is a manifold lie: first, that in so short a text they interpret Messiam differently and differently; there he must be Cores after the seven weeks; here he must be Agrippa after the sixty-two weeks; as if the angel were a fool, always wanting to give another Messiah over the third word.

(256) So we have heard above that the angel does not speak of a foreign people and city, but "of your people" (he speaks), and "of your city" I speak, therefore we must not unite two Messiahs in this saying, but one, and he who is Messiah of this people and city, namely Shiloh of Judah, after the fallen scepter, the son of David, Chemdath Haggai, yes, we must understand him here, otherwise the saying will not suffer anyone. For Agrippa was not king in Jerusalem, much less Messiah before the last week, that is, after seven and sixty-two weeks. The Romans gave him a small land on the other side of the Jordan by grace, and the Roman governors ruled the land of Judea, Felix, Festus, Albinus 2c., nor was Agrippa killed after the sixty-two weeks. Summa, everything they say is a lie.

257. because they now confess and confess

If a Messiah is killed after the sixty-two weeks, that is, in the first year of the last week, and Agrippa cannot be (as they would like to confirm their lies), nor any other, I would like to see where they will take one; we must have one who has been there before the seventy weeks have ended, and who is killed after sixty-two weeks; and who is from their people (as Gabriel says) without doubt from the royal tribe of Judah. Now they had not had a king of their people or tribe since Herod's time, that is certain; so Gabriel also wants to be certain, and have a Messiah of their people. Where now from?

258 I will say further. They themselves confess that from the first destruction of Jerusalem until the last destruction they had no Messiah, that is, an anointed king (Messiah means the anointed one), because the holy anointing oil, of which Genesis 2 Mos. 30, 25. writes, so that kings and priests were anointed, no longer existed after the first destruction. Therefore Zedekiah was the last anointed king; his descendants were princes, not kings, until Herod, when the scepter ceased and Shiloh, the true Messiah, was to come.

259. they want to clean the lies completely, because Daniel says: "He will confirm the covenant to many a week" (that is, the last week). Here they do the ninth lie, saying: "The Romans made peace and decency with the Jews this last week or seven years; but because the Jews resisted, the Romans came over three years and destroyed Jerusalem. Yes, where does Gabriel stand here, who says that the peace or decency (as they interpret the covenant) should stand for seven years? If it has not stood longer than three years, Gabriel lies with his seven years or last week, that is, the desperate liars falsely impute this to the angel Gabriel out of their lying heart. Ah, what decency! what peace! Read Joseph[us] and the histories, and you will find how the Romans slew many thousands of Jews long before, and there was no peace until they had to destroy Jerusalem and the land.

260. the tenth and last lie, that the desolation of Jerusalem shall endure until the

1) "Messia" is missing in the Wittenberg.

The end of the quarrel. This they interpret: until the battle of their Messiah, who shall slay Gog and Magog and win all the world. This is a poor, impotent lie, which is dead before it is born. For where it is received that Messiah is to come before the seventy weeks are out, such a lie is already destroyed 1500 years ago. And so the Jews do not keep a word of the whole saying of Gabriel that they have not made a lie, except when the angel says that Jerusalem is to be destroyed. That they now believe the same and let it remain true, no one knows them no thanks; but at the time when they still had Jerusalem, they believed it much less, neither they now believe in our Messiah, although it is brightly enough prophesied, see Dau. 9, 26. and Zach. 14, 2. And if they were still sitting in it, they would have to think up a hundred thousand lies before they believed it, as their forefathers did before the first destruction; they were not persuaded by any prophet that the holy city of God should be destroyed, and they tormented it and raged like mad dogs until faith came into their hands. They have always been a stiff-necked, unbelieving, proud, wicked, desperate people, and still remain so.

From all this we see that Daniel with his seventy weeks stands for us against the lies and foolishness of the Jews as an iron wall and immovable rock, that the true Messiah must have come before the end of the seventy weeks, and was killed, and came to life again, the covenant of God (for what should Daniel speak here of the Gentiles' covenant, which was also never nothing at that time?) the last week, so that the city and the people were given leave after the end of the seventy weeks, so that soon after it was torn apart by the Romans, and the people were destroyed with all their regiment and everything, as the angel said, "Seventy weeks have been reckoned for your people and your city," or determined; so that an end was made.

262 If the Jews can lie and interpret a lot to maintain their error against such a bright and powerful text, they need to do so; the previous lies have become disgraceful in themselves. But if they have a hundred

A thousand years should lie and take all devils to help, nor would they always have to stand with shame for and for. For it is impossible to give a Messiah at the time of the seventy weeks, as Gabriel's revelation compels, if it is not to be our Lord Jesus Christ; of this we are sure, certain and joyful, and offer it with a clip in defiance of all the gates of hell, all the gates of the world, and all that will or may be high, wise and prudent against us. I, a wicked, lowly saint in Christ, trust to resist them all alone, and to defend such with light, sleepy, merry work. But to convert the devil and his own is not possible, nor are we commanded to do so; it is enough to expose their lies and reveal the truth. Whoever does not want to believe the truth for the sake of his own soul may well leave it alone for my sake.

We will now leave it at these four sayings, Jacob, David, Haggai, Daniel, in which we see what a beautiful work the Jews have done in the Scriptures these 1500 years and are still doing. For as they deal with these sayings, so do they with all other sayings, especially those concerning us and our Messiah; they must all be lies, but they are the ones who cannot err or be mistaken. But they have not learned the art of lying well; they lie too roughly and unawares, that one can grasp it well, who wants to pay a little attention to it.

But a frightening example of divine wrath is presented to us Christians, as St. Paul says, Rom. 11, 21, that we should fear God and honor His word, while the time of grace seems to be, lest such a shameful or even worse thing happen to us, as we have already experienced with the Pabst and Mahomet. For in the case of the Jews one can see how easily the devil (once one falls away from the right understanding of the Scriptures) can lead people into such blindness and darkness that even natural reason and sheer unreasonable animals can grope and grasp; nor should those who teach and hear God's word daily see it, but consider it to be the right light. Oh, Lord God, have mercy on us!

265. where I should find all the other articles of the

I might have to write against them as much and for as long as they have been telling lies, that is, for more than two thousand years. I have said above, as they corrupt their circumcision with seditions, and destroy their bloodline with courtship; so also do they profane their Sabbath and all their feasts. Summa, they eat, they drink, they sleep, they watch, they stand, they walk, they dress or undress, they fast, they bathe, they pray, they praise, and everything they live or do is so polluted with rabbinical, obscene essays and misbelief that Moses is no longer recognizable among them, just as among us under the papacy Christ and his word became almost unrecognizable before the great immensity of human essays. But that is enough of their lies against doctrine or faith this time.

The third part of this book, of the Jews' lies against the person of our dear Lord Jesu Christ. 1)

In the end, we also want to see their lies against people, which neither make the doctrine worse nor better, whether they are pious or evil, namely, what they lie about the person of our Lord; item, about his dear mother, and about us and all Christians. These are such lies, when the devil can do nothing to the doctrine, 2) then he sets himself against the person, denies, reviles, curses and rages against the same. Just as the papist Beelzebub did to me; when he could not resist my gospel, he wrote: 3) I have the devil, I am a changeling, my dear mother is a whore and a bathmaid; immediately, when he had written this, my gospel was destroyed, and the papists had won. So John the Baptist and Christ himself had to have the devil and be called Samaritan [Joh. 8, 48.]; immediately John's and Christ's teaching became wrong, and the Pharisees' teaching right. This is what happened to all the prophets. Recently, now also, when the assassin of Wol-

fenbüttel 4) (of the Holy Roman Church, according to your Cardinal at Mainz, a certain sanctuary and treasure) 5) had reviled and disgraced the person of the Elector of Saxony and Landgrave of Hesse in the most shameful way, they were both lost in a flash; but he, the holy man, king over all kings, was crowned with a diamond wreath and gold, so heavily that he could not bear it and had to flee.

Therefore, whoever wants to win an evil cause, do so also, and, as the loose tongues do in court, if the silver addiction and the golden fever persist, scold and lie confidently on the person, then the cause is won. As that mother taught her child: "Dear son, if you cannot win, enter into a quarrel. These are called lies, because the liar does not believe or err in the matter (as happens in matters of faith), but knows himself well that he is lying and wants to lie against the person, and does not intend to prove it either with appearance or truth, as he cannot.

268. So do the Jews in this case; they confidently reproach, lie and curse the person, against their own conscience; Thus they have long since won the cause, that God must hear them, sitting in Jerusalem in a golden city for 1500 years, as we see before our eyes, being lords of the world, running to all the Gentiles with their chemdath, skirts, brogues 6) and shoes, letting themselves be strangled by the noble princes and lords of Israel, giving them land and people and everything they have, as they curse, spit and maledict the Goyim.

And if they did not lie, curse, spit, blaspheme, and revile the people so shamefully, you can think that God would not have heard them, and that they would have lost their cause long ago, that they would not be masters in Jerusalem, but would be scattered in the world, not seeing Jerusalem, feeding themselves with lies, deceit, stealing, robbing, usury, and all kinds of evil among the cursed goyim. Such a mighty thing is it, if one can curse the persons, if the thing is evil and lost. Therefore let

1) This superscription is in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

2) "anhaben" put by us instead of: abhaben. Jonas: laedere aut opprimere.

3) Duke George of Saxony.

4) Duke Henry of Brunswick.

5) These brackets are set by us.

6) d. i. Pants.

Do not let the Jews' example be a bad thing to you, where fifty-five. So they call Jesus, that is, three hundred and you have an evil thing. They are the noble princes of sixteen. Such a number shall then give another word, in it Israel, who can do anything when they have lost the stands Hebel Vorik, of which you may read further Anton. cause and can curse the goyim greatly. Margaritam, what they do devil's work with such number

270 First, they call our Lord Jesus a sorcerer and a and words.

devil, because they cannot deny his miracles, just as their Now when a Christian hears them speak Jesus, as fathers did, saying, "He casts out devils through must sometimes happen because they have to speak to Beelzebub, the prince of all devils" [Luc. 11:15]. And they us, a Christian thinks they call the name Jesus; but they have much to lie and make up about the name of God, mean the numerical letters, Jesus, that is, the three Tetragrammaton, that our Lord Jesus was able to hundred and sixteen number in the blasphemous word interpret the same name (which they call Vorik. And so, when they have said Jesus in their prayer, Shemhamphorah) and whoever is able to do this is able they spit three times on the earth in honor of our Lord and to perform all kinds of miracles; But they cannot give an all Christians, with great love and devotion. But when they example that ever there was a man who by such a themselves speak among themselves, they add:

Shemhamphorah performed a miracle worth a gnat, so *deleatur nomen ejus*, in good German: that God may that one has to grasp it, as they, as desperate liars, invent destroy him, or: that all devils may take him away. such things about our Lord. For if such a rule were true of Shemhamphoras, someone must have done it before or after; otherwise how could one know that Shemhamphoras had such power? But it is too long, will let it go out after this booklet in special note, what Purchetus writes about it. 1) It has happened rightly to them, since they rejected the truth of God, that they had to believe such shameful, foolish, foolish lies for it, and for the beautiful face of divine word had to look into the black, dark back lying hole of the devil, and worship his stink.

After that they take his name. For JEsus in Hebrew means Savior or Helper. The old Saxons used a name, Helprich or Hilprich, which sounds like the name JEsus, so that we would now say Hülfreich, that is, he who can or should help. To their chagrin, however, the Jews do so, and call him Jesus, which in Hebrew is neither a name nor a word, but three letters, like the cypher or number letters; as if I took the three number letters C. L. V. cypher-wise, and made the word Clu out of them, which are a hundred and ten letters.

deleatur nomen ejus, in good German: that God may destroy him, or: that all devils may take him away.

They do the same to us Christians: when they receive us, if we come to them, they turn the word, welcome to God, and say, "Sched wil kom,"²) that is, devil come, or, there comes a devil. Because we do not understand Hebrew, they secretly exercise their wrath on us, so that we think they are talking to us in a friendly manner, and so they curse us with hellish fire and all misfortune. Such fine guests we poor pious Christians have with the Jews in our country, whom we mean with all faithfulness, and would gladly do them the best, both in body and soul, and suffer very many rough things from them.

274 After that they call him a whore child and his mother Mary a whore, whom she had with a blacksmith in adultery. I must speak so rudely, though unwillingly, to the wretched devil. Now they know very well that they lie such things out of pure hatred and will of courage, only that they poison their poor youth and simple-minded Jews bitterly enough against the person of our Lord, so that they do not fall for his teaching (which they cannot deny). Nor do they want to be the holy people to whom God, for the sake of their righteousness, has given the

1) This was done by the next following writing of Shemhamphoras.

2) Deceptively spoken instead of: Be welcome". - In our Wittenberg edition, the following remark is made in an old hand: "Anton[ius] Margar[ita] C. 1.

Messiah. God commanded in the eighth commandment not to speak falsely against one's neighbor, not to lie or deceive, not to revile or blaspheme, even to one's enemies. Because Zedekiah did not believe the king of Babylon, he was severely punished by Jeremiah and Ezekiel for such lies, and was also miserably imprisoned [Jer. 37:17, Ezek. 17:16].

But our noble princes of the world and circumcised saints have invented this beautiful doctrine against such commandment of God, that they may freely lie, blaspheme, curse, rape, murder, rob, and do all evil as and when and to whom they will. God may keep His commandment Himself, the noble blood and circumcised people shall do contrary to it according to all their pleasure and good pleasure, and shall nevertheless be called right and well done, Messiah and deserving of Heaven. In spite of God and all the angels, that they should rebel against it, be silent, that the devil and the accursed goyim should reprove it unjustly; for here is the noble blood, which cannot sin, nor is subject to God's commandment.

Now what has the poor maid Mary done to them? With what do they want to prove that she is a whore? She has done nothing but bear a son, whose name is Jesus. Is it then an evil thing for a young wife to bear a child? or shall they all be called harlots who bear a child? where will their wives and themselves be? are they also all harlots and harlot children? Yes, you cursed goyim, that is another. Do you not know that the Jews are Abraham's noble blood, circumcised, and kings in heaven and earth, what they say is right. Now if among the accursed goyim there were a virgin as pure and holy as the angel Gabriel, and one of the least noble princes said that she was an arch-whore and worse than the devil, it would have to be so, without any other proof than this: "A noble mouth of the blood of Abraham has said it, who can say no to it? Again, if an arch-whore of the noble blood of the Jews were as ugly as the devil himself, if it pleased the noble lords, she is purer neither no angel. For the power stands with the noble circumcised lords, who

cursed goyim to lie, revile, defile, blaspheme and curse as they please; in turn, to bless, honor, praise and extol themselves, even if God would have it otherwise. Do you think it is such a bad thing for a Jew? God in heaven and all the angels must laugh and dance when they let a Jew hear a forz, so that you cursed goy may know from now on what a glorious thing it is about a Jew; otherwise, how could they so boldly call Mariam a whore for whom they know no guilt, when they would not have such power to trample God and His commandment underfoot?

You and I, as the pale goyim, want to present a rough similitude, so that we, as the blind Gentiles, may understand a little the high cleverness of the noble holy Jews. If I had a cousin or close blood friend, of whom I knew nothing evil nor had ever noticed anything, and other people, to whom I would have been unhappy, praised the same 1) my cousin, honored her highly, considered her to be an excellent, pious, virtuous, praiseworthy woman, so that they would also say that the wretch is not worthy that he should have such a fine honest female image for a cousin, a bitch or she-wolf should be his cousin. And if I were to hear such praise of my cousin, I would begin to say against my conscience, "She is an evil whore, they are all lying," and I would want everyone to believe me without any proof, since I would truly know that I, a desperate liar, was speaking such things against the innocent cousin, and I would curse all those who did not believe such a lie of mine (as I myself would have to consider it a certain lie in my heart):

Tell me, what would you consider me? Would you not say: I would not be a man, but a monster, a fierce monster, who would not be worthy to look at the sun, leaves, grass, or some creature, yes, you should consider me full of devils, as I should cover my base's shame, if I knew one, as it would be my own, where it wanted to break out, as all other people do. And now no one knows of her but vain honor, nor I myself, yet out-

1) In the editions: "the same".

and to lie to my cousin with false shame as a villain, regardless of the fact that such shame would come home to me myself.

The noble circumcised saints are also such people (where I should or could call them so). We Goyim, to whom they are hostile and hateful, confess that Mary is not ours, but the Jews of Abraham's blood, their base and blood friend, praise and extol her to the highest: then they go to and ravish her to the highest. Now if there were a real drop of blood from Israel in such shameful Jews, do you not think they would say, "What will we do? If her son has angered us, what can she do? Why would we ravish her? After all, she is our flesh and blood; surely before a wicked child comes from a pious mother. No, such saintly people must not have such reasonable human thoughts, but they must have devilish, evil, lying thoughts, so that they may repent and soon deserve their Messiah, as they have deserved for 1500 years.

280 They lie further and blaspheme him and his mother, that she conceived him untimely. This bit they mean very poisonous, bitter and evil. Moses writes, Leviticus 18:19, that when a woman's mother purifies herself, she should separate herself from her husband, and the husband from her, for loss of life and limb; for what is conceived at the same time of purification will also produce an unfit, infirm fruit, such as delusional children, natural fools, kilts, 2) changelings, and the like, who have broken brains all their lives. Thus the Jews want to disgrace us Christians, that we honor a natural born fool from the womb, or a right kilcrop for a messiah. Such nonsensical, accursed goyim they hold us, the highly understanding, circumcised and deeply enlightened saints. Well, these are the devil's own thoughts and words.

281. do you ask, for what reason they such

or what is the cause of it? Thou coarse, accursed goy, shalt thou ask this first? Is it not enough for you to hear that the noble circumcised saints say so? Wilt thou not yet learn that such a holy people, free from all the commandments of God, cannot sin, may lie, blaspheme, revile, murder whom they will, even God Himself and all His prophets, is all vain glorious service of God. Didn't I tell you above that a Jew is such a noble and precious jewel, that when he lets out a pomp, God and all the angels dance, and even if he does something worse, it should still be considered a golden Talmud, and what goes down and up from such a holy man, that the cursed goyim should have for vain sanctity.

For if it were not such a noble thing for a Jew, how would it be possible that he should despise all Christians with their Messiah and his mother so disgracefully, and destroy them with such sacrilegious, poisonous lies? That they would let us be as good as geese or ducks, if they did not want to take us for human beings, the tender, pure, wise saints! For such nonsense, which they herewith attribute to us, I would not know how to appropriate to a sow, which lets itself be defiled with dung below and above, does not eat much purer. Well, this may be called a wrath of God, which is terrible, namely, to fall into such groundless, devilish, hellish, furious malice, envy and hopefulness. And if I were to take revenge on the devil himself, I would not wish him such evil and misfortune, so that the Jews are tormented by God's wrath, that they have to lie and blaspheme so shamefully against their own conscience. Well, they have their reward, that God has always had to be their liar.

283. it also indicates Sebastianus Münster 4) in his Bible, that a poisonous rabbi should be, who calls the dear mother of Christ not Mary, but Haria, *sterquilinium*, a heap of dirt. And who knows what they have more among them, of which we know nothing? One sees

1) Wittenberger: and. Jonas: ex Abraham.

2) On "Kielkrops" compare Luther's Table Talks, Cap. 24, § 95 and § 96. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 756 ff. Jonas translates: lymphati, daemone afflati.

3) Pomp - Bombart, Fart. Compare § 293 and § 340 of this paper.

4) About Sebastian Münster compare the Tischreden, St. Louis edition, Vol. XXII, 1704, No. 106. Lauterbach, p.47.

They know that the devil drives them to all kinds of lies and blasphemies, which he can always devise in the worst way. So they do not begrudge the dear mother Mary, the daughter of David, who has done them no harm, not even her right name, how should they begrudge her life, good or honor? And what should they grant us cursed goyim, when they wish and show all shame and evil to their own flesh and blood, which is innocent, of which they know nothing evil?

With such a heart and mouth, they may therefore come before God, call His holy name, pray, and call upon Him to bring them back to Jerusalem, to send the Messiah, to kill all the nations, and to give them the goods of all the world. The fact that God does not strike them with thunder and lightning and sink them suddenly with fire, like Sodoma and Gomorrah, is the reason that such punishment is too small for such wickedness. Therefore he smites them with spiritual lightning and thunder, as Moses writes, among others Deut. 28, 28: "The LORD shall smite thee with madness, blindness, and raging of the heart." Yes, these are the right weather axes, lightning and thunderbolts, madness, blindness, racing hearts.

Although such terrible, shameful, blasphemous lies especially concern the person of our Lord and his dear mother, they also mean the person of all of us, and want to make us the highest mockery and annoyance by the fact that we honor such a Messiah, so shamefully cursed and scorned by them that they do not consider him worthy to be called by them or any man, let alone remember him 1). So we must repay him by believing in him, praising him, honoring him, serving him.

But I would like to ask: What did the poor man Jesus do to the holy people? If he was a false teacher, as they claim, he was punished for it, received his due, atoned for it with an ignominious death on the cross, paid for it, and did enough. Do no accursed heathen in the whole world so that they would always give a dead, poor man, who has suffered his right for his wrongdoing, for and for more?

persecute and blaspheme. How then do these most holy, blessed Jews think that they do much worse than the accursed Gentiles? Because they confess that Jerusalem is not destroyed, nor that they are imprisoned for sin, because they crucified Jesus. For they will have done right and well, as they did the deceiver his due, and so earned their Messiah. What can the dead man do, who has now endured his judgment, that we Goyim are so foolish and foolish, and honor him for Messiah? Why do they not fight it out with us, convince us of our foolishness, and prove their high, heavenly wisdom? We have never fled from them, and still stand here, defying their holy wisdom; what they can do, let us see. For it behooves such great saints to grovel at angles, and curse and reproach in darkness.

Now, as I began to ask, what has poor Jesus done to the most holy children of Israel, that they cannot stop cursing him after his death, so that he has paid? He may want to be Messiah, which they cannot suffer? Oh no, he is dead, as they themselves crucified, and a dead man cannot be Messiah. Perhaps he prevents them from coming back to their country? Neither; how can a dead man hinder such a thing? What then is the cause? I will tell you: It is the thunder and lightning of Moses, as told above: "God will strike you with madness, blindness and raging of the heart" [Deut. 28, 28.] and the eternal fire, of which the prophets say [Jer. 21, 12.]: "The wrath of God will go out like a fire that no one can extinguish." Likewise John Baptista preaches to them, after Herod had taken away the scepter, saying, "He hath the word-shovel in his hand, and shall sweep his threshing-floor, and gather the wheat into his barns; but the chaff he shall burn with fire that cannot be quenched" [Matt. 3:12.]. Yes, such fire of divine wrath we see in the Jews, how it burns brightly and brightly, more horrible than Sodoma and Gomorrah.

288 Although such devilish lies and blasphemies against the person of Christ and His

1) "his" is missing in the Wittenberger.

The same thing that was done to our dear mother is also done to our person and to the person of all Christians. For they also mean our person, since Christ and Mary are dead, but we Christians are such shameful people that we honor such shameful dead persons, so they also give us our special part in this. First, they complain about us before God that we hold them captive in misery, and fervently ask that God would redeem His holy people and dear children from our power and imprisonment, and call them Edom and Haman, so that they may have hurt us before God, which they mean very bitterly, and here [to] tell too long; for they themselves know that they lie in this, and I would not be ashamed (if it were true) to have Edom for my grandfather, who was the natural son of the most holy woman Rebekah, and the nephew of dear Sarah, Abraham his grandfather, Isaac his right father. And Moses himself commanded, Deut. 23:7, that they should hold Edom for their brother; yea, they hold Moses, as they are Jews.

After that, they teach God and write before Him the way in which He should redeem them. For he is a bad cobbler among the Jews, the highly learned saints, who has no more than a left last to make shoes, namely, that he should strike us Gentiles dead by their Messiah and destroy us all, so that they may have all the land, goods and dominion of the world. And here the weather goes over us with cursing, blaspheming, spitting, so that it is not to be said, wish us that sword and wars, fear and all misfortune come over us cursed Goyim. They practice such cursing publicly every Saturday in their schools and daily in their homes, teaching, training and accustoming their children to it from their youth, so that they may remain bitter, poisonous and evil enemies of the Christians.

From this you can see how they understand and keep the fifth commandment of God, namely, that they are scanty bloodhounds and murderers of all Christendom with full will, now more than 1400 years ago, and would rather be with the deed; as they have often been burned over it, that they were accused of having poisoned water and wells, stolen children, and of having broken and

so that they secretly cooled their little tiredness with the blood of Christians. God still does not want to hear their holy repentance of such great saints and dearest children, and the unjust God lets such holy people curse (I wanted to say, pray) so heartily against our Messiah and all Christians for nothing, does not want to see or know them or their pious nature, which is covered with the blood of Messiah and his Christians thickly, thickly, roughly, roughly. For they are much holier than the captive Jews of Babylon, who did not curse, nor shed the children's blood secretly, nor poison the waters; but, as Jeremiah [29:7] taught them, they had to pray for the Babylonians with whom they were captives. Cause that they were not so holy as these Jews are, neither had they so wise rabbis as these Jews have now. For Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel were great fools who taught such things, and should be torn with teeth among these Jews.

Now behold, what a fine, thick, fat lie this is, when they complain that they are captives with us. It is more than 1400 years since Jerusalem was destroyed, and we Christians have been martyred and persecuted by the Jews all over the world for almost 300 years (as said above), so that we would like to complain that they had captured and killed us Christians at that time, as it is the plain truth. In addition, we still do not know today which devil brought them here to our country, we did not bring them to Jerusalem.

Moreover, even now no one holds them, land and roads are open to them, they may go to their country when they want, we would gladly give a gift to be rid of them. For they are a heavy burden to us, like a plague, pestilence and vain misfortune in our country. They have often been forcibly expelled from landmarks (let it be said that we should keep them); they have been expelled from France (which they call Zarpeth from Obadiah, v. 20), which is a fine, peculiar nest. Now recently they are expelled by the dear emperor Carolo from Hispania (which they call Sepharad also from Obadiah), the very best nest. So fine they understand the prophet Obadiah; make of Zarpeth France, and Sepharad Hispania; that rhymes like a cow to the wind.

mill. And this year from the whole Bohemian crown, since they had one of the best nests in Prague. Item, from Regensburg, Magdeburg and more Oertern with my life expelled.

293 Does that mean to hold captive, if one cannot stand one in the country or home? Yes, they hold us Christians captive in our own country; they make us work in the sweat of their noses, win money and goods, meanwhile they sit behind the stove, loafing, pumping 1) and roasting pears; eating, drinking, living gently and well from our earned goods; have captured us and our goods by their cursed usury, mock at it, and spit at us that we work and let them be lazy squires of ours and in ours; are thus our masters, we their servants with our own goods, sweat and work, curse our Lord and us afterwards, for reward and thanks. Should not the devil laugh and dance here, if he can have such a fine paradise with us Christians, that he eats ours through the Jews, his saints, and for reward fills our mouths and noses, mocks and curses God and men for it?

They could not have had such good days in Jerusalem under David and Solomon in your own estate as they have now in our estate, which they steal and rob daily; nor do they complain that we have imprisoned them. Yea, we have caught and hold them captive, as I have caught my *calculum*, blood sores, and all other sickness or calamity, who must wait as a poor servant, with money and goods and all that I have, would that they were at Jerusalem with the Jews, and whom they would have with them.

295 Since it is certain that we do not hold them captive, why do we deserve such hostility from such noble and great saints? We do not call their wives harlots, as they do Mary, Jesus' mother; we do not call them children of harlots, as they do our Lord Christ; we do not say that they are born in the time of purification, that is, natural fools, as they do our Lord; we do not say that their wives are harlots.

We do not curse them, but wish them well, both physically and spiritually; we shelter them with us, let them eat and drink with us; we do not steal and tear up their children, we do not poison their waters, we do not thirst for their blood. Why do we deserve such cruel anger, envy and hatred of such great holy children of God?

296. It is no different from what we said above from Moses, that God struck them with madness, blindness and a raging heart: so it is also our fault that we do not avenge the great innocent blood, which they shed on our Lord and the Christians three hundred years after the destruction of Jerusalem, and until then on children (which still shines from their eyes and skin), do not put them to death, but let them sit free with us for all their murder, cursing, blaspheming, lying, defiling, Protect and shield their school, houses, body and property, so that we make them lazy and safe and help them to confidently suck our money and property, to mock us, to spit at us, whether they could finally become powerful, and for such great sin beat us all to death, take all our property, as they daily ask and hope. Tell us now if they do not have great cause to be hostile to us cursed goyim, to curse us, and to finally seek our eternal destruction?

From all this we Christians see (for they, the Jews, cannot see it) what a terrible wrath of God has come upon this people and goes on without ceasing, what a fire and blaze burns there, and what those gain who curse Christ and His Christians or are enemies. O dear Christians! Let us take such a terrible example to heart, as St. Paul says in Romans 11:21, and fear God, lest we also fall into such or even worse wrath in the end; but (as we also said above) honor His divine word, and not miss the time of grace, as Mahomet and Pope have already missed it, and have become not much better than the Jews.

What do we Christians want to do with this rejected and damned people of the Jews? It is not too much for us to suffer, since they are with us, and we have to put up with such lies, blasphemies, and

1) The word "pompen" is formed from "pomp". Compare § 281 of this document.

We have to know about their curses so that we do not participate in all their lies, curses and blasphemies. Thus we cannot quench the unquenchable fire of divine wrath (as the prophets speak), nor convert the Jews. We must exercise a sharp mercy with prayer and fear of God, if we could save some from the flame and embers: we must not take revenge, they have vengeance on their necks a thousand times worse than we may wish for them. I will give my faithful advice.

First, set fire to their synagogue or school, and heap earth over what will not burn, and pour it down, so that no man may see a stone or cinder of it forever. And this is to be done in honor of our Lord and Christianity, so that God may see that we are Christians and have not knowingly tolerated or consented to such public lying, cursing and blaspheming of His Son and His Christians. For what we have hitherto tolerated out of ignorance (I did not know it myself), God will forgive us; but now we know it, and should freely protect and shield such a house from under our noses to the Jews, in which they lie, blaspheme, curse, spit upon and defile Christ and us (as was said above), that would be as much as if we did it ourselves, and much worse, as is well known.

300 Moses wrote in Deut. 13:16 that if a city practiced idolatry, it should be completely destroyed by fire and nothing should be kept. And if he lived now, he would be the first to set fire to the Jewish schools and houses. For he commanded harshly, Deut. 4:2 and Deut. 12:32, that they should not change anything from his law, but that they should not pervert his testimony of the Messiah and the right understanding of the law; and Samuel says in 1 Sam. 15:23 that it is idolatry to disobey God. Now the teaching of the Jews is nothing else than vain additions of the rabbis, and idolatry of disobedience against Messiah and laws, that Moses has become completely unrecognizable with them (as said), just as with us under the papacy the Biblia has become unrecognizable. That therefore also Moses half their schools are not to suffer, whom they just as well

and it is not necessary that they should have their own free churches for such idolatry.

301 Secondly, that their houses also be broken up and destroyed in the same way. For they do the same inside that they do in their schools. For this they may be put under a roof or in a stable, like the gypsies, so that they may know that they are not masters in our land, as they boast, but in misery and imprisoned, as they cry out and complain about us before God without ceasing.

(302) Third, to take away all their prayer books and Talmudic books, which teach such idolatry, lies, cursing and blasphemy.

Fourthly, that their rabbis be forbidden, life and limb, to teach henceforth. For they have justly lost this office, because they have imprisoned the poor Jews with the saying of Moses, Deut. 17:11, 12, where he commands them to obey their teachers for loss of life and limb, when Moses clearly states what they teach you according to the law of the Lord. The evil-doers ignore this and use the obedience of the poor people for their courage against the law of the Lord, pouring such poison, curses and blasphemy into them. Just as the pope imprisoned us with the saying Matth. 16, 18: "You are Peter" 2c. that we had to believe everything that he lied to us and deceived us out of his devil's head, and did not teach us according to God's word, because he lost the office to teach.

Fifth, that the Jews be completely deprived of escorts and roads, for they have no business in the country, since they are not lords, nor officials, nor merchants, or the like; they shall stay at home. I am told that a rich Jew 1) is now riding in the countryside with twelve horses (he wants to become a kochab) and is overgrowing princes, lords, countryside and people, so that great lords look askance at him. If you princes and lords will not lay the road properly for such usurers, then a rebellion may arise against them, because

1) Here Jonas has the marginal gloss: "*Michael Judaeus*".

They will learn from this booklet what the Jews are and how one should deal with them and not protect their nature. For you should not and cannot protect them either, because you want to be partaker of all their abominations before God. What good may come of it, let it be known and come to pass. 1)

305. sixth, that they be forbidden to practice usury, which Moses forbade them, when they are not lords in their own land over foreign lands, and that they be deprived of all their goods and jewels of silver and gold, and that they lay them up for safekeeping. And this is the cause: all that they have (as said above) they have stolen and robbed from us by their usury, because they have no other food. Such money is to be used for this purpose (and not otherwise), if a Jew is seriously converted, so that one gives him a hundred two three florins of it before the hand, according to the occasion of the person, so that he may start food for his poor wife and child, and maintain the old or infirm with it, because such evil gained good is cursed, if one does not turn it with God's blessing into good necessary use.

306. but that they boast that Moses permitted or commanded them to usurp the strangers, Deut. 23, 20. (otherwise they have no more letter to pretend for themselves), to this is to be answered: There are two kinds of Jews or Israel. The first are those whom Moses brought out of Egypt into the land of Canaan, as God had commanded him; to them he gave his law, which they were to keep in that same land, no further, and all this until Messiah came. Although it was rather an indulgence than a law, which they should not have needed before, because they had kept Mosiah's law before (which they had never kept). Moreover, they were to do such things to strangers who would not suffer it from them, for they had been subject to them before. But this was a strange wild thing. For they were commonly subject to the strangers, as the books of judges and kings show. But we are not subject to them, but they shall be subject to us. Therefore

Their usury is vain theft and robbery against their overlords and against Moses.

The other Jews are the emperor's Jews, not Mosiah's Jews. They began in the days of Pilate the governor in the land of Judah. For when he asked them before his judgment seat, What shall I do with Jesus, who is called Messiah? Then they cried out, Crucify him, crucify him. And he said, Shall I crucify your king? They cried out again, "We have no king but Caesar" [Matth. 27, 22. Joh. 19, 15.]. Such subordinates to the emperor God had not commanded them, they did it by themselves. When the emperor demanded obedience, they resisted and sat against him, not wanting to be imperial. Then he came and visited his subjects and brought them to Jerusalem, scattering them throughout his empire so that they would have to be obedient.

308) Of these are the present rest of the Jews, of whom Moses knows nothing, nor they themselves of him; for they keep no passover 2) or verse in Moses. Now if they want to enjoy Moses' law, they must first come back to the land of Canaan, and Moses' Jews, keeping his commandment, will force Gentiles and strangers among them; there they may then grow as much as the strangers will suffer from them. But because they are in foreign lands under Caesar, and have disobeyed Moses, they shall keep Caesar's law, and not usurp their overlords, until they have obeyed Moses. For Moses' law never went a step beyond the land of Canaan, or out of the nation of Israel; for he was not sent with his law to the Egyptians, Babylonians, or any other nation, but only to the people whom he brought out of Egypt into the land of Canaan, as he himself often declares in the fifth book of Moses, that they should keep such commandments in the land which they would take over Jordan.

309. moreover, because priesthood, worship, principality, of which Moses gave most and almost all, has fallen, now over 1400 years, it is certain that his Law

1) Jenaer and Wittenberger: verkommen. Jonas: *praeveniat*is.

2) i.e. verse division.

The Jews, who had existed at that time, also fell and came to an end. Therefore, these imperial Jews are to be given imperial justice and are not to be allowed to be Mosaic Jews, who have not been any more for more than 1400 years. For they have no land of their own, much less foreign land, where they might grow up according to Mosiah's permission.

310. seventh, that the young strong Jews and Jewesses be given a mallet, an axe, a cart, a spade, a stick, a spindle, and be made to earn their bread by the sweat of their noses, as Adam's children were made to do, Gen 3:19. For it is not fit that they should make us cursed goyim work by the sweat of our noses, and that they, the holy people, should eat it behind the stove with rotten days, feasts and pomps, 1) and thereupon blaspheme that they are lords of the Christians, by the sweat of our noses; but the rotten rogue's leg should be cast out of their backs.

311 But we are concerned that they may harm us in body, wife, child, servants, livestock 2c. If they should serve us or work for us, because it is to be assumed that such noble lords of the world and poisonous bitter worms, accustomed to no work, would not like to humble themselves so highly among the cursed Goyim: so let us remain with the common wisdom of the other nations, as France, Hispania, Bohemia 2c., and reckon with them what they have robbed us of; and thereafter divide amicably, but always drive them out to the land. For, as we have heard, God's wrath is so great against them that gentle mercy only makes them worse and worse, but sharpness does little to improve them. Therefore always away with them.

312 I hear that the Jews give large sums of money and are useful to the rulers. Yes, from what do they give it? Not from their own, but from the property of the lords and subjects, which they steal and rob by usury. And so the lords take from their subjects what the Jews give, that is, the subjects have to give money and allow themselves to be exploited.

for the Jews, so that they remain in the country and can lie, blaspheme, curse and steal confidently and freely. Should the desperate Jews not laugh in their fists that we allow ourselves to be so shamefully fooled and fooled, and give our money so that they may remain in the country, and do all the wickedness, and become rich from our sweat and blood, while we become poor and are sucked dry by them? If it is right that a servant, a guest or a prisoner should give his master or host ten florins a year and steal a thousand in return, the servant and guest will soon be rich and the master and host will soon be a beggar.

313. And if the Jews could give such a sum of their own to the rulers as is not possible, and they should buy protection and protection from us, publicly, freely in their schools, to lie, blaspheme, spit on, curse our Lord Christ so shamefully, and also to wish us all misfortune, that we all might be stabbed and perish with our Haman, emperor, princes, lords, wives and children: That would truly be selling Christ, our Lord, the whole of Christendom, including the whole empire, to us, with wife and children, at a shameful price. How much of a saint would the traitor Judas be esteemed against us? Yes, if every Jew (as much as he is) could give a hundred thousand florins a year, we should not allow them to blaspheme, curse, spit, and run riot so freely against some Christian; it would still be much too cheaply sold. How much more unmistakable it is that we should allow the whole of Christ and all of us to be bought with our own money, to blaspheme and curse the Jews, 2) and to make them rich and our disciples for the reward of it, who also ridiculed us and tickled their courage. This would be quite a joy to the devil and his angels, that they could laugh through their noses as a sow laughs at her piglets, but earn a right wrath before God.

2) The meaning is: that we let ourselves be bought by the Jews with our own money, that they might blaspheme and curse us, and so on.

314. Summa, dear princes and lords who have Jews among them, if such my counsel is not equal to you, make a better one, so that you and we all may be relieved of the unpleasant devilish burden of the Jews, and not become guilty before God and be guilty of all the lies, blaspheming, spitting, cursing, which the raging Jews so freely and wantonly commit against the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, His dear Mother, all Christians, all authorities, and ourselves, not letting them have any protection, shield, escort, or fellowship, nor letting your and your subjects' money and goods serve and help them by usury. We have enough sin of our own upon us before, nor from the papacy, and do much to it daily with all kinds of ingratitude and contempt of his word and all his graces, that it is not necessary to burden us also with these strange, shameful vices of the Jews, and yet give them money and goods. Let us think that we are now fighting daily against the Turk, since we may well expect relief from our own sin and the betterment of our lives. Hereby I will have cleared and excused my conscience, as I have faithfully denounced and warned.

315. And to you, my dear lords and friends, who are pastors and preachers, I hereby faithfully remind you of your office, that you also warn your pastors against their eternal harm, as you well know how to do, namely, that they beware of the Jews and avoid them where they can; Not that they should curse them much, or do them harm personally; for they have cursed and offended themselves too much when they curse the man Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary, as they have unfortunately been doing now for over 1400 years. Let the authorities here be with them, as I have now said. But let the authorities do it or not, that each one nevertheless perceives for himself his conscience, and makes him such a *definitio* or *protopoeia* of a Jew.

When thou seest or thinkest of a Jew, say thus unto thyself, Behold, the mouth that I see there hath cursed every Saturday my dear Lord Jesus Christ, who redeemed me with his precious blood.

and 1) maledicted and eaten, prayed and cursed before God, that I, my wife and child and all Christians would be stabbed and perish most miserably; would like to do it himself, if he could, so that he would possess our goods, has also perhaps this day fed many times on the earth over the name of Jesus (as they use), that the saliva still hangs in his mouth and beard, where he would have room to spit: And if I should eat, drink or speak with such a devilish mouth, then I would eat and drink myself full of devils out of the bowl or jug, as I would certainly make myself a partaker of all the devils that dwell in the Jews and spit out the precious blood of Christ. God protect me from this.

317. For if they do not believe as we do, we cannot help it, nor force anyone to believe (which is impossible); yet this is to be avoided, that we do not strengthen them in their wanton lying, blaspheming, cursing and profaning, nor with protection, umbrella, food, drink, lodgings, and other neighborly benefits make ourselves partakers of their devilish raging and blustering, first because they boast proudly and shamefully, where we are friendly or of service to them, that God has made them their masters and us their servants, as where a Christian makes their fire on the Sabbath, cooks for them what they want in the inn, for which they curse us, spit at us and blaspheme, as if they were well off, and yet feed on our goods, which they have stolen from us. It is such a desperate, evil, poisoned, devilish thing about these Jews, so that these 1400 years have been and still are our plague, pestilence and all misfortune. Summa, we have real devils in them, that is no different, there is no human heart against us Gentiles. They learn this from their rabbis in the devil's nests of their schools.

In particular, where you are preachers, where there are Jews, diligently persevere with your lords and rulers, that they perform their office as they owe to God, and compel the Jews to work, forbid usury, and control their blasphemy and cursing. For if they punish among us Christians the thieves, robbers, murderers, blasphemers and other vices -

1) "and" is missing in the Wittenberger.

Why should the Jews be devil-free to practice this with us and against us? We suffer more from them than the whales from the Spaniards: the latter take the householder's kitchens, cellars, closets, and bags, curse them, and threaten them with death. The Jews, our guests, do the same to us. We are their landlords; so they rob and suck us dry, lie at our throats, the lazy rogues and idle wretches, drink, eat, have good days in our house, curse in reward our Lord Christ, churches, princes, and all of us, curse and wish us death and all misfortune without ceasing. Think, where do we poor Christians come to this, that we should feed and make rich such lazy, idle people, such useless, wicked, harmful people, such blasphemous enemies of God for nothing, and get nothing in return but their cursing, blaspheming and all the misfortune they can do and wish us? Are we as blind and staring blocks in this matter as the Jews in their unbelief, that we suffer such great tyranny from the unholy rascals, neither seeing nor feeling how they are our nobles, even our furious tyrants, but we are their prisoners and subjects, still complaining that they are our prisoners, mocking us for it, as if we had to suffer it from them.

319. But the lords will not force them, nor will they control their devilish will, that they be driven out to the land, as has been said, and let 1) them be told that they go to their land and goods to Jerusalem, and there lie, curse, blaspheme, spit, murder, steal, robbing, usurping, mocking, and committing all such blasphemous abominations as they do among us, leaving our dominion, land, body and goods, much more our Lord, Messiah, faith and churches, unharmed and untouched by such their diabolical tyrannies and wickednesses. Whether they could use liberties [privilegia], they shall not help; for no one can give liberty to practice such abominations, and all liberties are thereby neglected and lost.

320 If you pastors and preachers (besides me) have issued such faithful warnings, you will be able to do so.

1) Wittenberger: lasse. The reading given by us is confirmed by Jonas.

and neither master nor subject will do anything about it, then let us (as Christ says [Matth. 10, 14.]) shake the dust off our shoes and say: We are innocent of your blood. For I see well, and have often experienced it, how utterly merciful the perverse world is, when it should be cheaply sharp; and again, sharp it is, when it should be merciful, as king Ahab, 1 Kings 20:32. Thus reigneth the prince of this world. So perhaps now they will also want to be merciful over the Jews, the bloodthirsty enemies of our Christian and human name, in order to earn heaven. But that the Jews, with all such diabolical abominations, catch us poor Christians, torment us, torture us, and cause us all heartache, that is to be suffered, and is Christian, well done, especially if there is money which they have stolen and robbed from us.

321 What do we poor preachers want to do? First, let us believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is true, who speaks of such Jews, who did not accept him, but crucified him, such a judgment: You are serpents and devils' children, as his forerunner, John Baptist, also says [Matth. 3, 7], and yet you were his blood friends. Now our rulers and all such merciful saints, who are kind to the Jews, will at least leave us the space to believe Jesus Christ, our Lord, who certainly knows all hearts better than such merciful saints, that these Jews must be serpent-bred and devil's children, that is, who grant us as much good as their father, the devil; 2) We Christians should have long since understood from experience and from the Scriptures what good the devil grants us.

322 I have read and heard many histories of the Jews, which agree with this judgment of Christ, namely, how they poisoned the wells, secretly murdered, stole children, as reported above. Item, that a Jew sent a pot full of blood to another over the field, also by a Christian; item, a barrel of wine, since that was drunk, a dead Jew found in the fast, and the like much.

2) In the old editions: "gan".

And the stealing of children has often (as said above) burned them and made them perish. I know well that they deny these things and all; but it all agrees with the judgment of Christ, that they are poisonous, bitter, vengeful, malicious 1) serpents, assassins and children of devils, who secretly stab and do harm, because they are not able to do it publicly. That is why I would like them to be, since they are not Christians. The Turk and other pagans do not suffer from them what we Christians suffer from poisonous snakes and young devils; they do it to no one but us Christians. This is what I said above, that a Christian has no enemy more poisonous and bitter than the devil, except a Jew, yet no one does so much good, nor suffers so much from anyone, as from such evil devil-children and serpent-breeds.

323 Therefore, whoever desires to harbor and defile such poisonous serpents and young devils, that is, the worst enemies of Christ our Lord and of us all, 2) and to honor them, and desires to toil, rob, plunder, desecrate, spit, curse, and suffer all evil, let these Jews be faithfully commanded to him. If it is not enough, then let him also put him in the mouth, or crawl into their buttocks and worship the same sanctuary, then boast that he has been merciful, has strengthened the devil and his young devil, to blaspheme our dear Lord and the precious blood, so that we Christians are bought, then he is a perfect Christian, full of works of mercy, which Christ will reward him on the last day with the Jews in the eternal hellish fire.

324 Let this be spoken roughly of the gross cursing of the Jews, of which others write much; which also the Jews well understand to mean cursing, as they knowingly mean to curse and blaspheme. Let us also speak of it more subtly and, as Christians, spiritually; thus our Lord Jesus Christ says Matth. 10, 40: "He who receives me receives him who sent me"; Luc. 10, 16: "He who despises you receives him who sent me."

He that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me"; Joh. 15, 23: "He that hateth me hateth my Father also"; Joh. 5, 22: "That they all may honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent Him." 2c.

These are (praise be to God) clear, understandable words, namely that everything that is done in honor or dishonor of the Son is certainly done to God the Father Himself. This cannot be doubted nor suffered by us Christians. Whoever then denies, blasphemes, curses JEsu of Nazareth, Mary, the virgins, the Son, denies, blasphemes, curses also God the Father Himself, who created heaven and earth. This is what the Jews do 2c.

If you say, "Yes, the Jews believe and do not know this, because they do not accept the New Testament," I answer, "The Jews may know or believe this or that, but we Christians know that they publicly blaspheme and curse God the Father when they blaspheme and curse this Jesus. If now or on the last day God will speak to us Christians in this way: Do you hear, you are a Christian and have known that the Jews have blasphemed and cursed my Son and me publicly, but you have given them room and space for it, and have also protected and shielded them, so that they might do it unhindered and unpunished in your country, city and house: tell me, what shall we answer here?"

For that each one for his own person does not believe, *omissive et privatim*, we must leave to each one on his conscience; but to praise, to sing, to teach, to defend such unbelief publicly and freely in churches and before our noses, eyes and ears, and to blaspheme and curse the right faith, thereby to draw others to himself and to hinder ours, that is far, far different. It will not help us that the Jews do not believe, nor know, nor respect the New Testament, because we know it well, and cannot allow the Jews to profane and curse it in our hearing. Our watching and silence is as much as if we did it ourselves. So the wretched Jews complain to us with their

1) Wittenberger: domestic.

2) fretzen - to feed. Jonas: *pascat*.

diabolical, blasphemous, abominable sins in our own country.

328 It is not to be said here: We Jews do not ask about the New Testament or the faith of the Christians. They may speak such words in their own country or secretly; in our country and before our ears they must keep silent, or we must do otherwise. They know well, the desperate boys, that the New Testament is a book from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and they pretend that they do not want to know what the New Testament is. No, companion, it does not apply here what you know or want to know; it applies what you should know and what you are obliged to know. Now not only the Jew, but all the world owes to know that the New Testament of God the Father is the book of His Son JESu Christo. And whoever does not accept nor honor the same book, does not accept nor honor GOD the Father Himself. For it is said, "He who despises me despises my Father" [Luc. 10, 16]. If the Jews do not know this, we Christians know it, as I said.

329 Therefore, just as we cannot suffer the Jews (if we do not want to be condemned with the Jews' sin) to publicly blaspheme and defile God the Father in our hearing, when they blaspheme and defile Jesus our Lord, as he says, "Whoever hates me hates my Father also"; so we also cannot suffer them to speak publicly in our hearing, that they ask nothing about the New Testament, and consider it a lie. Which is just as much as to say, We ask nothing of GOD the Father, and hold him for a liar; because it is GOD the Father's book and word concerning his Son JESu Christo. And it shall not help them, but rather it shall help them not to say that they know not of the book, or that they regard it not. For God's book is to be known. He did not reveal it so that it should not be known or despised; he wants it to be known and no one to be excused from it.

(330) If a king put his only son in his place, and commanded the land to take him for their lord (though he was an heir by nature), and the land gladly received him; but some of them would not take him for their lord.

wanted to oppose it and pretend that they did not know. But the king would give seals, letters and all kinds of testimony that it was his will. But they said they did not want to know or respect it. So the king would have to take them by the head, throw them into the towers and order Master Hansen to teach them how to speak: We would like to know. If not, they would have to stay in the tower forever and leave the others satisfied with their rottenness, who would like to know.

God has also done this. He appointed His Son Jesus Christ in His place in Jerusalem and commanded that homage be paid to Him, Ps. 2:12: "Pay homage to the Son, lest He be angry and you perish. Some of the Jews did not want to know. God gave testimony through many tongues of the apostles, and all kinds of miraculous signs, and led the prophets to witness their sayings; but they did as they still do, standing stiffly, not wanting to know. Then came Master Hans the Romans, and spoiled Jerusalem, and took the boys by the heads, and cast them into the tower of misery, where they are yet, and shall be for ever, or until they say, We would know.

For God did not do this secretly, nor did He act in secret, so that the Jews could excuse themselves, as if they would despise the New Testament without sin. For, as we have heard above, He has given a sure sign through the patriarch Jacob: when the scepter of Judah would fall, they should certainly take care of the Messiah [Deut. 49:10]. Item, when the seventy weeks of Daniel would be over [Dan. 9, 24]. Item, a short time after the built temple Haggai, before the same would be destroyed [Hagg. 2, 7.]. Item, he let them know through Isaiah, when they would hear a voice in the wilderness (that is, a preacher and prophet), who taught: "Repent, the Lord is here, and come himself", they should be sure that Messiah would be there [Is. 40, 3].

333. soon after, he himself comes, teaches, baptizes, and performs unspeakable great miracles, not

secretly, but throughout the whole country, that many also said, "He is Messiah" [John 41]; item v. 31: "If Messiah comes, how can he do greater signs?" And they themselves: "What do we do? This man does many miracles; if we let him, the whole world will believe in him" [Joh. 11, 47, 48.], and at the cross: "He has helped others, but cannot help himself" [Matth. 27, 42.]. Yes, indeed, God should allow the circumcised saints not to know all these things, if they alone have overcome from the above four sayings, Jacob's, David's, Daniel's, Haggai's, that Messiah must have come at that time; as also some of their rabbis say that he goes begging in the world and in Rome 2c.

334 About this he warned them that they should not be offended at the person, proclaiming through Zechariah 9:9, 10. He would come to Jerusalem mounted on an ass, miserable and poor, but a king of salvation, who would teach peace, put away chariots, horses, and bows (that is, not rule worldly, as the mad Kochabites, those bloodthirsty Jews, race), and such a poor (yet peaceful, salutary) king would reign as far as the world. This is an exceedingly bright saying, that Messiah should reign without a sword and with peace as a holy king in all the world, so that I am not a little surprised how the devil can be so powerful to persuade a man (let alone a whole nation that boasts of God) otherwise than such a bright text forces him to do.

Furthermore, he faithfully warned them that they should not be angry when they saw that such a great miracle worker and poor king, riding on an ass, would be killed and crucified. For he had previously proclaimed this, Dan. 9, 26. and Isa. 53, 4. ff., "that his servant, of whom the kings would be astonished, must be beaten and miserably slain; but all this because God laid all our sin upon him, and smote him for the sins of us all, but he should give his life for a trespass offering for sin, and pray for sinners, and by his knowledge make many righteous," as the text stands brightly.

336. but outrageous thing has the sun

not seen nor heard, neither these 1) blasphemous Jews practice in this saying, which they point to themselves in this misery, of which now is not time to act. Oh, should they be the ones who are beaten for our sins, bear our sins, and make us righteous, and pray for us 2c., 2) as no worse people have ever been, who with their lying, blaspheming, cursing, profanation, idolatry, robbery, usury and all vices weigh us Christians and all people, where they are, down higher before God and the world? To this end, do not pray for us sinners, as the text says, but curse in the worst way, as is proven above from Lyra and Burgensi. But before great idleness and willfulness, the blasphemous evil-doers mock the Scriptures, God and all the world with such insolent glosses as they deserve and are worthy of doing.

After such a crucified king, God first gave the right signs that this Jesus was Messiah. Then the poor, despondent, unlearned, unconsecrated fishermen, who did not know their own language well, stood up and preached with the tongues of all the world, so that all the world, heaven and earth were still amazed; they led the scriptures of the prophets in the right understanding, did such miracles and signs that their sermons were accepted by Jews and Gentiles all over the world, so earnestly that countless people, young and old, let themselves be horribly tortured over it, and now for 1500 years it has lasted until us, and will last until the end of the world.

Since such signs did not move the Jews at that time, what do we hope from these wicked Jews, who now gloriously do not want to know about such stories? Yes, God will allow them to do so, who has so gloriously revealed such things before all the world, that they still today see us Christians preaching and keeping such things, which we have not invented, but have heard from Jerusalem from 1500 years ago, and no enemies nor Gentiles (the Jews in particular) have ever been able to dampen how hard they have opposed it; that it is impossible for them to have known it.

1) Wittenberger: the. Jonas: *his*.

2) "2c." is missing in the Wittenberger.

is to exist such a thing where it would not be of God.

The Jews themselves, with their fifteen hundred years of misery, must bear witness to this, that it was preached in their ears all over the world, and that it was challenged and proven by much heresy, so that God cannot be blamed as if he had done this secretly or in the dark, or that it never happened to the Jews or to any people. For they have persecuted it 1) all these 1600 years with great care and confidence. The blasphemous Jews still oppose it as shamefully and mockingly as if a drunkard had recently invented it, which they would not be obliged to believe, but would like to blaspheme and curse it freely and safely, and we Christians would have to give them room and place, house and courtyard for it, to protect and shield them, so that they could blaspheme and curse such a word of God confidently and freely, and let our money and goods grow into wages for them.

No, you miserable father of such blasphemous Jews, you infernal devil, it must therefore be said: God has publicly preached to your children, the Jews, with miraculous signs long enough in all the world, now at 1500 years and still, which they have been and still are guilty of obeying, but they have obdurately always contradicted, blasphemed and cursed for and for. Therefore, we Christians are obliged not to suffer their wanton and deliberate blasphemy, as it is said: "He who hates the Son hates the Father" [John 15:23]. For if we suffer them to do so in the place where we are powerful, and protect and handle them, we are eternally condemned with them for their sins and blasphemies, as if they were others, even though we might be as holy in our own persons as the prophets, apostles or angels, *quia faciens et consentiens pari poena*, perpetrators, robbers, helpers, abusers, and abusers, one is as 2) pious as the other. And it is of no help to us (the Jews much less) that the Jews do not want to know. For we Christians know it, as I have said, and the Jews owe it to us to know it, as they do with us.

1) "it" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) "so" is missing in the Wittenberger.

have heard at the same time for 1500 years, and have seen and heard all kinds of miraculous signs, how such teaching has been established by divine power against all devils and all the world.

Since it is certain (through such a long and powerful preaching in all the world) that "he who dishonors the Son, dishonors the Father", and he who does not have the Son, cannot have the Father [Joh. 5, 22. 1 Joh. 2, 23]. The Jews nevertheless always blaspheme and curse God the Father, the Creator of all of us, for and on behalf of His Son Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary (whom He has now transfigured for His Son with preaching and miraculous signs for 1500 years in all the world), against all devils and men's power and art, and still transfigured to the end of the world) blaspheme and curse, calling him Hebel Vorik, that is, not only a liar and false, but the lies and falsehood itself, worse than the 3) devil himself: so we Christians are not to suffer such things, before our ears and freely before our noses, in public synagogues, books and prayers, practiced daily in our own country, houses and government, by any means; or must God lose the Father with His dear Son, who bought us so dearly with His holy blood, with, and for the sake of the Jews, and be eternally lost; then God be for.

342 Accordingly, we Christians should not and must not be joking but very serious about seeking counsel against this and saving our souls from the Jews, that is, from the devil and eternal death. And is that, as said above.

343 First, that their synagogue be burned with fire, and whoever can throw brimstone and pitch; whoever can throw hellish fire would also be good, so that God may see our earnestness and all the world such an example that we have hitherto ignorantly tolerated such a house (in which the Jews have so shamefully blasphemed God, our dear Creator and Father, with His Son), and now have given Him His reward.

344 Secondly, to take away all their books, prayer books, Talmudic books, and the whole Bible, and not to leave them a single page, and

3) In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlanger: "der". Jonas: *quam contra diabolum ipsum*.

on those who were converted. For they need all of this to blaspheme the Son of God, that is, God Himself the Father, Creator of heaven and earth (as has been said), and will never need it otherwise.

Thirdly, that they be forbidden to praise, thank, pray, teach God publicly in our country and in ours, at the loss of life and limb. In their own country they may do so, or wherever they can, so that 1) we Christians may not hear nor know it; for their praise, thanksgiving, prayer and teaching is blasphemy, cursing, idolatry, because their heart and mouth call God the Father Hebel Vorik, as they call His Son, our Lord Jesus. For as they call and honor the Son, so is the Father called and honored. Does it not help them that they use many beautiful words and glorify God's name. For it is said: "You shall not take God's name in vain" [Exodus 20:7], just as it did not help their ancestors to take God's name, yet they called him Baal in the days of the kings of Israel.

346 Fourth, that they be forbidden to call the name of God before our ears, for we cannot in good conscience hear it, nor suffer it, because you blasphemously call the mouth and heart of God's Son Hebel Vorik, and so must also call His Father, who cannot nor will understand it otherwise; just as we Christians cannot understand it otherwise, who must believe that as the Son is called and honored, so also the Father is honored and called. Therefore the mouth of the Jew is not to be held worthy among us Christians, that it should call God in our ears; but whoever hears it from the Jew, that he should report it to the authorities, or throw a saber at him, if he sees him 2) and chase him away. And let no one be merciful or kind in this. For it affects God's honor and the salvation of us all (the Jews as well).

347) And whether they, or 3) someone on their behalf wanted to pretend that they did not mean it that way.

evil, nor would they know that with such blasphemy and cursing they were blaspheming and cursing God the Father; for though they blaspheme Jesus and us Christians, yet they praise and honor God most highly and beautifully: it is said above, as you have heard: If the Jews do not want to know, or pretend to know, we Christians must know. So the Jews are not excused for their ignorance, because God has preached this for 1500 years, that they owe to know this, God also demands this from them. For whoever hears God's word 1500 years and always says: I don't want to know, his ignorance will certainly earn him a bad excuse, that is, a sevenfold guilt.

Yes, they did not know at that time that it was God's word, but now they have heard for 1500 years that it is God's word, and have seen great signs, and have raged against it themselves, even coming to such misery 1500 years later. Well then, let them still hear and believe it, then all things shall be bad; if not, then it is certain that they will not know it eternally, but always want to curse for and for, as their ancestors did these 1500 years; so we Christians (who know) cannot suffer their wanton, eternal ignorance and blasphemy with us, nor take it on our conscience; they may go to their own country, there be ignorant and blaspheme as long as they can, and leave us unburdened with such their abominable sins.

Yes, how shall we do, if we forbid the Jews to burn their synagogue, to praise God, to pray, to teach, to call God's name publicly, 2c., nevertheless they will not let it be done secretly. And because we know that they do it secretly, it is just as much as if they did it publicly. For what is known to be done secretly and tolerated does not mean secretly, and yet our conscience is burdened with it before God. Well then, let us be careful. In my opinion, the point is this: if we are to remain pure and not participate in the blasphemy of the Jews, we must be separated, and they must be expelled from our country; they may think of us in their own land.

1) Wittenberger: "that". Jonas: *ut*. In the other editions: "da wirs Christen".

2) In the Jenaer, with Walch and in the Erlanger: "them". Jonas: *petat caput Judaei*.

3) Wittenberger: "vber", which is: over; a misprint.

Fatherland, they must no longer cry out before God about us and lie that we hold them captive, nor must we complain that they weigh us down with their blasphemy and usury. This is the nearest and best counsel that will secure both parties in such a case.

But here they, as they do not like to leave the land (so sour and grievous is this prison, in which they are our tyrants and young lords), will confidently deny everything and anything, and also offer money enough to the rulers, if they want to stay. But woe to those who take such money, and cursed be such money, which they have also cursedly stolen from us by usury. For they deny as much as they lie, and where they can secretly curse, poison, or harm us Christians, they make no conscience of it. If they are apprehended or otherwise accused, they may confidently deny it, even unto death, because they do not esteem us worthy of confessing the truth to, since the holy children of God certainly consider it that whatever evil they can curse and do to us, they do a great service to God by it. Yes, if they could do to us what we can do to them, none of us would have to live an hour. But because they are not able to do it publicly, they still remain in our hearts our daily murderers and bloodthirsty enemies. This is proven by their prayers and cursing, and by so many stories about how they tortured children and practiced all kinds of vices, and how they were often burned and driven out.

351 Therefore I believe that they speak and do much evil secretly, neither the. They do not write the Histories and others about them, but they rely on denial and their money. But even if they could deny everything, they cannot deny that they curse us Christians publicly, not because of our evil life, but because we consider Jesus to be the Messiah, and that they must be imprisoned with us, knowing full well that they are lying about it, and that they rather keep us imprisoned in our country by their usury, but that everyone would like to be rid of them. But because they curse us, they also curse our Lord. If they curse our Lord, they also curse God the Father, Creator.

Heaven and earth; that therefore their denial can help them nothing. They are overcome only by cursing, that one must believe everything that is written evil of them; they certainly do it more and worse, neither we know nor experience. For Christ doth not deny nor confess, who judgeth them serpents and devils' children, that is, his and all his murderers and enemies, where they can. I also hear miracles, how they take revenge on Christians in Turkey, where they have room, and cool their devilish little mouths; which is to be believed, because they are such devils with us, since they are not overlords.

If I had power over the Jews, as our princes and cities have, I would play this serious game with their lying mouths. They have a lie, so that they do great harm to their children and common men, and disgracefully denigrate our faith; namely, they blame us and lie to us among their own, that we Christians worship more than one God; there 1) is no measure nor number of boasting and pride. Thus they hold their people captive, as they alone are the people who worship no more than one God before all the heathen. Oh how certain they are in this matter of theirs!

Whether they know that they do us wrong in this, and lie as desperate, wanton evil-doers; whether they have heard from all Christians for 1500 years, and still hear that we say no to them: nor do they stop their ears like serpents, and knowingly will not hear us, but as they lie and spit upon us, so it must be right with their people. Even if they read in our writings that we, like Moses 5 Mos. 6, 4. says: "Hear, Israel, our God is one Lord", that we thus confess, publicly and secretly, with hearts, tongues, writings, life and death, that there is no more than one God, of whom Moses writes there, and the Jews themselves call; whether they know such (I say), hear such, read such from us, now at 1500 years, it does not help to deny the -

1) Wittenberger: das. Jonas: ibi.

Nor must their lies be right, and we Christians be defiled by them, that we worship many gods.

354 Therefore, if I had power over them, I would gather their scholars and their best, and charge them, with the loss of their tongues, to come out from behind their necks, that within eight days they should convict and convince us Christians, and thus make true this blasphemous lie against us, namely, that we worship more than the right one God. If they could do that, we would all become Jews one day and circumcise ourselves; if not, they should await their deserved reward for such a shameful, wanton, harmful, poisonous lie. For we, praise God, are not so much ducks, logs or stones as the highly knowledgeable rabbis (nonsensical fools) regard us, that we should not know that One God and many gods cannot be believed with truth at the same time.

But the fact that we believe that there are three persons in the one, eternal Godhead does not prove that we believe more than one God, neither Jew nor devil. If the Jews want to pretend that they cannot understand how three persons are one God, why do they deny, condemn and curse their blasphemous lying mouth that does not understand? Such a mouth should be punished in two ways: first, it should confess that it does not understand; second, it should blaspheme that it does not understand. Why do they not ask before? Yes, why have they heard it 1500 years and not wanted to learn nor understand? Therefore such ignorance cannot help nor excuse them, nor us Christians, if we suffer it longer from them, but must force them (as said) to make such blasphemous lies about us true, or suffer their right because of it. For he who in this article idolatrously beseeches and blasphemes us, beseeches and blasphemes Christ, that is, God himself, as an idol, from whom we have learned and received it as his eternal word and truth, confirmed, known and taught with signs and sounds for 1500 years.

No man has ever been born, nor will ever be born, who would want to be born.

They do not understand how leaves come out of wood or trees, and grass out of stone or earth, nor some creatures how they are created. And these insolent, blind, obstinate liars want to judge and know how it is done apart from and above the creature in the hidden, incomprehensible, inscrutable and eternal essence of God, when we hardly and with weak faith grasp what is revealed to us in the dark word; they fall into such terrible blasphemy that they call our faith idolatrous, that is, they call God himself an idol and blaspheme. For we are sure of our faith and doctrine, and we ourselves also owe it to know, as we have now heard for 1500 years that it is through Jesus Christ, of God and from God.

If the coarse people had been a little more careful and said: The Christians worship one God and not many gods, and we lie and do them wrong by saying that they worship more than one God, although they believe in three persons in one Godhead, which we do not understand, they must let their mind rule 2c., that would be spoken with reason. But now they fall into 1) the devil's name, like filthy swine into the trough, blaspheming and defiling, which they neither know nor want to understand. Quickly therefore: We Jews do not understand it and do not want to understand it, therefore it must be unjust and idolatrous.

But it is the people, to whom God has always had to be not God, but a liar in all the prophets and apostles, as much as he had them preach. Therefore, again, they must not be his people, no matter how much they teach, cry out and pray. They do not hear him, so again he does not hear them, as the 18th Psalm, v. 27. says: "With the perverse you consort." The wrath of God has come upon them, which I do not like to think about, and I have not been able to write this book happily, so that I have had to, now with anger, now with mockery against the Jews, tear the terrible look out of my eyes,

1) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer and Erlanger: "herein des". Jonas: *irruunt Satanico impetu*.

and it grieves me that I had to mention their terrible blasphemous words about our Lord and his dear mother, which we Christians do not like to hear at all; and I understand well what St. Paul means Rom. 10, 1.1) that his heart is grieved when he thinks of them; which I consider to be the case for every Christian who thinks of them seriously, not because of the temporal misfortune and misery about which they, the Jews, complain, but because they are given to blaspheme, to curse, to spit at God Himself and all that is God's, to their eternal condemnation, and yet do not want to hear or know such things, but do them as out of a zeal for God. O God, Heavenly Father, turn and let your wrath on them be enough and be an end, for the sake of your dear Son, amen.

I wish and ask our overlords, who have Jews among them, that they would exercise a sharp mercy against these wretched people, as I said above, if it would help a little (although it is unfortunate), as the faithful physicians do, when the holy fire 2) has come into the legs, they proceed with ruthlessness and cut, saw, burn off flesh, veins, bone and marrow. So also do here, burn their synagogues, forbid all that I have said above, force them to work, and deal with them according to all unmercifulness; as Moses did in the wilderness, and slew three thousand, lest the whole multitude perish. They truly do not know what they are doing, nor do they want to know, hear or learn, like the possessed people. Therefore, no mercy can be shown here to strengthen them in their nature. If that does not help, we must chase them out like mad dogs, so that we do not deserve God's wrath with them and be condemned, being partakers of their abominable blasphemy and all vices. I have done my part; let each one see how he does his part. I am pardoned.

The fourth part of this book, what a difference between the Christians and Jews Messiah, and what both people at her Messia search. 3)

I will say this for myself: If God would not give me another Messiah than the one the Jews desire and hope for, I would much, much rather be a sow than a man. I will tell you this for a good reason: The Jews do not desire more from their Messiah than that he should be a Kochab and worldly king, who kills us Christians, divides the world among the Jews and makes them lords, and finally also dies, like other kings, his children after him also. For thus saith a Rabbi, Thou shalt not suppose that in the days of Messiah things shall be different from those which were made in the beginning of the world, 2c, that is, there will be days, night, year, moons, summer, winter, sowing, reaping, childbearing and dying, eating, drinking, sleeping, watching, 5) threshing and casting out, and everything will go as it goes now, without the Jews being masters, having all the gold, goods, joy and pleasure of the world, but we Christians must be their servants; However, as Mahomet also thought and taught, who kills us Christians (as the Jews would gladly do) and takes land, goods, pleasure and joy, and if he were a Jew, not an Ishmaelite, the Jews would have long since accepted him as Messiah, or made him Kochab.

361 If I had all this, or could now become the Turkish emperor, or the Messiah, as the Jews hope, myself, I would rather become a sow. For what use would all this be to me if I could not be sure of it for an hour? Nevertheless, the terrible burden and plague of all men, death, would remain upon me, from which I would not be safe, would fear it every moment, would tremble before hell and God's wrath.

3) This superscription is found in the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

4) i. e. to say goodbye.

5) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: grow. Jonas did not translate this, but says: *dormire* etc..

1) Wittenberger: thut.

2) The holy fire, that is, the red run or the rose. Jonas has not translated this, but says: *in morbis gravioribus*.

and lift, and that all this should know no end, but should wait eternally; as the tyrant Dionysius showed such fine to one who praised him blessedly, he set him over a table, splendidly dressed, over him he hung a mere sword on a silken thread, under him a fiery blaze, and said: Eat, be merry 2c. Likewise would be the joy of this Messiah also. And I know that he who has ever felt the terror or burden of death would gladly be a sow for it, before he would ever bear such for and for.

For a sow lies in her downy feather bed on the street or dung, rests securely, snores softly, sleeps sweetly, fears no king nor lord, no death nor hell, no devil nor God's wrath, lives so completely without worry that she does not even think where the little ones are. And if the Turkish emperor were to march along with all power and wrath, she should be so proud that she would not stir a bristle for his sake; if one were to urge her on, she should probably crown herself and (if she could speak) say: "Behold, how you rage, you fool; you do not have the tenth part as well as I do, and never live an hour as safely, gently and quietly as I always live for and for, if you were still ten times as great and rich. Summa, she remembers no dying, is vain safe gentle life with her.

When the butcher comes upon her, she thinks that a wood or a stone is holding her up; she does not think of dying until the moment she is dead; she has not felt death for a moment, neither before, nor in death, nor after, but has felt vain and eternal life. No king, nor the Jew Messiah himself, will do this to her, nor any man, no matter how wise, high, rich, holy and powerful he is. She has not eaten of the apple that taught us wretched men in paradise the difference between good and evil.

What should the Jew Messiah do for me? If he could not help me, a poor man, against this great horrible fault and damage, and could not make my life the tenth part as good as the sow has? I would say: Dear Lord God, keep your Messiah, or give it to whoever wants it, but make me a sow for it. For it is better to be a living sow than an eternal one.

dying man, yes, as Christ says: "It would be better for man that he had never been born" [Matth. 26, 24.].

But if I had such a Messiah, who could heal this damage, so that I would not have to fear death, would be sure of life always and forever, could strike a cliff against the devil and hell, and would no longer have to tremble before the wrath of God, my heart would leap for joy and become drunk with vain delight; a fire of love for God would be kindled, praise and thanksgiving would never cease. If he did not give me gold, silver and other riches after that, all the world would be paradise to me, even if I should live in prison.

We Christians have such a Messiah and thank God, the Father of all mercy, with the full exuberant joy of our hearts, happily and gladly forgetting all the suffering and harm that the devil inflicted on us in paradise. For he has been amply atoned for and repaid through this Messiah. So the apostles sang and praised before such joys in dungeons and all misfortunes, also young maidens, as Agatha, Lucia 2c. For this the wretched Jews, who did not want to have this Messiah, have languished and become corrupt in the fear of their hearts, worries, citations, anger, impatience, malice, blasphemy and cursing, as Isaiah, Cap. 65, 14. 15. says: "Behold, my servants shall shout for good cheer; but you shall cry out for sorrow of heart, and howl for mourning, and leave your name for an oath to my chosen ones. And the LORD shall kill you, and call his servants by another name." Item v. 1. 2.: "I am sought by them that ask not for me; I am found by them that sought me not: and unto the heathen that called not on my name (that is, that were not my people) I say, Here am I, here am I! For I have stretched out my hand all day long to the people who would not listen" 2c.

367. Yes, we have such a Messiah, who speaks to us like this, Joh. 11, 25: "I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die"; and Joh. 8, 51:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that keepeth my word shall never see death." After such Messiah the Jews and Turks ask nothing. And what is he to them? They must have one from the land of the sleeping monkeys to fill their stinking bellies, and die with them like a cow or a dog.

Nor can they be anything against death, for they themselves are holy enough to come before God with their repentance and piety, to obtain such and all things. But the Christians are such fools and pusillanimous rascals, who fear God so much, who esteem their sin and His wrath so highly, that they do not dare to appear before the eyes of His divine majesty without a mediator or messiah to represent them and offer Himself on their behalf. But the Jews are holy and bold heroes and knights, and are allowed to appear before God even without a mediator or messiah, and to ask and obtain everything they desire, so that the angels and God Himself must of course be pleased when a Jew humbles himself so highly that he wants to pray; then the angels must sit in prayer and place God's crown on his divine head; as we see that this has happened 1500 years ago. So high does God think of the noble blood and circumcised saint, that they can call his son Hebel Vorik.

369 Further, since we senseless, pusillanimous Christians and cursed goyim think so highly of our Messiah that he must deliver us from death by himself without our holiness, we wretched people fall into such great, terrible blindness that we believe he does not need a sword or worldly power to do so. For we cannot understand how God's wrath, sin, death and hell can be driven away with the sword, since we see that from the world until now death has not asked for the sword, all emperors, kings, and whoever wielded the sword has been eaten as well as the most miserable infant 1) in the cradle.

The great deceivers, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and all the prophets, who charm us mad goyim, do us great harm.

1) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: child. Jonas: *infantulum*.

With their false teaching, when they say that the kingdom of Messiah shall not have a sword. Oh, that the holy rabbis and chivalrous, bold heroes of the Jews would come to our aid and help us out of these terrible errors, since Isaiah 2:2. prophesies of Messiah, how "the Gentiles shall run to the house and mountain of the Lord", and want to be taught (no doubt not with the sword, otherwise they would not run, and probably remain outside) and says v. 4: "He (Messiah) will judge among the Gentiles, and punish many nations. 2) Then they will turn their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. For no nation shall lift up a sword against another, neither shall they learn to fight any more."

In the same way he does magic with us poor Goyim also Isaiah 11, 9: "Nowhere will one perish on my holy mountain, for the land is full of the knowledge of the Lord". Here we poor blind goyim understand: "Knowledge of the Lord", not a sword, but the teaching, by which one learns to know God, as above Isaiah 2. is also said before teaching, which the Gentiles are to follow. For knowledge must not come by the sword, but by teaching and hearing, as we foolish goyim think. And Isa. 53, 11: "By his knowledge he will make many righteous", that is, by teaching, hearing and believing in him; what else can his knowledge mean? Summa, to know Messiah must come through preaching.

372 See the work before your eyes. The apostles did not use swords or spears, but only tongues; and this has been done throughout the world for 1500 years by all bishops, pastors and preachers, and is still going on. See whether the priest wields a sword or a spear when he goes into the church, preaches, baptizes, administers the sacrament, binds and loosens sins, controls the wicked, comforts the pious, and teaches, feeds and corrects everyone's soul. Does he not do all this with the tongue or word alone? In the same way, the people do not bring a sword or a spear to such an office, but only their ears.

2) In the German editions: "among many peoples". Jonas: *multos populos*; likewise the German Bible.

373 Then behold the miraculous signs. The Roman Empire and all the world were full of idols, which the heathen held fast; the devil was mighty, and resisted confidently; yet the tongue alone, without a sword, cleansed the whole world from all the same idols, against all swords; it also cast out innumerable devils, raised the dead, healed all kinds of sick people, and performed and rained down miracles, after which it purged all heresy and error, as it still does daily before our eyes. And, which is the greatest of all, forgives and cancels all sin, makes happy, peaceful, patient hearts, devours death, closes hell, opens heaven, gives eternal life. And who can tell all the good that God's Word works, Summa, making God's children and heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven all those who hear and believe it? Does not this mean a kingdom, power, might, dominion, glory? Yes, indeed, a comforting kingdom, and the right Chendath of all the Gentiles. And I should desire or accept for such kingdom a bloodthirsty Kochab with the Jews ? Marriage and I would rather be a sow than a man (as I said).

374 All the writings of the prophets rhyme very finely with this understanding, that the nations have fallen to Shiloh (as Jacob says Gen 49:10), both of Jews and Gentiles, after the scepter was taken away from Judah; item, the seventy weeks of Daniel completed; item, the temple of Haggai destroyed, and David's house and throne remained until then, and must remain forever. Again, after the Jews (so God rejected) wanton denial, lying and cursing; none of which can be understood, much less fulfilled.

First of all, speaking of the saying of Jacob, Genesis 49:10, we have heard above how the Jews have invented lazy, unrhymed fables about it, and yet have not hit anything certain. But if we confess our Lord Jesus and let him be the Shiloh or Messiah, he sends, gives, rhymes, and everything meets in the finest and funniest way. For in the days of Herod, when the scepter was taken away from Judah, he was quickly there, and began his regiment of peace, without a sword (as Isaiah and Zachariah prophesy), and all the people fell to him.

Peoples, both Jews and Gentiles, so that even in one day at Jerusalem three thousand souls became believers, and many of the priesthood and princes of the people came, as St. Lucas writes Apost. 2, 41 and 4, 4.

376 And from the time that Jesus rose from the dead, that is, from the eighteenth year of Tiberius the Emperor to the eighteenth year of Hadrian the Emperor, who waged the other and last battle against the Jews, defeated Kochab, and drove the Jews out of their land completely and purely, that is, for more than a hundred years, there have always been bishops in Jerusalem from the tribe of the children of Israel, whom 1) our Eusebius lib. 4, *Eccl. hist.* cap. 5; see St. James the Apostle and count fifteen of them, all of whom preached the gospel with great diligence, performed miracles, and lived holy lives, so that they converted many thousands of Jews and children of Israel to their promised and manifested Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth; without what is still converted by St. Paul, other apostles, and their disciples outside the country, scattered among the Gentiles, together with the Gentiles. Although the other part, the blind, stubborn, of these present Jewish fathers, raged, raged, shed much blood of their own tribe, both in and out of the country among the Gentiles, as is also said above about the Kochab, without ceasing and without 2) stopping.

377 Since Hadrian had driven the Jews out of the country, bishops had to be taken at Jerusalem from the Gentiles who had become Christians, because no more Jews were found in the country, nor were they suffering, because of Kochab and his rebellious Jews, from whom the Romans could have no peace. So the other pious, converted Jews, scattered among the Gentiles, converted many of the children of Israel, as we see in St. Paul's Epistles and Histories; but besides this, they always suffered persecution from the Kochabites in all places, so that the pious children of Israel had no worse enemies than their own blood friends; as they still have, where they are converted.

1) In the editions: "which they". Jonas: *quos*.

2) "without" is missing in the Miltenberger.

378 To such pious converted children of Israel also the heathen of all the world smote, and did it with such multitudes and with such earnestness, that they left over not only their idols and their own wisdom, but also wife and child, friends, goods and honor, life and limb; suffered all that the devil and all other heathen, even the raging Jews, could devise. They did not seek the food, nor the gold, the silver, the goods, the dominion, the land or the people, but the eternal, and another than this life; they were gladly poor and miserable, but joyful and confident; not bitter nor revengeful, but kind and merciful; they prayed for their enemies, and did many and great miracles. This has endured from that time to us who are now, and will endure to the end of the world.

Now it is a great and strange thing that the Gentiles of all the world, without sword and compulsion, for no temporal gain, gladly and willingly accepted a poor man of the Jews, whom they themselves, his own people, had crucified, condemned, cursed, persecuted without ceasing, for the right Messiah, so much for his sake and suffered, forsaking all idolatry, only that they might live with him forever. And now this has been granted for 1500 years; no false worship has ever stood so long, nor all the world suffered so much over it, or held so firmly to it. And this is probably one of the greatest signs, that no other God has ever endured such hard resistance as this Messiah, against whom alone all other gods and nations raged, and could well be one among themselves, how diverse and unequal they were. Whom this strange miracle does not move, it serves him right to remain blind or to become a damned Jew.

380 We Christians see that this work is in accordance with the saying of Jacob, Genesis 49: "The nations will obey Shiloh or Messiah (when the scepter of Judah has fallen). The work is there before our eyes, which fulfilled this saying, that the nations, that is, not only the Jews, but also the Gentiles, are together and in one accord obedient to this Shiloh, and one people, that is,

Christians. No other can be given nor conceived, to whom the saying of Jacob rhymes and applies so finely, as this is our dear Lord Jesus. And there must have been one from the time after the scepter, or the Holy Spirit must have lied through the holy patriarch Jacob, and God must have forgotten his promise. This say the devil, and who wants to be a damned Jew.

381 Thus also the saying of the eternal house and throne of David [2 Sam. 7, 13. 16.] rhymes with no one but this our Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth. For after the kings of the tribe of Judah since the time of Herod there is no son of David to be thought of who sat on his throne, and still sits to keep his throne forever; as it should be, and still must be, because God promised it with an oath. But when this son of David had risen from the dead, many, many thousands of the children of Israel, both at Jerusalem and in all the world, fell to him and accepted him as their king and Messiah, as the right seed of Abrahah and her blood; these were, and still are, the house, kingdom and throne of David. For they are the descendants of the children of Israel, and of the seed of Abrahah, over whom David was king.

382 But that they are dead and buried, it is not so; they are yet before him his kingdom and his people. To us and to the world they are dead, but to him they are alive and not dead. Whether the blind Jews know not this, it is right. For he that is blind shall see nothing everywhere. But we Christians know that he says, Joh. 8, 56. Matth. 22, 32.: "God is not God of the dead, but God of the living", that is, Abraham lives; item, Joh. 11, 26.: "He who believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live." So David's house and throne stand firm, and he has a son sitting on it forever, who will never die, nor let die all who are in his kingdom, and accept him as king with true faith. This means the saying is fulfilled: "David's throne shall be forever." Let all the devils and the Jews and the Turks, and those who will not give, give one son of David or more,

On whom this saying of the house of David rhymes so finely and sweetly, is from the time of Herod, so let us praise them.

383 To such a kingdom and throne of David also belong all of us Gentiles, who have accepted such a Messiah and Son of David for a king with the same faith, and still accept him until the end of the world and for eternity. As Jacob's saying, Gen 49:10, says, "The nations will obey him," that is, not one people alone, as the children of Israel are, but what else is also called nations. And before that Gen. 22, 18. "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In this saying is the word Goyim, which is commonly understood in the Scriptures of the Gentiles, without, where the Jews are also thus called by the prophets almost contemptuously. And the summa is: the blessing of God shall not only remain on his blood descendants through the seed of Abraham, but shall also be spread among all the Gentiles; therefore God himself calls Abraham "father of many Gentiles", Gen. 17, 5. There are many more sayings in the Scriptures.

384 But that the Scripture calls such a kingdom "David's throne," and the king Messiah "Abraham's seed," is the reason that such a kingdom of David and king Messiah did not come from us Gentiles to the children of Abraham and Israel, but from the children of Abraham and Israel to us Gentiles, as the Lord himself says John 4:22: "Salvation came from the Jews. And even though we all come from Adam of the same birth, all other nations are set apart, and only Abraham's seed is chosen, from whom the Messiah should come. After Abraham only Isaac, after Isaac only Jacob, after Jacob only Judah, after Judah only David; the other brothers aside, any time, not chosen to the line, from which Messiah should come. But all and all was done for Messiah's sake. Therefore the whole seed of Abraham, especially those who believed in such Messiah, are highly honored 1) by God, as St. Paul Apost. 13, 17.

says: "God has exalted this people". For it must be a great honor and glory to be able to boast that he is the Messiah's cousin and blood friend; and the closer, the higher.

But so far that such glory does not grow from the reason that Abraham's and his descendants' blood was worthy of such honors, for that would be to spoil it all for the reason, but only from the reason that God, out of pure grace and mercy, chose Abraham's flesh and blood for this, since it would have deserved otherwise, and other flesh would have known how to find its equal. 2) The same is true for us Gentiles. Just as we Gentiles are very highly honored to have been made partakers of the Messiah and Kingdom and to enjoy the blessings promised in Abraham's seed. But if we wanted to boast as if we were worthy of it, and did not want to recognize ourselves as having been blessed by mere grace, so that God alone might have the glory, then all would be spoiled and lost. It is said in 1 Cor. 4:7: "What do you have that you have not received? But if thou hast received it, why dost thou boast? Just as if you were the man who had not received it."

386 Therefore the dear Son of David, Jesus Christ, is also our King and Messiah, and we boast of his kingdom and people as well as David himself and all the children of Israel and Abraham. For we know that he is set over the living and the dead as Lord, King and Judge. "If we live, we live unto him; if we die, we die unto him," that is, we must live even after death, as we have now heard St. Paul preach Rom. 14:8. And look for no bloodthirsty Kochab in him, but the true Messiah, who is able to give life and salvation. That means a son of David, sitting on his throne for eternity, of which the blind Jews and Turks know nothing at all. May God have mercy on them, as He has done and will do for us, amen.

387 Therefore, there can be no Messiah to whom the saying Dan. 9. rhymes,

1) "are" is missing in the Jenaer, in Walch and in the Erlanger.

2) "would have" is missing in the Jenaer, in Walch and in the Erlanger.

For this JEsu of Nazareth alone, and the devil with all For whosoever believeth in him is righteous for ever, and his angels and Jews should become mad and foolish. For all his sins are eternally sealed unto him, made an how foul the lie of the Jews was from the king Cores and atonement for, forgiven him: as the New Testament Agrippa, is heard above. But as the angel Gabriel says abundantly sheweth unto us, especially St. John, St. there, so it came to pass, and so we see the work before Peter, and St. Paul. It is no longer said: "He who offers at our eyes. "Seventy weeks (saith he) are determined upon Jerusalem the trespass offering, the sin offering and other thy people, and upon thy holy city." He does not call the sacrifices, is justified or has atoned for sin; but it is said: city by its name, Jerusalem; but bad: "thy holy city," "He who believes and is baptized is blessed; he who does neither, God's people, but bad: "thy people." For this not believe is condemned" [Marc. 16, 16.], he may not run people's and this city's holiness should now be over, and to Jerusalem, but Jerusalem has come to him, wherever with the seventy weeks have come to an end, but a new he wants in the whole world.

people, a new Jerusalem, and another holiness should come, since one would not have to atone for sin annually by sacrifice, worship and holiness in the temple, and yet could never become righteous or thoroughly holy, because every year atonement had to be repeated and sought through sacrifice.

The Messiah was supposed to bring eternal righteousness, to seal up iniquity, to control transgression, to make atonement for sin, to fulfill the prophecies and visions 2c. Now that sin is eternally gone and eternal righteousness is here, there is no need for sacrifice for sin or for righteousness. Why would one sacrifice for sin when it is no more? Why would one seek righteousness through worship when it is already there? But if sacrifice and worship are no longer necessary, why should the priests and the temple? if priests and temple are no longer necessary, why should such a people and city be served by them? There must become another people and city, which may not have such priests, temples, sacrifices and services; or must the useless temple and services of priests and sacrifices become desolate and futile, as the seventy weeks give the final judgment and last end, with city and temple, together with priests, sacrifices and services.

389. Such a new people and new Jerusalem is now the Christian church, gathered from Jews and Gentiles, who know that through Jesus Christ sin has been purged away, all prophecy fulfilled, eternal righteousness established.

390 David also proclaimed this in Ps. 40:7 ff: "Sacrifices and grain offerings are not pleasing to you, but you have opened my ears (that is, the ears of the world, that they may hear and believe, and thus be saved without sacrifice, temple or priest). You do not want burnt offerings or sin offerings. Then said I, Behold, I come, in the book is written of me; thy will, O GOD, will I gladly do. "2c. Yes, this is the Messiah who brought righteousness by his will and obedience; such is the will of the book of Moses and of all the prophets. So also here Gabriel says that the sacrifices shall not do, and says: Messiah shall be killed, and have nothing. What will he have nothing of? Ask what he is talking about: He speaks with Daniel of his people, and of his holy city; of which he shall have nothing, that with him and in him of that holiness shall be nothing: as Ps. 16:4 saith also, I will not drink their libation with their blood, neither will I put their name in my mouth."

391 Thus says Isaiah 33:24: "The people that shall dwell in the new Jerusalem shall be called, Nesu owon" [xxxxxx] *Ievatus peccato*, a people of forgiveness of all sins; as also Jeremiah 32:40. promises another new covenant, wherein Moses shall not reign with his covenant; but "I will (saith he) be merciful to their sin, and will never remember it." Yes, this is a covenant of grace, of forgiveness, of remission of all sins forever. This cannot be done by the sword, as the bloodthirsty Kochabites desire; but with true grace through the slain Messiah in the

unworthy world, to eternal righteousness and blessedness, as Gabriel says here.

392 But the saying is too rich (as was said above), and the whole New Testament is briefly contained in it; therefore it takes more time and space to cut it out. Now it is enough that we are sure that it is impossible to understand it from another Messiah or king than from our Lord Jesus Christ 1) of Nazareth, because also at the same time in the last week no other Messiah is killed than this one, and Daniel must have a killed Messiah at the same time, as his words stand brightly there.

393 Finally, the saying Haggai does not rhyme with any other. For there is no one to be seen from the time of Haggai, who would be called with the slightest appearance "Chemdath of all the Gentiles", pleasure or comfort, without this Jesus Christ alone. In him the Gentiles have had their comfort, joy and pleasure for 1500 years, as the work is still before our eyes, and the Jews themselves 2) prove with their cursing until now. For why do they curse us? Only because we have not seen this Jesus, the true Messiah, our own.

1) "Christo" is missing in the Wittenberg and the Erlanger.

2) Wittenberger: still himself.

Comfort, joy and pleasure, confess, boast and praise, from whom we will not be torn nor parted, neither love nor sorrow, but live and die in him and over him confidently and willingly. And the more the Jews, Turks, and all enemies blaspheme and revile him, the more firmly we hold to him, and the dearer he has us, as he says, "Blessed are ye when ye are persecuted and reviled for my sake; be ye glad, your reward is great in heaven" [Matt. 5:11, 12.]. To Him be praise and thanksgiving, honor and glory, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, one, true, right God, amen.

So much writing, dear sir and good friend, you have forced me to do with your booklet, as a Jew proves his art against an absent Christian in conversation. He should not do it to me at present, praise God. So also in this (I hope) a Christian, who otherwise has no desire to become a Jew, has so much that he can not only well ward off the blind poisonous Jews, but must also become hostile to the Jews' malice, lies, cursing, and grasp that their faith is not only false, but that they are certainly possessed with all devils. Christ, our dear Lord, mercifully convert them and keep us firm and immovable in his knowledge, which is eternal life, amen.

52. D. Martin Luther's writing of the **Shem Hamphoras** and of the lineage of Christ, Matth. 1. *)

March 1543.

Doctor Martinus Luther.

(1) In the next booklet I promised that I would run down what the frenzied, wretched Jews lie and blaspheme about their Shem Hamphorah, as it writes

Purchetus in his book, called *Victoria*. This is what I want to have done here, in honor of our faith and against the devil's lies of the Jews, so that those who want to become Jews may also see what beautiful articles they have written.

*This writing appeared, about March 1543 (because on March 7 Luther wrote to Justus Jonas that he had finished it), with Georg Rau (Rhaw) in Wittenberg and was printed by him again in the same year. Then in 1544 by Nickel Schirlentz in Wittenberg. In the collections it is found: in the Wittenberger (1556), vol. V, p. 509b; in the Jenaer (1562), vol. VIII, p. 108b; in the Altenburger, vol. VIII, p. 277; in ver Leipziger, vol. XXI, p. 614 and in the Erlanger, vol. 32, p. 275. It is also printed in Georgii Nigrini "Judenfeind", Frankfurt am Main, 1605. The Erlanger gives the text according to the latter original edition by Nickel Schirlentz. We share it with you, comparing the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

must believe and hold with the damned Jews. For as I state in that booklet, my opinion is not to write against the Jews, as if I hoped to convert them, therefore I did not want to call the same book "against the Jews", but, "about the Jews and their lies", that we Germans historically would also like to know what a Jew is, to warn our Christians against them, as against the devils themselves, to strengthen and honor our faith; not to convert the Jews, which is just as possible as to convert the devil.

(2) For as we must teach and write of the devil, hell, death, and sin, what they are and do, not that we would make of the devil an angel, of hell a heaven, of death a life, of sin holiness, which is impossible; but that we would beware of them: so also I write of the Jews. For a Jew or Jewish heart is so hard as a rock, so hard as an iron devil, that [it] cannot be moved in any way. If Moses came with all the prophets, and did all the miraculous works before their eyes, that they should leave their hardness of mind, as Christ and the apostles did before them, it would be in vain. Even if they were punished so horribly that the streets would run with blood, that their deaths would have to be counted not with a hundred thousand, but with ten hundred thousand 1) and counted, as happened in Jerusalem under Vespasiano and in Bitter under Adriano, nevertheless they must be right, even if they should be in misery for another 1500 years beyond these 1500 years, nevertheless God must be a liar, but they must be truthful.

Summa, they are young devils, condemned to hell; but if there is anything human left in them, such a letter may come in handy: of the whole bunch, whoever wants to may hope, I have no hope, I don't know any scripture about it either. If we cannot convert our Christians, the great multitude, we must be content with the small group; how much less is it possible to convert all these devil children! For

The fact that some people draw such a delusion from the epistle to the Romans in chapter 11, as if all Jews should be converted at the end of the world, is nothing; St. Paul means something else.

From the eleventh chapter in the first part of the book *Purcheti*, translated by D. M. Luther.

1 We will see again how the Jews have always been so hostile to the miraculous deeds of Christ that they ascribe them to Beelzebub, the prince of devils. For he has done as many and as great miracles as no one else has ever done, as he himself says John 15. Nor has it ever been heard that anyone else in his name has made the blind see, the deaf hear, the lame walk, the dumb speak, as Isaiah prophesied earlier on the 35th, v. 4. 5: "God, the Rewarder, will come and help you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped; then shall the lame lick, 2) as the hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall speak praise."

(2) In addition to these four miraculous signs, he did many others, raised the dead, cleansed the lepers, and healed many other sick people, and did such signs that no one but God alone could do; nor did the wickedness of the Jews, who always dealt in evil wiles, dare to blaspheme and defile them with lies, inventing a book against Christ in which they wrote these lies:

It came to pass in the days of Halani, 3) the queen that reigned over all the land of Israel, that Jesus HaNozri came to Jerusalem, and found in the temple of the LORD the stone, whereon the ark of the LORD was set aforetime; on the same stone was written Shem Hamphorah; whosoever learned and understood the letters of the name thereof, could do whatsoever he would.

004 And our wise men were anxious, lest, when the children of Israel should learn such a name, they should turn the world by the power thereof. Therefore they made two dogs of brass, and set them upon two pillars before the

1) In the old editions written: "rechen", which Walch had resolved with "rächen".

2) Written in the old editions: "lick".

3) Afterwards, in § 21, the queen is called "Helena".

Door of the sanctuary. If someone went in and learned the letters of the aforementioned name and went out again, the dogs of brass would attack him so horribly that he would forget the name and the letters he had learned.

005 So Jesus HaNozri came and went into the temple, and learned the letters, and wrote them upon a parchment. Then he tore open the flesh on his leg and put the letters inside. And when he had spoken the name, he was not hurt, but his skin was as it was before: and when he was gone out of the temple, the dogs of brass barked at him, and he forgot the name; and when he was come home, he tore open his leg with a knife, and took out the writing which had the letters of the pretence of Hamphorah, and learned them again.

006 And afterward he gathered unto him 310 young men of Israel, and said unto them, Behold, the wise men say that I am a whore child, because they will reign over Israel: but ye know that all the prophets prophesy of Messiah; the same am I, it is true. And Isaiah prophesied of me, "Behold, Alma is with child, and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel" [Isa. 7:14]. So also my grandfather David prophesied of me, saying, "The LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee" [Ps. 2:7]. Thus my mother bare me without man's help, by the power of God alone. Therefore not I, but they themselves, are harlot children, as Hosea says: "I will not have mercy on their children, for they are harlot children" [Hos. 2, 4Z].

007 And the young men of Israel answered him, If thou be Messiah, give us a sign. What sign do you want from me? They said: Make a lame man standing, as we are. And he said, Bring one to me. As soon as they brought to him a lame man who had never trodden on his feet, he spoke Shem Hamphorah over him, and at the same hour he arose and stood on his feet. Then they all bowed down before him and said: He is without a doubt Messiah. They also brought to him a leper, and he spoke his name over him and laid his hand on him.

on him, and he was healed as soon as possible. Therefore, many loose people from our nation fell to him.

008 But the wise men, when they saw that Israel began to believe in him, caught him, and brought him to Halani the queen, which at that time held the land of Israel, and said unto her, Madam, this man practiseth sorcery, and deceiveth the world. Jesus Ha Nozri answered, "Madam, the prophets prophesied about me in ancient times; one of them says, "A branch will grow out of the tribe of Jesse" [Isa. 11:1], and I am that branch, but David says of this branch, "Blessed is he who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked" [Ps. 1:1].

009 And she said, Is this written in your law, which this man saith? They answered: Yes, it is in our law, but it is not said of him, but so is it written of him Deut. 13:5: "The prophet shall be put to death, because he hath taught unrighteousness against God," but of Messiah it is thus written [Jer. 23:6]: "In his time Judah shall be helped." Then this wicked man answered and said unto the queen, I am he, for I can raise the dead.

010 And the queen sent with them her most faithful servants, and the wicked made a dead man alive by Shem Hamphorah: and from that time the queen was astonished, and said, Verily this is a great miracle; and she made a great mockery of the wise, that they departed from her in shame: and it grieved them and them of Israel exceedingly. And Jesus Nozri went into upper Galilee.

011 And the wise men went again unto the queen, and said unto her, Madam, this man dealeth with sorcery, and perverteth creatures. And she sent her soldiers to take him: but the men of Galilee would not suffer it, but fought against her. And he said: Ye shall not fight for me: for the power of my Father from heaven, and the signs which he hath given me, shall surely defend me. And the men of Galilee made birds of clay before him, and he spake over them Shem Hamphorah: and the birds flew straightway, and fell on their faces, and worshipped him.

012 And at the same hour he brought a great millstone, and cast it into the sea: and when it was done, the wicked man spake the Shem of Hamphorah, and made the stone lie still upon the sea; and he sat upon it, and said unto the soldiers: Go to your wife and tell her what you have seen. Then he stood up before her eyes and walked on the sea.

013 And the soldiers went and told Halani the queen all that they had seen. The queen was very shocked and called the wise men and said to them: You say that this man Jesus Nozri is a sorcerer, but you should know that the signs he performs prove that he is the true Son of God. But they said: Madam, let him come here, and we will expose his mischievousness. Then the elders of Israel went and let one named Judas Sharioth enter into the temple into the holy of holies, and he learned the letters of Shem Hamphorah in the same way that Jesus Nozri had learned them, and he tore open the flesh of the leg, and all that he had done.

014 So Jesus Nozri came with his company, and the queen called the wise men also to come. And he stood before the queen, and said, David prophesied of me, Dogs have compassed me about, and the assembly of the wicked have compassed me about [Ps. 22:17]. But this is said of me also, Jer. 1:8: "Fear them not, for I am with thee, that I may deliver thee, saith the LORD." But the wise men contradicted him.

015 And he said unto the queen, I will go up to heaven: for so David said of me, Arise, O God, above the heavens; [Ps. 57:12] and lifted up his hands like wings by the name of Shem Hamphorah, and flew between heaven and earth. When the wise men saw this, they told Judah Sharioth to say Shem Hamphorah, and to go up after him. He went up and wrestled with him, so that they both fell down together; and the wicked man broke an arm: this is what the Christians mourn over every year before their Easter.

016 And the same hour the children of Israel took him, and covered him with cloths, and smote him with rods of grenadiers. And they said unto Halani the queen, If he be the son of God, let him tell who smote him: but he could not tell. And the queen said unto the wise men: Behold, he is in your hands; do to him as you please.

017 Then they took him, and led him to the gallows: but what tree or beam they hanged him upon, it brake in twain at once: for he had adjured all the trees and woods by Shem Hamphorah, that they could not receive him. So they went and got a cabbage stalk, which grows not on the tree but on the herb, and they hung it on that. This is not a miracle. For in the sanctuary a stalk grows every year, and a hundred pounds of seed hang on it. *Haec ille.*

Where are they now, the loose Christians who have become Jews or want to become Jews? Here to kiss, the devil has thrown into the N., and emptied the belly again, that is a right sanctuary, which the Jews, and what wants to be a Jew, should kiss, eat, drink and worship, and again the devil also eat and drink, what such his disciples can spit, throw out above and below. Here the right guests and landlords have come together, have cooked and served it right. Oh how right it has happened to them both! The devil was created a beautiful angel, that he should sing the eternal *Te Deum laudamus* with his holy angelic mouth together with the other holy angels. He could not stand that, and became a devil, who now eats with his angelic trunk and eats with pleasure what the lower and upper mouths of the Jews spit and spatter, yes, that has become his speech 1) in which he feeds like a sow behind the fence around St. Margaret's Day; right, right, that's how he wanted it.

(19) So it was done to the Jews, O rightly. They were called and chosen to be the mouth of God, as Jeremiah says [Jer. 15:19] and Ps. 81:11: Open wide your mouth, and I will open it.

1) Galrede - jelly. - Margaret's Day is July 13.

But they kept their mouths shut, their eyes, their ears, their noses, their whole hearts, and all their strength. Then the devil came, and they shut his eyes, his throat, his ears, his heart and all his senses, and he poured and splashed them so full that it spilled out of them in all places and washed away the devil's filth; yes, it tasted them in the heart, and they smacked their lips like swine. That is how they want it. Shout now more, crucify him, crucify him! Cry out more, "His blood come upon us and our children" [Matth. 27, 25.]. I mean, it has come and found you.

20. Nevertheless, we want to look at the beautiful articles of the Jewish faith, given in this text, one after the other, so that the desire (to become a Jew) may be atoned for whoever has it. Now, if you want to become a true Jew, listen here and learn the Catechism of the Holy Mixed Faith, not in God's name.

First, you must believe that Helen was queen in the land of Israel or Canaan, where our Lord Jesus Christ lived, taught and performed miracles. If not only the evangelists and apostles resist this, but also the whole Roman empire, as it then stood; in addition to the testimony and misery of the Jews themselves, which began in the time of Vespasiani, 250 years before Helen was born; you must not let yourself be mistaken, but think: The rabbis (masters of this book) cannot err, heaven and earth must err much before God and all angels and creatures. You must believe this if you want to become a true Jew.

22 You must also believe everything that is written here about Queen Helen, how she acted and had acted with Jesus HaNozri 250 years before she was born; for this is part of the catechism who wants to become a Jew. If someone wanted to say against it: The Jews did not exist in the country at the time of Helen, at 200 years, but were scattered all over the world, and Jerusalem had neither temple nor regiment; against it you must sneer against the cursed Goyim, and thus say: Our rabbis write it, therefore it must be so, even if God Himself with all Scripture and creature says otherwise; he must well what the rabbis want.

23 Secondly, you must believe that two dogs of brass were able to bark at that time, even without Hamphorah's Shem; before and now no one can do it anymore; even with their eyes of brass they saw so sharply who had gone out and who had come in, and who had written the letters engraved on the stone: they must have had very sharp eyes, especially because they were made of brass, and could see through such thick walls, doors and curtains. Here, perhaps, you would object that all the living dogs of the world, which can bark naturally, would not believe this if they heard and understood it, much less the iron dogs themselves 2c. But let it not be disputed; what the rabbis say is right, ask no further, if you want to be a pious Jew.

(24) Thou must think that the wise men of Israel in those days were not wiser than to keep the Shem Hamphorah with two barking dogs of brass, so that the accursed goyim might have found other ways than with iron doors, bars, and the like. If it occurs to you that the sages of Israel had much less sense in this than the iron dogs themselves, you must reject such thoughts and think: Dear, what the rabbis say is right and cannot be a lie.

25) Thirdly, you must believe that in the sanctuary of Jerusalem grew annually such 2) large cabbages that they were stronger than any 3) beam on the gallows, and grew at 100 pounds of seed. Here you must believe that 200 years after the destruction there was a sanctuary in Jerusalem, not only that, but that it was a cabbage garden and a sanctuary at the same time. If all the histories, Moses and all the prophets, even God with all the angels, say otherwise, it is a lie, but the faith of the Jews must be right; know this well if you want to become a Jew.

Finally, you must surrender to what a rabbi says, no matter how strange it may be, so you must believe it is right, regardless of whether God Himself commanded and said otherwise.

1) "the" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) "so" is missing in the Erlanger.

3) Instead of "none" it says "so" in the Erlanger.

For so Moses commanded them Deut. 17:8 ff: "If they do Shem Hamphoras did miracles, Judas Sharioth also; as it not understand a matter, they shall go up to the priests said above. If a rabbi were to put thick and thin into the and judges who are in the place which God has chosen bowl in front of your nose and say, "Here is a delicious 2c. They shall pronounce judgment upon thee (saith he); almond paste," you would have to say that you had never according to the law which they teach thee thou shalt do, eaten better paste in your life. Defy thy throat, and say and according to the law which they tell thee thou shalt otherwise. For he who has the power to say that what is keep, that thou depart not from the same, to the right right is left and what is left is right, in spite of God and all hand or to the left." Here it is decided (I would almost his creatures, can also say that his back mouth is his front have said, shitty) that everything the rabbis say, a Jew mouth, and his belly is a broad mouth, and his belly is a should believe and not deviate from it. Therefore they say broad mouth.

now, they must believe their Rabbins, if the same said, 29 If thou hast learned these things, and canst believe the right hand would be the left, and the left would be the them, run quickly, and be hastily circumcised, before the right, as Purchetus writes. Also the three Jews, 1) who dogs of brass see them, and come from Jerusalem, and were with me, did the same to me: when I wanted to force bark out of thee such high understanding of the most holy them to the text, they said that they had to believe their Jewish faith, or before the deceiver HaNozri with his Shem rabbis, but did not want to confess any text to me; Hamphoras beguile thee into believing a Christian. therefore I have to believe Purcheto all the more in this. Because you are a righteous, fine, holy, clever Jew, you according to my own experience. will now be able to be called right, and make the belly a

27) If you want to become a devout, faithful Jew, broad head, so that you have enough to eat with all Jews surrender, as I have said, that you believe what the all your life long, if you already invite all devils as guests. rabbis say, whether it is against God, reason, angels or Thank also such high heavenly rabbis, by whom you are all creatures. For here you hear that a Jew should believe so highly learned and deeply sanctified, that God Himself that the right hand is not the right hand, when a rabbi and all the angels of your holiness must be astonished, the says so. God has indeed said, yes, he has created, cursed Goyim are not worth judging 4) nor hearing ordered and named it by his eternal word, that the right anything about it.

hand should be and be called the right hand, as all angels (30) Well, perhaps one of the merciful saints among and creatures confess. But this may well be the truth, us Christians would think that I have been too rude and until a rabbi comes and says, no, it is not so, but what I unkind 5) to the poor miserable Jews by mocking and call the right hand, that is the right hand. What should scoffing at them. Ah, Lord God, I am much too low to mock God's word and work, together with all angels and such devils; I would gladly do it, but they are too far creatures, be witness against a rabbi who is so far higher superior to me in mocking, they also have a God, who is a master in mocking, and is called the wretched devil and

28. so you must believe here that the queen Helena, evil spirit. What I could mock him to his annoyance, that I with her wise men, and Jesus did this thing 200 years should do justly, he would have well deserved it. I want the before she was born; item, that cabbages grow yearly in the sanctuary, thicker than a beam, bearing a hundred pounds of seed; item, that dogs of brass bark; item, that Jesus by

1) Compare § 125 of the previous paper.

2) "nun" is missing in the Erlanger.

3) Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: müssest.

4) Jenaer: richen.

5) unesse - what you can't eat, inedible, disgusting.

show a little (who otherwise would not notice) what an unspeakable mocker he is here.

The arrogant evil spirit mocks three things in this book. First, he mocks God, the Creator of heaven and earth, with His Son Jesus Christ, as you can see for yourself, if you believe as a Christian that Christ is the Son of God. Secondly, he mocks us, the whole of Christendom, for believing in such a Son of God. Thirdly, he also mocks his own Jews, giving them such disgraceful, foolish, foolish things, of dogs of brass and sticks of coal, that all dogs would bark themselves to death, if they understood, at such raging, raving, senseless, raging, mad fools. Is this not a master of mockery, who with a single mockery can perform such great three mockeries? The fourth mockery is that he has mocked himself with this, as we, praise God, will see with joy on that day.

(32) Thus the Jews also mock themselves the most, that they obey the devil, their God, in such mockery and become such raging fools. For they do it not in error, but because they know it well, and also natural reason, given by God, warns them, instructs them and convinces them that such cannot be true; nor do they tickle themselves with it, it does them good, and they do it with pleasure, so that they may hear, learn and preach such tangible shameful lies and blasphemy against us Christians and Jesus HaNozri of the devil. O right, right, master and disciple have come together in the right school.

33 Further. Over such mockery they first of all prove their supernatural mastery, because they say that Jesus HaNozri (that should be called Jesus of Nazareth) has done his miraculous signs through Shem Hamphoras, which should be called "the interpreted name". Here they confess (as they must) that the miraculous signs of Jesus HaNozri were real true signs, and herewith they testify and condemn themselves, like their ancestors in the Gospel, that he raised the dead. He made the lame walk and cleansed the lepers 2c. [Matth. 11, 5.], which are such works, which only the one can do,

The first thing that must be said is that they are the result of the eternal, divine power and are possible; men, even angels, are not able to do them, as little as creatures can create from nothing. All reason must say this.

Now behold the tender little fruits, the circumcised saints; such divine works and miracles they ascribe to 1) the Shem Hamphoras, that is, to the single, dead, wretched letters, which are written in ink in the book, or hover on the tongue, or are carried in the heart, even of the wicked. For the Shem Hamphorah be what he will; so they are, and can be, nothing else, but corrupt, dead, impotent letters, even if it were God's holy Scripture itself (which is all the worse), of which the Jews prattle much, and know not what they prattle. What should letters be able to do, as letters, from their own strength, where nothing more would come to it? What do they help the devil, Turks, Jews and all the wicked, who misuse such letters, even God's name, without ceasing against the other commandment? Satan and all the wicked names and works are also written in holy letters.

(35) But the frenzied Jews give the Shem Hamphorah divine power as a mere, empty letter, without any promise or commandment from God. For they say here that even the wicked and deceivers can do many miracles and divine works through these letters. Where then are they, the circumcised saints, who boast against us Christians that they alone are those who honor the one true God, since the accursed HaNozriim worship three gods? Here they give the divine power and honor to the mere, empty, dead letters in the Shem of Hamphorah so completely that even the godless and deceivers, against God's will and prohibition (in the Ten Commandments), can do divine majesty's own works. O²⁾ these are holy children of God, who make over the one God as many gods as there are letters in the Shem of Hamphorah, which shall be 216, as follows; that is, they worship 216 thousand devils, and not the right God,

1) "to" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) Erlanger "Ob", although the old editions offer "Oh". This is not a misprint in the Erlanger edition, because "O" is given as Walch's variant.

whom they so shamefully blaspheme with the Shem Hamphoras and steal his divine honor, appropriating the same¹⁾ to the wretched letters.

(36) How right it was for the furious Jews! They did not want to accept Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah and Son of God, so that they would remain with the one, true God, as we Christians have remained. For it is impossible that he should or could accept more than one, the right one God, who accepts Jesus Christ for the Messiah with right faith; Again, it is impossible that he should remain with the one right God, who does not accept Jesus Christ for Messiah with right faith, but he must (as the devil wills) accept strange and other more gods, and should they be mere, dead, void letters, or Shem Hamphoras, that is, great sacks full of heaped devils. Yes, such gods the Jews wanted to have for the right God in Jesus Nazarene.

(37) They might say, "If you Christians do this yourselves, speaking words over water, it must be baptism, which washes away all sin and makes newborn men. Item, bread and wine you make body and blood with words; item, you lay your hand on the sinner's head and absolve him of sins with words. Thus your Luther writes: Whoever lifts up a straw in God's word does a better work, neither all monks, nuns, bishops, Pope 2c. Now the words are nothing else but living, bare, poor letters: to which you nevertheless give the works that are proper to divine majesty, as forgiveness of sin, new birth and redemption from death.

38 We Christians have been well and sufficiently taught and told about this, that it is not necessary to act here; but recently we Christians say that water is nothing but water, words are nothing but empty letters, do and help nothing beyond their nature, much less do they work divine works in us; for water and letters do not make baptism. I have often seen a horse or an ox drink up a bucket full of water, and if you

If you speak the words of baptism over it, the horse would not be baptized and would not be born again from it; there is more to it. But baptism is such a thing that all devils must not swallow a drop of it, for it would become a cellar neck for them, which would burn them like hellish fire; but they flee, if they can, where they see baptism, must not come to it, nor stay with it. Why is that? They certainly do not respect water and letters.

39) But because God has commanded and commanded that we should use our hands and tongues, and pour the water over the person to be baptized with the words or letters that He has commanded, He has promised and assured us in the most certain way that He Himself will be present with His divine grace and power and do this work Himself. Here you grasp that we Christians do not give divine power to the water and the letter, nor do we say that [it] is our doing, but confess that it is and remains God's alone, who wants to show and prove in us such a way that has pleased him, namely through the water and the word or the letter. This does not mean that the letters are not alive or just water that the cow drinks, but that God is united in this, so that he will exercise his grace and power on us and through us as his instrument. And so both water and letters in baptism are full and rich in God's grace and power, because He promised and revealed that He Himself would do it. "Go, baptize" (he says), not in your name, but "in the name" 2c. that it is a work of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

40 Therefore we also reject the pope and his whole church, who has filled all the world with the same jugglery, sorcery, idolatry, because he also has his special Shem Hamphoras; there he goes, bewitches the water with loose, mere, empty letters, pretends that it is holy water, which washes away sin, chases away the devil, and others have much virtue; wants to imitate God, like a monkey. Item, likewise enchants the dear wax with empty, single letters, ver-

1) In the editions: the same.

2) Erlanger: "with water".

3) Erlanger: and.

buys it for emperors and kings for holy Agnus Dei, 1) which shall have much, much virtue, thus feeds himself with it, yes, became rich in the world, quite like a blasphemous juggler, magician and idolater. So he also bewitched caps and plates and all the world with mere words or letters, so that they become monks, nuns, priests, say mass and sell, call and celebrate saints, solve indulgences, tread dead men's legs, serve the devil, and by their own works earn heaven, namely heaven, since the devil is abbot and pope inside.

41) That he needs good words of Scripture and God's name for this is all the more annoying; God did not command him, but rather strictly forbade it. It 2) says: "You shall not take God's name in vain"; therefore, his power is not involved, but are empty, mere, impotent letters. But if something happens through it, it is not God's work, but the devil's, to strengthen his lies and sorcery (by God's decree) and to seduce the unbelievers, but to tempt and warn the believers with it; as we see that the milk thieves 3) and other sorceresses often do great harm. The Turks, too, have among themselves such curses, and carry with them in war letters in Arabic, very beautifully written (of which I have seen several), that they want to be safe from weapons and danger by such empty, mere letters, or, as they call them, good holy words. Thus the devil fills the whole world with sorcery, idolatry and incense, as if he had nothing more to do than to create strange appearances of Hamphoras in every place.

Here, I think, it would be time, and the reader should be moved by the desire to know what the Jews Shem Hamphorah is. I know and am certain, as I have said, that it is nothing else, nor may it be, but vain, mere, poor letters. But to expose their foolishness and the devil's wickedness, I will show it here as much as I can and know: may he who has it no other way,

1) Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, vol. XIX, 1018 ff.

2) Erlanger: "he".

3) Compare Luther's Table Talks, Cap. 25, § 5. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 783.

read Antonium Margaritam. It stands 2 Mos. at the 14, 19. 20. 21. a text, which reads thus:

43] "And the angel of God, which went before the host of Israel, rose up, and stood behind them; and the pillar of cloud also departed out of their sight, and stood behind them, and came between the host of Egypt and the host of Israel. And there was a dark cloud, and it lighted up the whole night, so that they could not come together all the night, neither this night nor that night. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, and the LORD caused it to pass away with a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry, and the waters were parted from one another."

44 This text has 216 letters in Hebrew, which divide it into three groups 4) or verses, so each verse has seventy-two letters. One could make six good verses out of it, but the rabbis do not want it that way. Now notice the high art of Shem Hamphora. If you write the three rows under each other, so that just one letter is under the other, then do so: Take the foremost letter in the first row, and the rearmost in the other row, and the foremost in the third row, put them together, and you have a word of three letters; in this way do with all the letters in the three rows or rows, and you will find seventy-two words, since each one has three letters.

They can do it finely in the Hebrew alphabet, since all letters are digits or number letters; for they count with letters, like the Greeks. But we have no more than seven number letters, C. D. I. L. M. V. X. But I will try it as a rough example to show us Germans, and put three rows of twelve letters, that the text is this:

L	V	C	I	M		I	L	X	D	I	C	V
L	V	X	L		I	C	V	M	D	V	M	I
I	V	D	I	C	V		D	I	C	L	I	I

46 Here I take the foremost letter L in the first tier, and the rearmost I in the other tier, and the foremost I in the second tier.

4) Squads - rows.

third row, it becomes the word LII. If you do the same with the other letters after that, it becomes the word VMV; if you do the same with the third letters, it becomes the word CVD. If you do the same with the fourth letters, you have the word IDI and so on, as the Jews do with the three verses of Moses, and make seventy-two words out of them, each with three letters. These three literal words, which are made from such art, mean nothing, should also mean nothing, just as you see an example here that the four words LII, VMV, CVD, IDI mean nothing to us Germans. However, the text of Moses stands for itself in its natural interpretation, as it is read.

I would have liked to make my example clearer, but the number letters cannot make it so pure, but help him with a little reflection, because so much should be said:

<p>Luci milks the Ku, Luxli¹) kum du zu mir, Jude kau du die Klien.</p>

48. but because k. a. e. n. 2c. are not number letters, I had to leave them out, and so speak wicked Wendish or Danish German.

49. Now you ask: What then are the seventy-two three-letter words, made from the text of Moses? Then listen to the other piece of great art. They are to be ziphra or number letters, no longer reading letters; not grammatically, as one reads them in the school, but arithmetically, as one reads them in the arithmetic school. So, in my example, you must not read 141, as in school, but as in the retirement or arithmetic school, where one does not read LII, but fifty-two. The other word is not VMV, but thousand and ten. The third word is not CVD, but six hundred and five. The fourth word does not read IDI, but five hundred and two, and 2) so

1) The old edition of Walch and the Erlanger: Luxie. 2) "and" is missing in the Erlanger.

henceforth. So all letters in the text of Mosi must become arithmetic, because grammatically they do not serve to the Shem Hamphorah.

50 Further and thirdly you must learn that such three-letter seventy-two words, made from the text of Moses, are names of seventy-two angels (how almost the word devil would have escaped me), as if I spoke in my example the four words LII, VMV, CVD, IDI, that four angels are thus named, that one is called arithmetically fifty-two, the other thousand and ten, the third six hundred and five, the fourth five hundred and two. So there the seventy-two angels are called also with vain number names, the one seventeen, the other twenty-two; item seventy-nine and so on.

What are the seventy-two names of angels, understood arithmetically? Clear your throat, here it will be, here we come to the right main part. You have now heard 3) that the whole text of Moses 2 Mos. 14, 19. 20. 21. has been divided arithmetically or numerically into three times seventy-two angel names. Now you must learn that these same arithmetical letters again become grammatical or reading letters, but nevertheless remain arithmetical; namely: the first angel VII is called arithmetically fifty-two. Now you must go and look for another word or two that also understands fifty-two, but so that it calls God, or says something about God's powers or works. Rather than following my example, "It is God's love." Here you hear an understandable speech, that the love of God does and is able to do everything, and the letters are all grammatical or reading letters; nevertheless, inside you find the angel's VII name arithmetically, that is one L and two I⁴⁾, which are fifty-two. Such examples you may look for yourself more than: "God helps fine", "God gives salvation" 2c. There you hear an understandable speech according to the grammatica or reading letters, and yet at the same time you have inside the arithmetic or number letters LII, which give the first angel's name. So you must

3) Wittenberger: now right.

4) In the issues: II.

with the other names of the seventy-two angels, that is, with the whole text of Genesis 2:14, which is divided into these seventy-two angels' names, as you heard above.

52 Now here you see how God's name, or what is spoken of His doing, is mixed in with the seventy-two angels' names. And so there is an interpreted or spread out name through the whole text of Moses, that is, through all the seventy-two angels' names, that is, Shem Hamphorah, the interpreted 1) name. Such alphabetship is fine in Hebrew, since they can make all letters arithmetic, and give LII, that is fifty-two, with other and other words, which we are not able to do in our ABC, which we have little, that is, only seven arithmetic letters, C. D. I. L. M. V. X. Therefore, although I can write LII with these letters xxxxi, or xl and xij, I cannot make a grammatical word or speech out of it, as they can do in Hebrew. For x is, especially for us Germans, strange in usage, and could well be dispensed with in the German language. Therefore, in this speech: "God's love is complete," we must also borrow more grammatical letters, so that the angel's LII name, the fifty-two, are written arithmetically and yet also grammatically.

53) Whether you want to argue here, one could also make another from the number books, both in Hebrew and Latin or German, namely: "Satan helps fine", "Satan gives salvation. There is also LII, the first angel's name, that is, fifty-two; or thus: "Hans helps fine" 2c. Hie would become Shem Hamphoras also of the devil and man interpreted name, and all that I wanted. But dear Goy, you have heard above, you must believe and do what the rabbis say and want; if not, then the brazen dogs of Jerusalem would come, and bark you to death 2) and, which is even more dangerous, the cabbage stalk of one in the sanctuary with

the 100 pounds of seed will fall on you and beat you to death.

54 Finally, to make the Shema of Hamphorah complete, they do the Benedicite or prayer for it, putting a verse from the Psalter to each of the names of the seventy-two angels, so that there are seventy-two verses. With this high devotion (³) pay attention to it), that in each verse the great name of God Jehovah, called Tetragrammaton, is written; but that you do not call the letters, but speak Adonai for it, because it is unpronounceable. Now you have the Shem Hamphoras completely and perfectly, now you are not only a circumcised, right Jew, now you can do all kinds of miraculous signs, as the deceiver, Jesus Nozri, did through it. Now quickly run to Jerusalem, and 4) commanded by the Shem Hamphorah the dogs of brass to beget a hundred thousand young dogs of brass, each barking ten times brighter than the two old ones, so that they may bark the cursed goyim all over the world deaf, blind, foolish, and straight to death, and thus concede the world to the holy children of Israel, even before their Messiah Kochab comes.

How is it that they have not used such art and power of Shem Hamphorah for 1500 years in the misery, especially since they were destroyed by the Romans through Vespasianum (because it was time to do miracles), and afterwards, since they were slain and scattered with their Messiah Kochab under Adriano? The answer of the rabbis is that they are not pious enough now, that they are in the misery and disgrace of God, that they have forgotten the power of the seventy-two angels in such a long time. But how is that possible? They are eternally the noble blood and circumcised saints, God's own people before all the world, the dearest children of Israel, who worship no more than One God. Such cannot be in disgrace (the Scripture would have to be wrong) like the cursed Goyim who worship more than One God and consider Jesus HaNozri as Messiah, they must be in disgrace that no Shem Hamphorah can help them.

3) Erlanger: "I did."

4) "and" is missing in the Erlanger.

1) In the editions in the text: "laid out". The Jena edition has as a conjecture in the margin: "laid out".

2) In the old edition of Walch and in the Erlanger: zu tod.

(56) How could the wise men have been so foolish as to forget the power of the angels in the Shem of Hamphorah, who were so wise as to keep the treasure with two iron dogs, and so powerful as to let Judas Sharioth enter? Rather, they went in themselves when they desired, and became like Judas Sharioth in everything they do, as they still are. Therefore, the great treasure of such art must certainly still be with them, inherited from Judas Sharioth and their ancestors, and cannot be so lost. Otherwise, how could they so surely still write and speak of it?

(57) Thou cursed goyim, for thou art a rough fellow, thou wilt not and canst not learn. Have you not heard above that when a rabbi says the right hand is left, it is left; when he says the left hand is right, it is right? Thus, if a rabbi here says that the art of Shem Hamphora is lost, it is lost; but if he says they still have it, they still have it; if he says they are in disgrace, they are in disgrace; if he says they are the dear chosen people of God alone, they certainly are.

58. Here you will perhaps ask me: Where did the Jews get this high wisdom, that one should divide Mosi's text, the holy innocent letters, into three verses and make arithmetic or counting letters out of them, also call seventy-two angels, and summa, put the whole Shem Hamphorah in this way? Leave me alone, ask the rabbis about it, they will tell you. - Yes, I want to hear your opinion before I become a Jew, because then I know that I must believe the rabbis; but you promised me the Catechismum of the Jews, that also holds.

(59) Well, I don't particularly know where they got it, but close to it I will well advise. Here in Wittenberg, near our parish church, there is a sow carved in stone, and there are young piglets and Jews lying underneath, sucking; behind the sow stands a rabbi, who lifts the sow's right leg, and with his left hand he pulls the pirzel over himself, bends down, and with great diligence peers under the sow's

Pirzel in the Talmud, as if he wanted to read and see something sharp and special; there they certainly have their Shem Hamphoras. For there have been many Jews in these lands in the past, as the names of villages, towns, citizens and peasants, which are Hebrew, prove to this day, that a learned, honest man, who was hostile to the dishonest lies of the Jews, has had such an image stated and torn down. For so the Germans speak of one who pretends to great wisdom without reason: Where did he read it? The sow in (roughly out) the butt.

60 To this one would easily draw and turn the word Schem Hamphoras, namely Peres schama, or, as they do, boldly master and make Scham HaPeres, 1) so it reads close together. Just as if a German in hearing or reading understood n  ren for nourish; item, he has finely improved my goodness, yes, watered it. So the wicked spirit of his captive Jews mocks, makes them say Shem Hamphoras, and believe and hope great things within; but he means Scham Haperes, that is, "hie Dreck", not which lies in the street, but comes out of the belly. Shame means "here or there", peres, which is in the intestines of the sow and all animals, as Moses needs it in the third book [Cap. 8, 17.]²⁾ when he commands to burn the sin offering with skin and hair, and with his peres, dung 2c.

(61) For the devil has possessed and imprisoned the Jews, so that they must be of his will (as St. Paul says), to deceive, lie, blaspheme, even to curse God and all that is God's. For this he gives them as a reward his mockery, shame of Haperes, and helps them to believe that this and all their lying and fooling is delicious thing. About such a terrible prison they do not complain and cry, they also do not desire with the slightest sigh to come out of it, but are happy to be inside, consider it a special great freedom, wanted to

1) In the old editions, probably erroneous "Shamha Peres".

2) Here the Erlanger edition has reprinted the wrong Bible quote from Walch'. "3 Mos. 8, 27." In addition, the Erlangen edition has ten other false citations from Walch in this scripture.

They also like to have us Christians inside. But they cry out about the Roman prison, since they are not imprisoned by us, but we are imprisoned by them in our country, money and goods; because they are too comfortable, they deal with us in the same way as the devil deals with them, mocking us to our detriment, as the devil mocks them, to their eternal damnation.

(62) But in order that it may be clear how the foolish Jews deal with incense, they leave the previous text, where God gives must and promises that he shall divide the sea with the rod and lead the children of Israel through it (2c). Yes, this is the right main text that does it, since God promises and gives that it shall be done. But the nonsensical Jews ask nothing about this, take history before them, want to imitate (like monkeys) with mere letters what God has done at that time by His word and commandment, make no distinction between God's power and word, and between their nonsensical, nonsensical hypocrisy.

63 Also, they say that whoever knows the power and virtue of the seventy-two angels can force them to prove their power through the shame of Haperes. First of all, they are right in saying that whoever knows the power of these seventy-two angels can certainly do all miracles through them; just as it is certainly true that whoever has an ass that throws out gold can have florins, but where is such an ass? In the land of the sleeping monkey. So these seventy-two angels of the Jews are nowhere except in the land of the sleeping monkeys, they were never created, and they will never be created again; therefore they say rightly that whoever knows the power of these angels, he also does miracles as much as he wants and when he wants. We will also see that by such angels' power they will wrest their Messiah from God without his thanks and win Jerusalem; how can they fail? . On the other hand, we see how the frenzied, senseless fools would like to charm the angels and force them under themselves with loose, mere letters, and put themselves above God, so that the angels would have to do what they want. These are they, the saints of all saints, who alone worship One God. For worshipping One God means, with them, to be with the

Mouths call One God, and with knees or bows show themselves to be against One God, but with the heart also worship mere letters, that is, many thousand lies and devils; for in what a heart relies and trusts, that is its God; Just as we Christians, the great cursed goyim, say that even if the mouth is silent and the knees do not bend, nevertheless, because the heart bends without ceasing, that is, places its confidence, comfort and trust in the one God, it is called without ceasing rightly and finely worshipping the one God.

But this is pure foolishness in these circumcised saints, who can sometimes call One God with their mouths (that is enough), but make angels and gods out of letters, as much as they want, in which they not only trust (which we mad goyim call worshipping), but also charm, for what they want. Should not a goy gladly become a Jew, since such great power is found, that one can make gods and angels of our liking, so we cursed goyim can nothing more than believe that the one God has made us all, and the angels rule us, not we them. Summa, a Jew is as full of idolatry and sorcery as nine cows have hair, that is, innumerable and infinite, as the devil, their god, is full of lies.

66. If they had to use such a way of learning with letters, as children are taught in school to know the letters, that they have to say the Abc in front of them and behind them, move the letters this way and that, so that they learn to make syllables and practice reading, or make pictures and figures with the letters, as some boys are skilled at, and did in the past; It would be to suffer as a merry children's game, as one could do better with Hebrew letters than with other letters; but to give power to the mere, empty, poor letters, and such power that can do wonders, even through the wicked and enemies of God, that is not only "Fie on you" and shame on Haperes, but the wretched, blasphemous devil himself with all his malice out of hell. For with 1) the wise pray

The Jews believe so many devils, yes, so many thousand devils, as much as they lie to angels in their shame of Haperes (as said above). For they build on this and believe it to be the truth, which is a lie. This is what the prophets call idolatry, *confidere in mendacio*, trusting in lies, which honor belongs to God alone.

Now behold, how fine saints the Jews are; they condemn us cursed goyim for worshipping more than One God, but they, the given fruit of noble blood and circumcised saints, worship only the One God. That is true, if the seventy-two lying angels, that is, seventy-two thousand devils are called one God, then they certainly worship one God. See also what a great new miraculous saint you have become, when you have denied Christ and become a Jew. For you can by shame make Haperes that all devils are one God, which 1) God Himself is not able to do. Therefore, think and be grateful to the rabbis for their almighty shit, ah, shame Haperes I was going to say. Yes, that's how it goes, if you don't want to hear God's word, but blaspheme without stopping, you have to hear all the devils and worship them, as our Lord Christ speaks, Joh. 5, 43: "I have come in my Father's name, and you have not accepted me; another will come in his name, and you will accept him."

(68) Even if they let such falsehood and folly be bad lies, as the jesters or 2) jugglers lie, and confess that it would not be true miraculous signs, what should happen through the shame of Haperes: so one could still hope that they would get tired of the folly with time and once desist from it themselves. Now, however, they hang on to the wicked 3) click that they trust in it as in the truth of God Himself, make a worship and idolatry out of it, do not want to consider it as false miraculous signs, what happens through Shem Hamphoras; it should be serious, and real divine power should work in it, as it

1) Erlanger: because it.

2) Erlanger: "and".

3) Wittenberger and Erlanger: single bare.

In the text above they say that Jesus, the wicked, raised a dead man in front of the servants of Queen Helen; as their ancestors also confessed that Jesus cast out devils rightly, and was no jugglery, but in Beelzebub's name [Luc. 11, 15]. For their Shem Hamphoras shall be able to do everything and anything, righteously.

Lastly, it is a blasphemy beyond measure that they attribute such divine power in the Shem of Hamphorah to perform miraculous signs, even to the wicked, as Judas Sharioth and the deceiver (as they blaspheme) Jesus HaNozri, teaching it knowingly. This piece also moves Lyra, Burgensis and many others, without them not being angry enough about it. I do not know how to speak or write about this. If I say that the Jews are mad, blind, insane (as Moses says of them), full of devils, then it is all too little said by those who want to worship the one God, and are allowed to spit out such blasphemy, and also teach such as a right. Understand, whoever can, what this is said, that the divine, eternal Majesty, our all dear 4) Creator, praised and to be praised forever, is to be scolded by these damned young devils, that he by his miraculous works, which he alone does and can do, Psalm 72:18. He is a witness, a confirmer, a super-helper of all the lies, seduction, error, idolatry, blasphemy, and all the abominations that they lay on our Lord Jesus Christ, or cannot and will not defend himself against the shame of a false prophet, Haperes.

I cannot understand this in any other way than that they make God Himself the devil, yes, the servant of all devils, who helps to do, strengthen, accomplish all evil that the devil wants, who has the desire and love to deceive poor souls, to disgrace Himself with His own miraculous works, and to rage against Himself, summa, worse than all Jews, yes, than all devils. Oh my God, my dear Creator and Father, you will graciously grant me that I must speak so shamefully of your divine eternal majesty against your cursed enemies, devils and Jews. You know that I do it out of

4) Walch and the Erlanger: allerlieber.

Fervor of my faith and in honor of your divine majesty, for it goes through my body and life.

71 But your judgment is right, *justus es, Domino*.

Yes, so shall the Jews and no one else be punished, who have so long without ceasing despised, mocked, blasphemed and condemned your word and miraculous work, so that they do not have to fall, like other human children, pagans and whoever they are, into sin and death, not up into hell, nor in the middle of hell, but into the abyss of hell, where one cannot fall any lower. For this is also their sin, which cannot be worse, since they not only despise you, the true eternal God, with disobedience and blasphemy of your word, but also want to make you a devil and a servant among all devils, that you with your glorious divine power should be a witness and serve the devil in his lies, blasphemies, murder, and what more devilish works are; right, right are your judgments, heavenly Father, they wanted to blaspheme, they got enough of it.

72. Moses writes, Deut. 18, 20. ff., that God will not let miracles or signs happen on the word of a false prophet, and says: "You should know that if the word of the false prophet does not come, then be sure that the Lord has not spoken such a word. But these devils say that Jesus HaNozri is a deceiver and a false prophet; nevertheless, true miraculous signs are, as raising the dead, walking the lame. Making lepers clean (which no one but God is able to do) have been done by such a deceiver. It would not be surprising that Christians who suffer such blasphemers, cursed by God, would have long since been sunk by God's wrath with hellish fire into the abyss of hell with the Jews, without it having helped us that we did not have to and are therefore innocent of their atrocious deeds. But now watch, dear princes and lords, if Jews protect themselves and suffer what you do, I will be excused. Here is not only Christ our Lord, and the Father in Christ, but God the Father Himself in Himself, that is, reviled in His divine majesty worse than Christ, and made a devil and servant of all devils.

makes. Cry out now more, Jew, cry out now: Crucify him, his blood be upon us and upon our children; it is done that you would have it.

Enough has been said about this; a Christian's heart and ears must want to hear and remember nothing of it, for it is too horrible, terrible and inordinate.

74. against this abomination it is a little less, what they from the name TETRA

GRAMMATON fool and slobber, of which I must also say a little, to reveal their foolishness to us Germans. In the Holy Scriptures God has many names, but in particular they count ten, among which is one they call the great and TETRAGRAMMATON the They keep the most holy name, so that the others are sometimes also given to the angels and other creatures, but this one is always given to God alone. Here they are so holy and spiritual that they do not call the same name with their mouths, but instead of it another, or the four letters of the same name, Jod, He, Vof, He, because it is supposed to be unpronounceable. Therefore St. Jerome says: The Greeks, because they did not know these letters, have read them PJPJ, the He for a P considered.

First of all, I leave out the ten names, as this is not new, but is also indicated by St. Jerome in *epistola ad Marcellam*, where he counts them thus: El, Elohim, Elohe, Zebaoth, Eljon, Ehje, Adonai, Iah, Jehovah, Schadai. Others do it differently; I don't think anything of it. There are probably more names of God in Scripture than these, as, Ab, Bore, Or, Chai 2c., Father, Creator, Light, Life, Salvation, and the like. And what good thing can be called or be, that must not be assigned to God beforehand, but he who has it in himself, as Christ says: "God alone is good, and we receive from him all that we are and have. But now we will deal with the One Name, called Jehovah, with which the devil and the Jews practice much sorcery and all kinds of abuse and idolatry.

This name Jehovah, according to the Grammatica, comes from the word Haja, or Hava, 1) which means Latin: *fuit, in praeterito*,

1) In the old editions: "Haio" and "Hauo".

6886; German: *wesen* 1) or *sein*; and this can be *nota nominis verbalis*, like Josaphat, Jesaias, Jeremias and many other names, and is so much, as in Latin *ens*, in Greek *on*. We Germans must speak: "he is"; and thus becomes *trigrammaton* in Latin, *dygrammaton* in Greek, *hexagrammaton* in German, or, if we want to take "is" badly, it is also *trigrammaton*. That they now pretend that the name Jehovah should be unpronounceable, they do not know what they slur; if they mean the letters, it cannot be true, because he is called Jehovah. And if he can be written with feathers and ink, why should he not also be called with the mouth, which is much better than feathers and ink? Or why do they not 2) also call him unwritable, illegible, unthinking? Summa, it is a lazy thing. But if they do it in honor, they should do it in all other names as well, and let them also be unpronounceable. For it is said, "Thou shalt not take God's name in vain," therefore it is also evil. The Scriptures do not say that some of God's names should be unspeakable, otherwise all those who take God's name in vain would be innocent, because they would say that they could not have called His name, let alone take it in vain.

She says that God's essence, power, wisdom, goodness, and what else can be said of God is inexpressible, immeasurable, infinite, incomprehensible, 2c. that not the letters or syllables, but that which is meant by them, is inexpressible. Yes, so one would have to speak of the ineffable name of God. For he has his being from no one, has neither beginning nor end, but is from eternity, in and of himself, so that his being cannot be called "has been" or "will be," for he has never begun, cannot begin to be, has never ceased, cannot cease to be; but it is called with him vain or "being," that is, Jehovah [Ex. 3:14]. Since the creature was created, there is already his essence, and what is yet to come, there he is ready with his essence.

1) "Being" is another form for "to be", which is still in use in Low German.

2) Erlanger: make.

In this way Christ speaks of His divinity, Joh. 8, 58.: "Before Abraham was, I am"; does not say: I was then, as if he would not be afterwards; but: "I am", that is, my being is eternal, has not been, will not be, but is a vain reality.

Therefore, as his Is, Am, or essence is incomprehensible, so it is also inexpressible, for no creature can comprehend that which is eternal. 3. Therefore the angels are eternally blessed, for they cannot see and rejoice in the eternal essence of God, nor comprehend it; and where it could be comprehended, it could not be eternal, would itself also have to have an end or beginning, and no one could give or receive a being, because it would itself be uncertain of its essence. Further, his wisdom, power, goodness 2c. is also eternal and incomprehensible, because it must be nothing else than his divine being itself. Thirdly, which is probably higher, that in the divine essence God is Father, Son, Holy Spirit, three persons in one, eternal, incomprehensible essence. Yes, to say all this about God might be called an incomprehensible, inexpressible name. Who wants to name such a strange being, to think it out, to pronounce it, to write it out? In this way, perhaps, the ancients would have called the name Jehovah unpronounceable, because it means God's essence, according to the Grammatica, which (as heard) is one, from eternity, and is called three persons.

79. With this one should be concerned, and learn to recognize such Jehovah, that is, divine essence, and seek it in the Scriptures, as he has revealed himself, through his word, in this life, and will reveal himself there, without word, in that life. But this is too high for the Jews, yes, nothing at all, but this is what the tender saints do: with their mouths they honor the letters of the name Jehovah, which should and must be unspeakable, but the divine essence, which is signified by the letters, they comprehend and measure it with cubits, pounds and bushels, that it must be as large, long, wide, deep, heavy and full as they want it to be. Note that God had promised them the Messiah, whom He also sent, according to His divine, miraculous, incomprehensible, and unbelievable nature.

3) "can" is missing in the Erlanger.

They go to him and paint him a picture or a form, a It is also worthwhile that they not only do not mention the measure and a concept of his wisdom, how he should name of Jehovah, but also do not have to name, read, send the Messiah, namely, as the Kochab made a way, write, hear, or have a letter in all of Scripture, because not as Jesus of Nazareth; for their Messiah is not to be they need it to disgrace God, to dishonor Scripture, and crucified, but to put to death the Gentiles and make the to condemn themselves.

Jews rulers in the world.

82) And how can it be otherwise, dear brother? if

No other way shall the eternal divine essence and his God's word does not shine on us and show us the way, eternal incomprehensible wisdom find or meet, but in this Ps. 119, 105, and his light 2) does not shine on us in the imagined way let men compel, comprehend and embrace dark place, 2 Petr. 1, 19, then there can be nothing else him; if not, he shall not be their God. For it is they who can but darkness, error, lies that we invent for ourselves. give God purpose, measure, weight, manner and form, Look at our experience, when under the papacy we had not only in his works, but also in his eternal divine being, put his divine word out of our sight and took the doctrine so that he does not have to be three persons in one being. of men for it, what thick darkness, lies and abominations For they stand there with their compasses and angle we worshipped with masses, purgatory, holy service, irons, with cubits and lead, they will not suffer God to be monasticism and our own works 2c. Now the Jews have such an incomprehensible being, and will not let them be no word of God, therefore there must be darkness, much wiser, wiser and more understanding than God because circumcision and Mosi's law is not valid any Himself is. Why is it that the Jews do not name or longer than until Messiah, who should teach them pronounce the literal Name with their mouths, but with another, Deut. 18, 15, as he has done; they did not want their hearts they not only name, pronounce and judge His to accept that, so they have to do it, that they do not do divine essence, the true Jehovah, but also force and what God wants, but God should do what they want. At compel Him into their sheaf? So they must do, is their way the time when Mosiah's law was commanded to them, (as Isaiah prophesies in 29, 13.), with the mouth they they did not want to do it, they killed all the prophets over honor the letters, and with the heart they defile and it; now, when it is no longer commanded, they want to do blaspheme; nor shall God always be fooled, that they thus it, and they kill Messiah and all his Christians over it; devour the kernels, and spit the husks under his eyes. before with the deed, now with the full will, desire and

81. they are given to do nothing righteous, to live nor wish of their heart. The wrath of God has come upon speak, but to lead vainly perverse, blind, furious, them, as they deserved.

senseless beings, as Moses says. It must be a great thing that they do not call the name of Jehovah, because they

The other part.

do not see that they use it in shameful abuse for their From the beginning of the Gospel, as described by St. shame of Haperes, that they adorn, honor and strengthen Matthew and St. Lucas, the question has arisen: Why the their seventy-two invented angels, that is, seventy-two two evangelists tell so unequally (or, as many have lies and devils, with the same holy name of God, and do interpreted it, so contrary to each other) the persons or all kinds of sorcery, incense and idolatry with it. I would, members of the family of our Lord Jesus Christ, and especially that they both lead the line or line of persons in the family and end with Joseph, and not with Mary and Christ?

and they would be

1) Erlanger: and.

2) Erlanger: Leucht.

The tribe of David, because it does not come from Joseph, which the evangelists well lead finely, according to the line of the family of David, and suddenly leave the same Joseph, put Mariam instead.

Here they all have to do, especially the Jews, then Julianus the emperor with his pagans; item, many of the old teachers, also the new ones not a little; the latter have to master here, the latter to wonder, as if our Christian faith were wrong, uncertain or completely dark in this. Therefore we also want to speak something about it, but with leave, because we want to let everyone make everything better.

First of all, to answer the Jews, if someone wants to talk to them. After the Jew, who moved me to write about the Jews the next time, also started this piece: it could not be proven that Jesus was of the tribe of Judah, because the evangelist Matthew traced the tribe of Judah to Joseph and not to Mary; therefore he could not be Messiah, of the tribe of Judah and David. 1) The serpents are thorny and poisonous, and they look closely to see if they can make our books false. For they ask not that they might learn of us, and know the truth; but with such questions they flatter and provoke us to scorn and ridicule of our faith, as which we cannot prove.

(86) Therefore one should tread on the head of the poisonous, prickly serpents and answer them in the most blunt and harsh way, in defiance of the devil: "That Mary, the mother of Jesus, is of the tribe of Judah and of the house of David, says not only Matthew the Evangelist, but also Moses, the very first, and after him all the prophets unanimously. And if we Christians had nothing else from the Old Testament, but only Moses, we would have enough and plenty to prove that Mary must be from the tribe of Judah and the house of David, so that all the devils and all the world (not to mention the wretched, raging Jews) should not overthrow this.

87 Thus says Moses, Gen 49:10: "The scepter shall not be taken away from Judah.

until Shiloh comes. Here it is decided that Shiloh or Messiah shall come from the tribe of Judah, just as there is no doubt about the snakes, no matter how poisonous they are. Item, 5 Mos. am 18, 15., he thus speaks, "God will raise up a prophet for you from among your brethren, like me, whom you shall hear." Follows [v. 18. f.], "I will (saith God) raise up unto them a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him: and whatsoever man will not hear him, that will I myself avenge."

Here it is written that Mary is of the tribe of Judah and David, no more proof is needed; the Jews are obligated to obey this shiloh and prophet before others, as Moses commanded here and God Himself commanded. Now this Shiloh and prophet said that his mother Mary was of the tribe of Judah and David, so he commanded his evangelist Matthew to write it. Therefore the prickly Jews herewith have their answer: If they do not believe Mose that he speaks such things of Mary, then it is not necessary, nor are they worthy that they should believe Matthew or hear some Christians nor believe some truth, but Shem Hamphoras, yes, Sham Haperes 2) they should believe. Such faith belongs to such saints.

We Christians know (and no devil nor Jew can deny) that Messiah or Shiloh must come from the tribe of Judah and the house of David. If he now has no father, but only a mother, then the mother must certainly also be David's daughter. There can be no doubt about that, because her son, Messiah, must be from the house of David. Summa, whoever believes that Jesus, born of the virgin Mary, is the right Messiah, has already confessed, sealed and proved that his mother Mary must be of the house of David, as well and certainly as Joseph, her bridegroom, and much more certainly.

90 Yes, here we have a clash with the Jews: they do not want to have Jesus as their Messiah, so they flicker at us with their venomous, blasphemous barbed words about Joseph and his family.

1) "beweiset" is missing in the Wittenberg.

2) In the editions: Hamperes.

Mary; for they care not much whether Mary be of the house of David or not. And if they had seen for themselves that she was born of David, like Solomon and other of his children, yet they would not believe that Jesus, their son, was Messiah. They do not care about the son, they do not want it; they know well, the husks and false mouths, if Jesus is Messiah, that it is no longer necessary to ask whether Mary is of the house of David.

(91) It is about this same son that we Christians are concerned. For if he is not Messiah, we do not ask where his mother Mary comes from, no more than where Sarah (Isaac's mother) or other unknown women come from. But if he is Messiah, God says to the Jews through Moses, "Him you shall hear." And do we Christians believe the evangelists and apostles the high, some, great main piece, that JEsus is Christ or Messiah, why should we not also believe all the other lesser 1) pieces? For he who does not believe nor want to believe that Jesus is Messiah, does not need to know who or where his mother is; indeed, it would be good for him if he had never heard a word from the whole Scripture, even better if he had never been born. For God hath put all things upon the man, hath ordained all things, hath directed all things, hath given all things into his hand: he that hath, the same shall have all things; he that hath not, the same shall have nothing; so it is said.

And how would we do, if Saint Matthew and Saint Lucas had not described such a cord of birth? How many things are undescribed, as St. John speaks at the last. And to landmarks he himself writes much that Matthew, Marcus, Lucas have omitted. Which Christian would not like to know what the Lord did the thirty years before his baptism? St. Paul alone has described Jesus much more gloriously and abundantly, as he is Messiah, than all others; nor does he go through with his mother and gender so briefly, that he only indicates her once, yet without a name, Gal. 4, 4: "He was born of a woman," and Rom. 1, 3: "Who was born of the seed of David, according to the flesh." He knows, the dear

1) Wittenberger: low.

Apostles, if this main thing is that Jesus Messiah is believed, then everything that is the truth must be found, or must not be necessary to find: "For in Him (says He) are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" [Col. 2, 3.], so that the Holy Spirit then does not allow anything false to be taught or believed.

But the Jews, the circumcised saints, are proud, boastful, and stiff-necked against us cursed, wretched Gentiles, thinking that not we, but they alone have the holy Scriptures; therefore, what we teach about baptism, sacrament, keys, and other articles of the New Testament is ridiculous to them, because they do not find it in their book. They think that everything must be in their book alone, or could not be right. So also, because they do not find in their book these words: Mary is David's daughter, or of the house of David, they grumble and reproach themselves against it, as if they were sure that it must be nothing.

94 I will pay them in their own coin and say that they are not Jews either, for there is not a letter in the holy Scriptures about these Jews, and they are not able to prove from their book that they are Jews or Israel's seed; I dare to deny them that. Further I say with right earnestness and on my conscience: If there were nothing more than the Old Testament, I would conclude, and no man shall persuade me otherwise, that these present Jews must be about a basic soup of all loose bad boys, flowed together from all over the world, who have gathered and scattered to and fro in the countries, and scattered to and fro in the countries, like the Tattern or Gypsies and the like, to burden the people with usury, to explore and betray the countries, to poison water, to burn, to steal children, and to do other all kinds of assassinating harm; as brother Richardus writes in the Alcoran, 2) of the assassins who are sent by the Saracens all over the world to cunningly strangle the worldly lords and to murder what they can, whether they have thus

2) This paper is included in No. 56 of this volume.

They are called Ishmaelites, and they are able to take over no doubt also to the blow. But the same prince was much lands that are not their own and without lords. You may too clever for such a smokehouse. But nevertheless, the read about them in the 10th chapter of the Alkoran. boys tried it.

95 Such an opinion should be strengthened for me by (97) Yes, I say, I would consider these Jews to be the histories written about the Jews, which are learned such loose, bad boys, and not true Israelites, if there were more and more every day all over the world, about which nothing more than the Old Testament. For the Old they are often expelled, burned and slain, as is reported Testament tells us about Jews who were in the land of in that book. Thus one sees also how gladly they intrude Canaan and still should be, and if they were led away themselves with the lords and noblemen, give medicine because of their sin, they should have come back home before; item, art with signs and letters against all kinds of long ago, according to the promise of Moses 5 Mos. 4, 31. weapons and iron, so that they have filled Christendom. 3 Mos. 26, 44. But since this did not happen, there is no For even the village priests and sextons with such other way to think, than that they perished in time, and smokehouse circumvented, with which we found in the perished completely (like Moab, Ammon and other visitation many of the books of the name nations), or even changed into another nation, and Tetragrammaton, Ananisapta, and many strange prayers, remained nothing 5) but a lazy bunch of foreign boys or signs, names of angels and devils, which are certainly gypsies, who circumcise themselves and pretend to be Hebrew. So we also learned how they helped the Jews, because they do not keep any part of Moses or the noblewomen from the diseases to the churchyard, that prophets. But that they praise the Old Testament, we they undoubtedly laughed in their fists. have better neither them. That they circumcise

I heard about thirty years ago how a Jew had infiltrated Duke Albrecht of Saxony, who also taught him sign of Jewish kind or blood, but a real pit of murder, full of all kinds of wickedness and malice, to damage and such art against all kinds of weapons that he should not of all kinds of wickedness and malice, to damage and be able to be stabbed, hewn, shot 2c. Oh, these are fine weigh down country and people. Thus one also finds in arts, to lead the lords in such a way that they should perish the "Beggars' Book" that they speak Rothwelsch, since cunningly. But Duke Albrecht was wise, wanted to be sure there is much Hebrew among them, as a sign that they of the art beforehand, rode out into the field with the 1) are with or from the Jews. Jew and said: "Jew, I must try the art on you, go out and 98. but because the New Testament testifies that the stab the Jew, so that he lay there dead, and even his Jews shall be scattered among all the Gentiles, and Shem Hamphoras, Tetragrammaton, and others could not Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the help his smokehouse. That you (said the duke), you times of the Gentiles be fulfilled (that is, until the end of knave, how should you have led me away for my life! Yes, the world), as our Lord saith, Luc. 21:24, for Christ shall he might even have laughed softly in his fist. Now it was sit for ever, and no other Messiah shall come: therefore I better that the duke tried on the Jew, than that the Jew must believe that yet .Some, and very few, of the Jews should have intertwined with the duke. I also have a must remain in the world, but shall not have dominion of their own, but shall sit on an uncertain footing, as the 59th crystal with me, which was Duke Frederick of Saxony's, Psalm v. 11. 12. prophesies, in the spirit and person of which my present most gracious lord, Duke John Christ and his people: "God maketh me to see my air in Frederick 2) has given me, which is with golden Hebrew mine enemies. He- letters and signs,

1) Wittenberg and Erlangen: den.

2) Thus the Wittenberg edition correctly. In the other editions, "Friedrich" is missing.

3) Wittenberger: versuchens.

4) "in" is missing in the Wittenberger and in the Erlanger.

5). Erlanger: "remain".

choke them not, that my people forget not; but scatter them with thy might, O LORD our shield, and thrust them down." And must go to them, as Cain, thy fratricide, Gen. 4, 14.: "Thou shalt be Nogvonod [xxx xx] upon the earth, inactive and fugitive, that we call nowhere home, sitting on the cuckold and scales, having neither certain foot nor room.

99) Nevertheless, because they are so eager to pick up and collect the loose, renegade, defective Christians, in whom they certainly gather nothing good, and have now done so for many years, the Israelite blood will have become quite mixed, impure, watery and savage, who have very soon learned from them to attack and murder the Christians. Again, the Jews did not learn anything good from them, so masters and disciples practiced among themselves, sharpened and improved until they became such a murdering pit and the devil's basic soup; for a renegade Christian becomes a bitter enemy of the Christians.

Let this be said of the pride of the wretched Jews, who boast of their holy Scriptures as if no one else had them; yet they must enjoy our New Testament, where they are supposed to be Jews, and have nothing else to prove it. Neither is there anyone who has less holy scripture than the Jews; let us see.

If the Jews had ears or eyes to hear or see, they would easily be told and shown that there must be more than one book of the holy Scriptures, and not the Old Testament alone, since they have heard and understood Moses and the prophets, and yet do not understand. For they must confess that the Messiah is promised in the holy Scriptures. Now when he comes, he will not be dumb or lame, but will speak and do better than Moses, David, Solomon, or any of the prophets. From such speech and deeds a book will be written. For he shall cause it to be written, even as Moses wrote his preaching and doings, and Isaiah his, and so on. This book of Messiah must now be much better, holier and more glorious than Moses and all the Old Testament.

Testament, because Messiah must not only be holy, like Moses and the prophets, but must be the most holy and prophet above all prophets. Therefore, his book must also be the most holy, above all the holy books in the Bible.

We cursed goyim do not invent such things, but Moses has announced such things clearly to his people, namely that another book of the holy scripture should come, which they should accept. For so he speaks 5 Mos. am 18, 15. (as said): "A prophet from your brothers will God raise up for you, like me, you shall hear him." I hope that the Jews, as poisonous evil worms they are, will not be able to say that we have invented this saying. Now let us hear the words, we want to carry in nothing from own Kops, as they are used to carry into the scripture their raving, insane glosses.

Moses does not speak in that place of his person, as he was born of his father, but of his office, as he was called or raised up by God to be a prophet; that is, as God raised me up from among your brethren to be a prophet, so will he raise up another prophet from among your brethren. This other prophet cannot be Samuel, David, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, or any of those who were in the Old Testament; For they were all under Moses, teaching what Moses (as a prophet of God) commanded and promised or proclaimed, namely circumcision, the Ten Commandments, the laws of the priesthood, principality, worship, temple and what was to be taught in the whole state and regiment and to the people and Old Testament, none may teach or promise anything else without what Moses commanded and promised.

If this other prophet is to do with his prophecy as Moses did, he must establish other commandments, laws and rights, other priesthood, principality, worship, temple and government. But if he should teach nothing else than what Moses taught, then it would be Moses himself, or the

old prophets who have been under Moses, and would not be like Moses is. What is Moses doing, that he promises with useless words, "God will raise up another prophet like him, whom they shall hear"? So much more would he have said: When that prophet comes, you shall hear me (that is, my prophecy). But now he gives up his mastery, office, and prophetia, and sends them to that prophet, saying, "Him shalt thou hear." For that they should hear Moses and his prophets, he had done before, and all the prophets have done after, to the point of great weariness.

105) The same testifies when he introduces God Himself, who says Deut. 18:18: "I will raise up a prophet for them from among their brethren, like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall preach the things which I will call him" 2c. These words and sermon of the other prophet must be other words and sermon than Moses' word and sermon; for they are to be future words and not yet given, because Moses' word was put into Moses' mouth on Mount Sinai forty years before, and was also written by Moses at that time. Therefore Moses took good care against the naughty Jews, because he announced to them brightly enough that another book, more holy than his, would have to come through the other prophet, and thus also another priesthood, worship, people and law would have to be established.

Accordingly, all the prophets cry out in unison with Moses that Messiah should be a prophet and priest who should preach a different and new message, as Moses preached here. Isa. 2, 3. 4, 2. Many Gentiles will say, "Let us go up to the house of the Lord, that he may teach us his ways; for from Zion shall go forth a law, and from Jerusalem the word of the Lord." Do you hear here that it has not gone out, like Mosi's law and word, but it shall go out in the future, and be a new and different word. Isa. 61, 1: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; therefore hath he anointed me (to the Messiah, or

1) "in" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) Walch and the Erlanger: shouted.

Anointed One), that I should preach the gospel to the wretched, to heal the afflicted hearts" 2c. Ps. 110, 4: "You are a priest forever, after the manner of Melchizedek." Zach. 9, 10.: "He shall preach peace from sea to sea, even to the end of the world." Isa. 9, 6.: "He will be a prince of peace," that is, as Zechariah also says on 9, 10., "putting away horse and chariot," and, Isa. 11, 4., "ruling without sword."

107. If he is to rule without a sword, and yet last and keep peace, he will not have to be a king like David and all other kings (who cannot rule without a sword), nor teach about their worldly law, and thus his kingdom must be far different from another kingdom, neither a worldly kingdom, which is nothing without a sword and its law, and can have no peace. Also, if he is to be a priest, preacher and prophet, who is to rule in peace, how can he maintain such a regime, which must have no peace, and so far right, especially no eternal peace, as yet the prophets say of him? Israel had peace under Solomon, but so far that they themselves cried out about him, 3) that he had overestimated them 4) and sucked them dry; nevertheless it was no eternal peace. Summa, it must be another thing with this other prophet, as it was with Moses, all prophets, kings and all the world, and still is; or Moses must be a liar with all his prophets. He should not be like other prophets or kings, that is what the holy scripture of the Old Testament wants; therefore his book, the New Testament, must also be different and higher than the Old Testament.

108. but no one is so gross and nonsensical as to confirm all these things in Moses and the prophets, as Jeremiah 31:31, who, after all, despises too much these high-souled, shitty (circumcised) saints, and may without leave of all the Talmudists and rabbis (O, that this and that might pass him!) lead out and say, "Behold, the time cometh, saith the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and Judah." O, Jere-

3) Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: scream.

4) Erlanger: "übersetzt".

mia, drive beautifully, where do you want to go? You don't know how the rabbis will turn your nose after 2000 years with their glosses, which are better than your bright text. Shall a new covenant and testament come? Where will the old one remain? Where will the circumcised saints remain, who do not want to know anything else nor suffer, also with the Christians, the cursed goyim, because only the old one? Shall you be so bold and throw away Moses with the whole holy old scripture, in addition with the Talmudists, and so highly and deeply learned saints, that you may prophesy before their nose of a new book and testament?

And, what is even worse, you insolent heretic may say thus: "Not as the covenant was, which I made with their fathers, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt" 2c. O Lord God! God have mercy on you, poor Jeremiah, how mad you have become that you so purely abolish the old covenant, which surely was made by God Himself, as you yourself confess and say: "which I made with their fathers"; you also mention the time, as if you were not mad, "when I took them by the hand and led them out of Egypt". Well, you can't be helped, you want to be condemned by the circumcised saints; so I won't ask for you, nor interpret your words differently, because the circumcised saints couldn't stand it, might make it worse. 1)

110) But here the learned Jews give us cursed goyim a good haircut, 2) because they write that our Jesus himself said, Matth. 5, 17: "he did not come to abolish the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them, and not one letter nor one tittle should pass away, everything must happen, before heaven and earth pass away" 2c. There you have it, you cursed goyim. Well, which man could have provided more and more that the Jews would have been so highly instructed to teach us Christians also the New Testament? Surely a brazen dog at Jerusalem will make them so wise with barking, or a fresh shame will make them so wise.

1) This proverb otherwise also in the form: "Uebel wird Aergeres. Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. X, 365, § 11.

2) Give hair off - prepare a delicate defeat.

Haperes have filled with great smoke (spirit I would say) that they understand so powerfully what fulfilling the law means.

The wretched Jews have never known all their lives what the least law is, much less what the fulfillment of the law is, and they can never understand it (as long as they are such Jews). Other people belong to this group, as St. Paul, Rom. 3, 21: "God's righteousness is revealed, testified by the law and the prophets", and Joh. 1, 17: "The law was given through Moses, but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ"; St. Peter, Apost. 15, 10, 11.: "This is the burden which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear, but believing, by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we are saved, even as they were saved." Dear one, tell me how it is possible that the rangers (rabbis, I would say) and the Jews in their school should understand such high words, who have done nothing all their lives, and still do nothing but dig in the shame of Haphre with their rebuke?

I will say something less, how can a Jew understand what is said, Matth. 7, 12: "What you want people to do to you, you also do to them; this is the law and the prophets. Here almost all of Mosi's laws are lost. Item, Matth. 22, 37. ff: "Love your neighbor as yourself; the commandment is equal to the first: You shall love God with all your heart. In these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Moses understood it well, as he says 2 Mos. 34, 6: "Lord, Lord, merciful God, who forgives sin and no one is innocent before you", and David, Ps. 130, 3: "Lord, where you will look upon sin, who can remain before you?" Item, Ps. 51, 8: "Behold, thou lovest the truth in secret, and teachest me the secret wisdom." Jeremiah also says that he will not write the new covenant on tablets of stone, like the covenant that never entered the heart of any fleshly Jew, nor did he understand it, much less keep it; as Jeremiah says, "They did not keep that covenant," but that he will write the new covenant on living tablets, in the hearts, so that there will be living, burning books of the new covenant.

The words shall be, and so may God's will be done.

Now, of such living Scripture written in the heart, it will be necessary to speak outwardly and to write a book, as Moses had to write a book of the Scripture in the tablets of stone; for there will be so little, and much less, that will be done secretly, which this New Testament or Scripture would do in the heart, neither that Testament which is written in tablets of stone and not in the heart. But of this we speak and know, 1) if we are true Christians; for even the pope with his church knows nothing of this, neither does he respect it. The Jews know as much about it as a sow knows about the Psalter.

This certainly proves that a new testament should have come over the old, so that the pride and glory of the Jews is nothing but a peres and fie on you, since they want no testament nor holy scripture to be without the old. But it does not help them; their own Old Testament is against them, condemns them with its glory, because it prophesies so aridly that the old covenant should not do it, Moses' regiment should be over, Messiah should not rule according to it, but the New Testament must do it. Just as Moses gave up his office and gave way to the new prophet. Therefore, the Jews must accept the New Testament, baptism and our faith, or be eternally lost. The Old Testament, Moses himself and all the prophets will not help them, but stand against them and condemn them to hell.

(115) But here comes the question again, whether Messiah is come? If he has come, then Jews, Gentiles and all the world are obliged to accept the New Testament, not only as a holy scripture, but as the most holy scripture above the old holy scripture. Now it is sufficiently proved that Messiah came 1500 years ago; then we Christians, first of all many thousand children of Israel, then we Gentiles, accepted such a New Testament, also 1500 years ago, and will accept it until the end of the world; but the Gentiles, the other Israelites, they would not accept it,

spurned them such a small thing. They have thus spoiled the food and mangled the joy, out of great arrogance and stubbornness; after that they wanted to pout and grunt, since 2) they found nothing in their hunger. So it is that those who 3) proudly boast and boast that they alone have the holy Scriptures before all the world, they have not one leaf nor 4) letter of them, as far as the mind is concerned, for the soul's use and good; we do not speak of the body's and the body's use. For that which they seek in the Scriptures they shall never find; it is not in them, neither is it ever found in them, so waveless as in the most vile book that is made upon the earth. Messiah is promised inside, but not the Messiah they want and dream of.

We Christians have both books of the holy scriptures, the old and the holy, and the new and most holy. The old promises the Messiah and says: he shall surely come and be given. The new one calls and says: he shall surely come and be given. Now if the Jews could accept the new book, the most holy scripture, as many did 1400 years ago, they would understand that circumcision and all old holiness should give way to baptism and the new holiness that is above that holiness. 5) For at the time when Messiah and his book were still in the old book, that is, in the promise, there was certainly no holy scripture but the old book, in which promise all the saints were saved who hoped for such promised Messiah. For he is the same Messiah, the one who promised those, but who came and appeared to us, so that no one else could be hoped for, nor could come.

But after the Messiah and his book have come forth and been given to us, there is no longer any promise to wait for. And if the old book is a certain witness to God that the Messiah has come to us, the new book is still much more of a promise.

1) Erlanger: "will". This is not a misprint, because "we" is given as a variant.

2) Erlanger: that.

3) Wittenberger: they.

4) Erlanger: another.

5) "is" is missing in the Erlanger.

sure witness of God that the Messiah has come. So the two cherubim look with their faces towards each other into the mercy seat, that is, Old and New Testament, say that Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary, is the Savior of the world and the right mercy seat before God, against our sin, death, devil and hell. Thus is fulfilled that which is said: "Israel shall dwell safely", which the Gentiles want to have understood from the yeasts of this life.

But now the Jews do not accept these things, they have neither old nor new book, neither God the Promiser, nor Messiah the Messenger, they hover between heaven and earth, and touch nowhere, neither old nor new book, as Zechariah 5:1 shows the flying letter, which he calls *maledictio*, curse; for their teaching is vain cursing; otherwise they truly know nothing in the Scriptures. For first of all, it is certain that they do not understand the promises of Messiah. Secondly, they do not understand the Ten Commandments, because without Messiah they cannot be understood. Thirdly, they cannot understand what the ceremonies mean. In addition, because the priesthood is fallen, they also do not understand the manner or the form of the ceremonies. Fourth, no Jew understands the noble, exquisite examples or lives of the fathers, Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, David, Summa, the whole people of Israel. For they do not know what right faith and right good works are. This is proven by their blind, stupid, miserable Talmud glosses, Commentary, and finally also their *Grammatica*. That is why they have nothing left in the Old Testament. It is said: "I am the light" (says Messiah [Joh. 8, 12]), where this is not, what else can there be but vain darkness?

119) Let this be said of the blunt and harsh answer that one should give to the stiff-necked Jews to their prickly poisonous question, namely that Moses 1 Mos. 49, 10. and 5 Mos. 18, 15. testifies powerfully, and with him all the prophets unanimously and abundantly, that Mary is Messiah's mother, and must be from the tribe of Judah and the house of David. If they do not believe Mosi, they believe much less the evangelists. Also we know Chri-

even such an answer is good and certain enough, as said, because the son Messiah must come from David, and we believe that his mother is a virgin, then she must of course also be David's flesh and blood and natural daughter: otherwise her son Messiah would not have to be David's, but of another blood, because his mother would be of another blood, especially if she, a virgin, should give birth without man's blood and flesh:

120) Over such testimony of the Old Testament we will now see the New Testament, how abundantly and powerfully it testifies that Mary must be David's daughter. First, St. Matthew begins his book, Matth. 1:1: "This is the book of the birth of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. Here you hear that Jesus Christ or Messiah is David's son and Abraham's son; so his mother must be David's and Abraham's daughter, because she is a virgin who gave birth without a man, as the evangelist proves afterwards. And if St. Matthew had not written a word more about this than this beginning of his book, this would be enough to prove that Mary must be from the house of David. For the son Messiah proves where the mother is from, not the mother (as the foolish Jews seek), where the son is from, or that he is from the tribe of Judah. Now the evangelist does abundantly well, and counts three times fourteen members of Abraham, that is forty-two members, so that it may be said of any one member, Whose daughter is Mary, and Jesus is his son, as he is David's and Abraham's son; that thus forty-two times Matthew alone in the line of the lineage confesses that Mary is of the tribe of Judah and of the blood of David. And summa, as often as Jesus is called Christ or Messiah in the Old and New Testament, so often Mary, his mother, is proved there to be David's daughter.

(121) But that some are troubled, why the evangelist turns the words in the last parts in such a way, Joseph leaves, puts Mariam, whom he does not lead down in the cord from David, as he leads Joseph: here we should (if we knew nothing else) give glory to the Holy Spirit and think that Matthew is very much in favor of the friendship of Mary.

He knew Joseph, her husband, so well with his friendship, and it is not to be believed that he should bear witness forty-two times alone in the line of the family that Christ is David's son, and yet lead the mother from a foreign tribe, as if he had become mad and foolish in the last generation.

But let us consider the words of the evangelist, whether he could also lead Mariam from David, as well as Joseph. It is certain that St. Matthew leads the cord through Solomon, and St. Lucas through his brother Nathan: these are two cords, but of the same blood as two brothers, from David; but in King Jehoash they come together, and must come together in one cord, because 2 Chron. 22, 9. 10. it says that Athaliah killed all the royal seed except Joash, and as the text says, "There was none left of the house of Ahaziah to be king." Here Solomon's line goes down, that Christ indeed comes from his blood, as according to the line of his brothers and fathers, but not from his body's descendants, but, as Lucas says, from Nathan his brother.

123 Whether the two evangelists then leave each other again with the cord, I leave to act now; they remain in the house of David, that is certain; but in the grandfather of Joseph they are one, both arrive at the same time at Matthan or, as Lucas calls him, Matthes. I respect that he calls Matthan by the name of Matthes.

nach gemeiner Laien Sprache genannt sei, wie wir Deutschen Johannes, Hans, Hänsel, Henno Einen Namen machen. Item, Nicolaus, Nickel, Claus 2c. We Germans pronounce the name Matthes scantily and rightly, as it is written in Hebrew, Matthath, *Thaphato, et A puro vel Italico* [that is, with an x, provided with Raphe, and with a pure or Italian A].

Let us remember this Matthes, it is because of him that Abraham and David's blood are close to. Messiah, almost in the last Hans. For Messiah has now come down from above to this Matthes' house, and we have him in this house for sure; and from this house alone he must come, putting behind him what is left of brothers or

Cousin 1) Houses are none of our business; Matthes' house is where he is. If we now had nothing more than this Matthes, we would have plenty to answer those who are concerned about Mary and Joseph being of one tribe and house. For since Messiah is in Matthes' house, and must come from Matthes' house, the evangelist has thus clearly and brightly enough proved that both Mary and Joseph must not only be of the tribe of Judah and of the house of David, but also of one house of Matthes, the grandfather Joseph; because Messiah must come from Matthes' house. But if Messiah is in Matthes' house, then his mother is certainly also inside, as she, a virgin, shall give birth to Messiah from Matthes', David's, Abraham's house. For in whichever father or house Messiah is, in the same his mother Mary must certainly be beforehand (as said above), which means she is a virgin, has no husband; virginity does, which leads Messiah with his mother through all fathers, except himself.

What was the reason that St. Matthew could not prove to us how Mary and Joseph are of one stock, house and father? It is because we have not noticed in which father the Messiah is, in which his mother should also be, because she is supposed to be a virgin and cannot give her child to anyone but herself and her father. For Jerome, Lyra and others write that Joseph and Mary are therefore of one sex, to prove that he took them in marriage according to the law of Moses, Numbers 36:6, 7, so that the property would not be separated into foreign tribes, this is much too cold and too lazy, also too high up, above David, and yet it helps nothing; as Burgensis also rightly and well refutes. Why did we not look at this Matthes? We would have come closer to it, and so close that [it] cannot be closer.

For since Messiah must come from Matthes' house and nowhere else, let us see what comes from the same Hanse. First, Jacob, his son, comes out, as Matthew writes. From this Jacob's house

Messiah did not come out, nor did he come in, but Joseph, his son, came out. Now we must look again at Matthew's house, which comes out the other time. Mary cannot come out yet, nor can she be his daughter, although she is inside with her son Messiah; otherwise Joseph would have taken his father's sister or his grandfather's natural daughter, which God forbade through Moses, Deut. 18:12. Much less can it be another daughter of Matthes who will be the mother of Messiah, which must be Mary alone. For the daughters leave the father's house for other houses, therefore the scripture does not count a woman's cord. So Matthes must have another son (at least), in whom Messiah comes from him, who is Eli, as Lucas writes. This begat a daughter, Maria Jakobi, it is not; and after it a younger daughter, Maria, it is. If he has more sons or daughters, go his way; for Messiah must come from a virgin, Eli's daughter.

Here we have the mother of Messiah, who is a sibling with Joseph, and both are niftel of one grandfather, Matthes. So, I think, it is strong enough to prove that Mary and Joseph are of one stock and blood, because they are of one grandfather's sibling, two brothers' children, and cannot be closer, they would be bodily brothers and sister. But it was permitted by Moses in this people that siblings would marry each other, that is, a grandfather would give his two nieces or two brothers would give their children together in this people, so that the evangelist also calls Joseph Mary's husband and Mary Joseph's bride; as if he wanted to say: Because you hear that Joseph is Mary's husband, you know them 1) well, that they are of one blood and siblings according to the common way.

So the evangelist brought the Messiah, his mother with him, from above, through all the fathers' houses, to Matthew's house, then to Eli's house, and from there to Joseph's house, where he was born and brought up, not from his own body, but from the body of his bride in marriage, or in his married state,

and Messiah is his legitimate son, and Joseph his legitimate father, but only from the virgin Mary. Since we now have 2) so much, that Joseph and Mary are niftel of the great father Matthes, we have enough, and it is certain that Mary is of the house of David with Joseph. Whoever now wants to continue to argue about the two brothers Jacob and Eli, whether Jacob took his brother's daughter Mary and gave her to his son Joseph, or whether Eli took his brother's son Joseph and gave him to his daughter Mary, may do so; it is sufficient for us that they, the two fathers of Joseph and Mary, were sons of Matthes.

129) Jerome writes that Jacob is Joseph's natural father according to St. Matthew's text, but Eli, whom he also calls Eliakin and Joakim (for all three should be one name, as with us Nicolaus, Nickel, Claus), is his father according to Lucas' text, that is, his sister-in-law or cousin according to the way in which daughter-husband is also called son, and son-wife is also called daughter, and according to the law in which a brother must allow himself to be called and be the father of his deceased brother's children. That pleases me well, and better than Eusebius with Lyra, who means, Jacob took his brother Eli widow, and with the same Joseph begot. Since Mary (Joakim or Eli daughter) and Joseph would be children of the same mother and natural siblings, Moses does not suffer, 3 Mos. 18, 6.

130 Here falls the old question: Which evangelist among the two, Matthew and Lucas, describes the paternal cord, because it is obvious that Matthew leads the fraternal cord from Solomon down to Ochosias, as is proven above. First of all, Lyram and his part must be let go with their opinion, because they go too far from the path, so that he also holds that Nathan is not David's natural son, but the prophet (who was probably as old as David himself), and is with the other two brothers, Shimea and Shobab, 1 Chron. 3:5, of Uriah and Bethsaba's descent, whom David afterwards chose to be his sons, 3) and only Sa-

1) "they" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) "nun" is missing in the Erlanger.

3) Kōrkinder --- adopted children.

lomo was Bethsaba son of David; there he leads the saying, Proverbs 4, 3: "I was a certain son of my mother" 2c. This is nothing; in this way Christ would be Uriah's son, who was a Hitheus, a Gentile, though more pious than many thousand Israelites.

On the other hand, it is enough for a Christian that both evangelists introduce children of David, whether father or brother, and both remain in the house of David, counting no children of the body or foreign blood. From which then Christ comes, he comes from David. I keep it with those who give Lucas the paternal line, except for Eli; For since the cord from Matthes, the grandfather, 1) points one part to Jacob, the other to Eli, he must probably put Joseph, Eli's son, that is, son-in-law, for the reason, as he himself says, that Joseph is *putativus* Pater, putative father of Christ, not natural father, as the cord would have demanded, since Mary, his bride, would not have been a virgin mother, and the scriptural way does not suffer him to carry the woman's cord; nor is he *putativo*, supposed way, One Body with his bride Mary, as he is also supposed Father of Christ. Summa, as said, the great father Matthes makes it all bad, that Mary and Jesus are one house and father's children.

132) It moves those that Matthew always says, *genuit, genuit*, he has begotten or given birth to; therefore they think that Matthew speaks of the natural cord that follows from birth from father to son for and for; but Lucas speaks of the fraternal or paternal cord, which they call *legalem, not adoptivam, as* Lyra thinks, but since a brother according to the law (as is said) must adopt his deceased brother's children as if he were their father. This I do not believe. St. Matthew does not believe it himself and thinks nothing of it. For he knowingly leaves three members out among the kings and says: Joram begat Uziah; which is impossible, because Uziah was born in the fourth member of Joram at 100 years after Joram's death, in addition in the brotherly line.

comes from Nathan, not from Solomon, since Joram is the origin. Likewise he does among the princes after the Babylonian prison, since he leaves much outside, counts alone fourteen, so Lucas counts probably twenty-two, and could not be called: Asar begat Zadok, so perhaps in between two or three are omitted; therefore the *genuit* does nothing Hiezu that Matthew should lead the paternal cord.

He has his way of speaking, *genuit*, he begat him 2c. So that he does not mean anything else than: he is born from him or from his blood, as we also speak in German: Carolus is of Maximilian origin or born. He shows this also with these words in the title: "This is the book of the birth of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." Christ is not born nor begotten of David; nor is he his son, because he comes from him by blood. So birth here cannot only mean the personal birth of Christ, if he counts forty births of his ancestors. But Lucas leads the paternal cord. For he boasts in the beginning that he has diligently investigated everything and wants to write it properly, which we must believe, because we believe the greater and everything else. For such registers were well known among the Jews, have it all (as their way gewest) diligently written, as there are two examples Chronica [and] Ezra; also Moses, who describes Jacob's and Esau's family diligently.

134 But Matthew freely confesses that he does not want to count everything properly, saying that he wants to count three times. fourteen, from Abraham to Christ. And because he found fourteen patriarchs, he would take no more than fourteen kings and fourteen princes. 2) Although the scribes, through no fault of the evangelist, omitted one king, Jehoiakim, the father of Jechoniah, and there are only thirteen kings, as St. Jerome also shows the lack in the Greek books. Lucas, however, makes four times fourteen, taking them all, even those who were not kings, as Nathan and his descendants. To the same Luca is also by the scribes the fourth member after Noah.

1) "zwieset" ---- splits into two. Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: "zwieset".

2) Erlanger: name.

Kenan, which cannot be, after all. Therefore, I consider it that we compare them as much as we can; there you a futile effort to compare all names against each other, may ask Joseph[us] and Philo. because we do not have the registers. And it is not written I want to set the whole friendship, according to my to us Gentiles in particular (but to the Jews), who knew it idea or concept; whoever does it better, have thanks. well. That is enough.

Levi.

Abraham.

Aaron. |

David.

Zadok. |

| Joas.

Jojada. |

| Zerubabel. | Matthes.

Zacharias. Elisabeth.

Anna.

John Baptista.

Eli. Jacob.

Maria Cleophä. Mary. Joseph. Salome. Zebedee.

1st Jacob. 2. Simon. **J**Esus. 1. jacobus major.

3. joses.**)

2. John Evang.

This Mary, our Lord's mother's sister or his mother's wife, is called in the Gospels Mary Jacobi, from the son; is also called Mary Cleopheh, from the other man, who was still alive on the Easter day of Christ, Luke 24:18. So Judah is also called Jacobi, perhaps that he is Jacobi's brother, from Alphaeo, the first husband of Mary Jacobi. These are called our Lord's brothers because they are children of his mother's sister.

137 The angel Gabriel also says, Luc. 1, 36, that Elizabeth is Mary's mother or friend; this cannot be otherwise than that Mary's mother was Elizabeth's sister, which we will call Anna, as she is called everywhere. But because Elizabeth is from the priestly tribe, as the angel says, from the daughters of Aaron, therefore I place the two sisters, Anna and Elizabeth, in the line of Aaron, so Joachim or Eli 1) takes the one sister from the tribe of David.

Annas, and Zacharias from the priestly tribe the other one, Elizabeth. Thus Mary is Aaron's daughter from the priestly tribe by her mother, and David's daughter from the royal tribe by her father; thus Christ is also of royal and priestly blood. And if Elizabeth is her mother and the Lord's great mother, Mary would be a sibling of John the Baptist, and he would be a near cousin of our Lord Jesus Christ in the third generation.

Now Salome wants to be something special, misses an advantage with the Lord, because she asks him to place her two sons, one on the right and the other on the left in his kingdom [Matth. 20, 21], that I think she must have listened to him very closely. Therefore I set her as Joseph's sister; she thought that Mary Jacobi was her mother's sister, but I am her father's sister; therefore I have the right of way with my children over the mother's sister with her children. Because Joseph is no longer a child

1) "or Eli" is missing in the Erlanger.

*This A indicates the priestly tribe, while the other line indicates the royal tribe. **) In the editions erroneously (just as afterwards in § 144) "Joseph" instead of: Josés.

my two sons are the closest friends of Jesus, and she thinks that Jesus is Joseph's son, as everyone thought at that time [Luc. 3, 23]. Against this the others grumbled, without doubt the children of the mother-sister, and perhaps some more with them, who also wanted to be the greatest, as we read in the Gospel. Hereby Jacobus the Great and John Evangelista also become cousins of the Lord, with the name as close as Jacobus and Simon, Juda and Joseph, but one limb further according to the blood. For Joseph is not the natural father of the Lord, only his mother Mary and Salome are daughters of two brothers 2c.

139 From this it can be seen how the Lord's closest friends have approached him in a human way, and again he presents himself as another human being, Phil. 2:7, and he also holds himself friendly and brotherly to them. And there shines no splendor of majesty, but the utmost servile form.

Some, like Bonaventure, have their devotion here, but with a free conscience, that John Evangelista and Mary Magdalene were bridegroom and bride in the wedding at Cana, as the sequence of St. John Evangelista reads. On the other hand, another one may have his (but free) opinion that Simon or Juda was the bridegroom, and the bride was also a near mermaid in the other or third member; for the Evangelia call Simon of Cana and Juda Zealots, that is, of Cana. And it is well to think that bride and bridegroom must have been close friends of the Mother Mary, because she herself is there and helps to rule. For she would not so lightly mix herself in foreign or far friendship wedding, since probably other closer women would be.

But the final opinion of the evangelists, especially Matthew, with such a cord of sex, is that he wants to teach and strengthen the ignorant weak Jews, but to shut up the stiff-necked ones with these two articles: Jesus is Messiah, and Mary is a virgin. For these articles were very difficult for the pious to believe, but impossible for the stiff-necked to believe; because he was very well attended in Nazareth with father, mother and all his friendship.

He was raised and lived there for thirty years, carpentered with his father Joseph like a journeyman, did not go to school, learned nothing, likewise after his father's death he and his poor mother continued to feed each other in this way, and did not let himself be particularly remembered, but kept himself badly and quietly, like another journeyman of his kind, so that she was quite used to him and could not bear in her heart that the unlearned, coarse, poor carpenter should be taught all his life, let alone become a preacher.

Suddenly, when the thirty years were up, he left the trade, ran away, was baptized with others by St. John, and began to preach, to interpret and teach the Scriptures, and to perform miracles, to the horror of the whole world, because all the priests and teachers were lazy, cold, lumpen preachers against him. 1) This was a strange incomprehensible thing in their eyes and ears. It was even stranger that he should not only be a prophet, but the Messiah himself. O how strangely contemptuous speeches were made about it! Dear, be silent, should Jesus preach, do you think I do not know him? I have lived with him for thirty years, I know who he is and what he can do.

If you had lived, worked, eaten, and drunk with Hans N., the son of a poor citizen, from his youth until thirty years, and you knew him as well as yourself, that he had never known a letter, and that same year he wandered off to another country, where you heard that he preached and was more learned than all the doctors in the world, and that he performed miracles, you would answer the announcer. There you would hear of him that he preached and was more learned than all the doctors in the whole world, and that he performed miracles; then you would answer the announcer, "Are you foolish or are you joking? Do you think I do not know Hans N., with whom I have eaten bread for thirty years? If the clamor were great that some would begin to believe and boast that he was king or Roman emperor, you would say, "Well, he has become foolish, and the world is mad and wants to be mad; I should not be persuaded of this, I know him too well. It is the same for the Nazarenes with Jesus.

144. as he comes home again, about barely

1) Erlanger: been.

After half a year, he goes to school, stands up, takes the book of Isaiah in his hand, reads from it, sits down, and preaches a beautiful sermon, so that they are all amazed; then they all see him themselves, cannot deny that it is Jesus, whom they know very well, and look at him and say, Matth. 13, 54. ff: "Where does this wisdom and power come from? Is he not the son of a carpenter? Is not his mother's name Mary? And his brothers Jacob and Joses, Simon and Judah? and his sisters, are they not all 1) with us? Whence came all this unto him? And were they vexed with all him." Why did they fret? They could not believe that it was full of God what they heard and saw. They knew the person too well, and it was too small; therefore they thought that he had surrendered to the devil, who must do such outrageous things through him. And since the first one touched him with a word, they took him at the same hour, led him out to the city, and wanted to cut off his neck, down the rock, as a harmful person.

For he had let it be known in the lection of Isaiah that he was Messiah, since he said that the same saying was fulfilled in him, Isaiah 61:1: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, therefore the Lord hath anointed me," that is, made me a Messiah, and yet he was a beggar, as they knew him. For this he scolded them, as if they were not worthy of his miraculous deed, as Lucas indicates on the 4th, B. 16. Then they were angry and thought: Away with such a Messiah, he will cause misfortune; we know that he is a beggar and wants to be Messiah. The boy who recently helped to build a house and read shavings with us has suddenly become Messiah, that is, king of kings, and despises us, the holy people of Israel, because he does not want to do what we like 2c.

146. but it is all the more grievous, since he rose from death and ascended into heaven (but they thought that he was now dead, as he deserved to be, as a deceiver), that they should now consider this Jesus, with whom they had played (as they say) the Kötten (2), not only to be the true Messiah, but also

1) "all" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) "To play the Kötten" - to deal with someone according to favor. - The Köhde - the ankle on the horse's foot.

to accept him as Lord of heaven and earth after death; this was an unpleasant and unbearable sermon to them; they were offended by it and fell, the greater multitude, until this day; for their thoughts had to be right, God had to lie and be wrong, as they still do, and so they have lied to and broken down against Jesus, so that it cannot be said nor written.

(147) Yes, this is (as I began) the evangelist's main final work, that he would like to present Jesus to the Jews, so that they would accept him as the Messiah, and that they would let go of all the anger and would not let themselves be hindered, because he had lived so despicably with them for thirty years and had been crucified so shamefully afterwards. For he was the son of Abraham, David, and of all the fathers, counted by the cord, except for the mother Mary, who was attested a virgin by Isaiah and the Holy Spirit; not a bad son of David and of the fathers, as others were, such as Joseph, Simon, Judah, Jacob; but the only, peculiar, miraculous son, in whom the prophecy and promise made to Abraham and David and all the prophets were fulfilled. If they would accept this son, that is, the fulfillment of the prophecy and promise, then they would have grasped the right Messiah, then they would let the old testament go, with circumcision, priesthood, principality, temple, Jerusalem and all laws, which go and belong to it, because they would no longer need it. On the other hand, they would cheerfully accept the New Testament, baptism, sacrament, and all that Messiah has taught and ordained, and also hold it much, much 3) holier than the Old Testament has been, and not dwell on the fact that no holy scripture or book is more than the Old Testament, as they dream. Testament, as they dream.

The evangelist did not work in vain, along with other apostles and evangelists. Many have been converted who have accepted Jesus with great joy, and cannot be sufficiently surprised that God has fulfilled His promise so wonderfully, and yet so sweetly and kindly, before they

3) A "much" is missing from Erlanger.

could understand it. The others kept and still keep the saying of Isa. 53, 2. 3.: "We saw him, but there was no form that we could have desired him. He was the most despised and worthless, full of pain and sickness, so despised that people hid their faces from him: therefore we did not respect him" 2c. But whoever wants to be Kochab or Messiah to the Jews, he does not have to be shaped like that nor to be looked at, they certainly despise him, says Isaiah here:

149) That we come to the end, the Jews, as I have said, easily believe that the line which Matthew leads is right from Abraham to Jesus, and so they stand still and listen. For at that time all the men and women of the whole tribe of Judah, of whom there were many thousands, were of Judah, and the greater part of the house of David, as well as Joseph, Mary, and their son Jesus. But when the evangelist hangs on it: "from whom is born Jesus, who is called Messiah," they recoil as if thunder struck them down, there is no more hearing, although the evangelist has introduced so many members into the string, whom he might well have taken less; as he then omits some to indicate that it is not necessary to name all of them (for they were quite happy to hear their family boast), so that this salutary article should also come to them neatly and gently.

150 St. Matthew does not only want to say from his spirit (as he has power, right and command) that Mary, a young woman, has given birth, but also brings in the prophet Isaiah to entice her kindly by her own scripture. But what does it help with the stubborn, gnarled, stiff-necked, damned Jews? They have here many martens in this saying, as they have in all others, and yet they can accomplish nothing without always tinkering with the mallet, and would gladly make one lie true with seven lies. But, as said above, let the Jews go, and ask nothing of what the devil rages through them. If there is a man's heart among them, 1) that will

With the others it is said according to the proverb: Lost like the soul of a Jew. Therefore, to strengthen and adorn our faith, let us see how ridiculous (yet poisonous) the devil acts through them this saying against St. Matthew.

From the word Alma, and the Virgin Mary.

151. first. "Behold (says Isaiah), the virgin is with child" 2c. Here the word Alma is written, of which many others, I also have written, that it is called a virgin or maid, who still walks in hair and in wreath, and has not become a woman. And if a Jew or Hebrew can show me that Alma is called a woman in the Scriptures, he shall have a hundred florins with me, God grant where I find them. For four times, and no more, is the word Alma found in the holy Scriptures. First, Genesis 24:16, about Rebekah, who describes to Moses in many words that she is not indebted to a man. Secondly, Exodus 2:8, about Moses' sister Miriam: "Then Alma went and called her mother" 2c. But Miriam could not have been ten years old at that time, as the Jews themselves must confess. Third, here Isaiah 7:14: "Behold, Alma is with child." In these three places there is an article which means *singularitor unam*, and no other. To the fourth, Proverbs 30:18 ff: "Three things are too strange for me, and the fourth I know not: the way of the eagle in heaven, the way of the ship in the sea, the way of the serpent upon the rock, and the way of a man upon a maid. So is the way of an adulteress, which swalloweth up and wipeeth her mouth, saying, I have done no evil."

Here, here stands (they say) Alma with a man. I do not ask whether Alma is standing there with a man; for I see it very well myself, praise God, I must not ask a Jew to show it to me. I say that one should prove to me that Alma here is called a woman and not a virgin; I would like to hear the master and admit a hundred guilders. How, if Solomon in the place (as the cursed Goj, Doctor Luther, understands it, and will not let him take it easily, if it's

1) Erlanger "jenen". Should the "jnen" of the old prints have been dissolved in this way?

(not even a hundred guilders) spoke of the vexatious misfortune in the world? since a "giver", that is, a husband, cannot find the wife's bed in God's name, and creeps after a maid or virgin, for instance, in the devil's name. Again "Gebirah" (the woman) cannot find the man's bed, in God's name, and creeps to the servant or other companion, the devil's name, has a clear 1) conscience, swallows adultery like a wolf swallows a mosquito, wipes the mouth afterwards, and no one may call her a whore. Who wants to prove it?

Because such things must be played out in darkness and secretly plotted, there are strange ways, handles and intrigues, which no Solomon nor regent can devise, or forbid, or convince, as little as he can dictate the way to the bird in the air, because the whole sky is its way, and the whole sea is the way of the ship, and goes where the wind wants to go, and the snake on the rock, which also has no cord nor straightedge, it can bend too much. It is a pity of this life that one cannot prevent secret adultery, and that (unfortunately) the husband likes a maid better than the wife, and the wife's servant better than the master; as the poet also says: *Quod licet, ingraturum est. Nitimur in vetitum. Lex occasio peccati*. This is what Potiphar's whore wanted to do to Joseph. Gen. 39, 7.

Nevertheless, Alma here is called a maid of the virgin, whom the man creeps after; if he brings her down, she is never a maid; if she is firm, she remains an Alma, as I have well heard in the histories that the pious virgins have cunningly brought the horny men to the women, under her name. So the Jews cannot prove that Alma here in Isaiah 7 is called a woman, because the word Alma in all Scripture means a virgin or maid; also in *plurali numero*, Alamothe, they cannot prove that it is called anything else but virgins or maids. Prove it otherwise, but drive nicely, so that I do not have to lose my hundred guilders so shamefully. And before that, that St. Mat-

thaeus not become a liar; otherwise the Holy Spirit would have to be circumcised himself; that would be a pity for the beautiful feathers, that they should become Jewish.

(155) Secondly, says Isaiah, that such Alma is with child, and this should be a miracle or sign; does not say she will become pregnant, as some ravens would have liked to interpret: they had 2) to be ashamed of their own *grammatica*, that Hara is called *conceptit*,

est praegnans, she is pregnant, she has conceived. But they want to turn to this, that the Prophet took a young maiden in his old age and made her pregnant; then he starts and says: Behold, Alma is pregnant and will bear a son, so that the opinion is: This is not the sign that Alma is pregnant, that the Prophet has beautifully arranged; he is her husband, but that she bears a son, and not a maiden.

Whom shall we believe now? God says: This is a sign that Alma is pregnant. The Jew says: Oh no, God denies, this is not a sign, because the prophet has made Alma pregnant. So we have here two texts; the text of Isaiah stands bright and clear: God will give you a sign, behold, Alma is with child 2c. But the Jewish text is this: "Behold, Alma has a husband and is with child by the prophet; God will give you a sign that she will bear a son, and not a daughter. You may want to ask where the high art came into the Jews, that they can dice the text and God's word so masterfully, as if they were on a double game, and put the hindmost first; also give Alma a husband, since Isaiah does not write anything about it, but says that Alma is pregnant, does not say that the prophet did it.

157. i cursed goy cannot understand from where they have such high art, without that i must think, since Judas Sharioth had suffered that his intestines were torn, and, as happens to the exalted, the bladder 4) burst: then perhaps the Jews have provided their servants with golden pots and silver

2) Erlanger: must.

3) d. i. fraudulent dice game.

4) Walch and the Erlanger: Bläse.

They had bowls with them, caught the Zudas piss (as it is must stand there alone and without a husband, and hear called) together with the other sanctuary, then ate and that she is pregnant and will bear a son; but it shall be a drank the earth 1) underneath each other, from which they special, a sign and wonder (says God), not the common get such sharp eyes that they see such and such glosses way; yes, it shall be my sign, I will give it and do it, I will in the scriptures, which neither Matthew, nor Isaiah be father and husband, she shall be mother. Now it is well himself, nor all the angels, not to mention us cursed known (it should be known by a cow) that it is not a sign goyim, can see. Or have looked their God, the Sched, in when a young wife is pregnant; what else would or should the butt, and in the same smoke hole found such written. they do, the young women, with their husbands, but to It is not written in the Scriptures, that is certain; so it become pregnant? what else are they made for? It is cannot be taken out. considered neither a sign nor a miracle, but a common

158. Therefore we cursed goyim must leave the most way and example, which is rarely lacking. holy Jews their heavenly 2) wisdom, which they have It is neither a sign nor a miracle that a pregnant found apart from the Scriptures in Judas' piss and in their woman bears and gives birth to a son, because it is the Jews' sweat, so that they alone remain wise, and common way, ordained by God, that they should not bear meanwhile let us be fools with Isaiah and Matthew, that vain daughters; but that the Jews want to make God such we remain in and with the poor, meager, dry text, since no a frivolous fool that he should call it a sign, which they such art is in it, if Judas' piss and the Jews' sweat is out, invent a sign according to their Judaic piss, since the namely, that this Alma is pregnant without man's consent, women themselves and the physicians can easily guess and bears a son without loss of her virginity. For in the whether it is a son or a daughter. But if this sign is that whole of Scripture no woman is given a child unless the Alma is pregnant without a man, then it is already nothing man or father of the child is named; just as it is said that with the Jewish gloss but Jewish piss and Jewish sweat; the child must have a father, except for this Alma, where they feel this well themselves, therefore they contest the no man is mentioned, and yet she is promised a son. first part of the impregnation of Alma. For it is because of

To prevent the evil and dangerous example, that him that the mother is a virgin. virgins and widows could not boast, if they had children If Isaiah were not a prophet, and Matthew not an without men, that they had it, like the woman and the evangelist, whom one is obliged by God to believe, but woman in the Scriptures, who also had no men. For it bad historians, then one should still believe them, as one would be a strange thing if our daughters, virgins, and does Joseph and Philo, and more than the lying, widows should set the house full of children for us, and blasphemous, obdurate Jews, who in the whole of say that they had licked the snow, and had no other father. Scripture now almost at two thousand years have flown Oh no, one does not lick the children at the snow. Moses and practiced to invent one lie after another, that one says, Gen. 1, 27, that a male and a female belong to it; should not believe a word of them. For a lying mouth is God also did not want to give the blessing to the fruit of not believed, even if he saws the truth (as one speaks), the womb until he had created them both and given them even if God gives him a true word, no one believes it. *Et* together. *illud: Si mentiris, etiam, quod verum dicis,*

160 But this certain Mary has no husband to whom she can give the child, but *mentiris.* Christ, our Lord, would not let the devils

speak, even though they spoke the truth.

1) Merde - porridge, mixture, dung.

2) Erlanger: clandestine.

the Jews also hold, badly lying like the devils, before where two pious honest men or *historici* say otherwise; how much more where a prophet and evangelist say otherwise. For it is not good to put the piss of Judaism and the sweat of the Jews over the ointment of the Holy Spirit.

Nor is it Isaiah alone who proclaims the mother of Christ a virgin; God proclaimed it in the beginning of the world after the fall of Adam, when He gave the first promise of the New Testament or Gospel, saying: "I will put enmity between you and a woman, between your seed and her seed; she shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise her heel" 2c. [God the Lord could have spoken so much that He could have said, "A man's seed shall bruise your head," or "Name the man whose seed is the woman." But now He is silent about the man and gives the child or seed to the woman alone; this can be no one but Mary, the mother of Christ, for all children and seed are otherwise attributed to men.

Although all the saints from Adam onward, and we Christians to the end, are also such seed as trample the devil's head, we are not of ourselves, but of the seed of the woman in whom we believe, just as after him we are called Christians and children of God, and are, because we abide in him, that is, in Christ and the Son of God; we must become like him. Through such faith of the promised seed, Adam, Eve, Abel, at the same time, rose again from the serpent's power, and became his head-kickers. What now here some fathers play in this saying with allegories, we leave aside. For one part is of no use at all: that Adam should be *portio superior rationis*, Eve *inferior portio*. Such *philosophia* does not belong here. One part makes the church out of Eve, the Christians her seed. But this is a piece of right understanding, namely, as said, that all saints are also such seed through faith in the one seed of the one woman. And if someone wants to pretend that this does not prove that the woman must be a virgin, she could be a widow:

God did not want to pour it all out at once, but to make it clearer and clearer as time went on; it is enough now that Christ should be the seed of a woman without the seed of a man; virginity is indicated. It all depends on the seed. Afterwards Isaiah shall express it, that [it] is an Alma, a virgin. The New Testament shall freely state that she is called the Virgin Mary of Nazareth, the bride of Joseph and the mother of Christ.

165. this is where (as the *grammatici* tells us) the Hebrews admonish) the patriarch Jacob with the word Shiloh, Gen. 49, 10.: "The scepter of Judah shall not depart until Shiloh come." For it is very well to reckon that the fathers from Adam have daily and well practiced the promise of the woman's seed, when it was their life and blessedness, after the lamentation and fall of Adam. But Silo comes from Silva or Siljah (as they say), and is called *secundinam*, 1) since the child is in the womb, or recently born child, *continens pro contento*, as seems to be the case in Deut. 28, v. 53, since it brings such grief to the Jews that a woman with great hunger will eat her Siljah, which goes out from her womb, that is, her child, recently born, per *synecdoche*, which figure is common in all languages. As when we say, he can drink out of a barrel, eat out of a pot, when it is not the barrel nor the pot, but what is inside, that is eaten and drunk. Item: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you kill the prophets" [Matt. 23:37], when the stones and wood do not do this, but the people inside do. It is a wicked house when wicked men are in it.

166 Therefore Jacob will say: until Shiloh comes, that is, until her (the woman's, not the man's) child comes, which she alone has conceived, carried and born in her womb, of which it was said to our father Adam: a woman's seed 2c., in German, until the virgin's son comes. For he was not to be conceived and born in sins, as other Adam's children; therefore his mother had to be a virgin, whom no man touched.

1) d. i. secundae [partus], the afterbirth.

Nor a widow who had a husband before and served and helped to increase the original sin. Psalm 51:7.

167 And if the devil might have had this cause, that Mary was a widow, he should have made us so many Christos, as a widow would have carried children, that we would not have known which one it was, and thus would have lost the right one among so many sons. Otherwise, it was difficult for us to keep the only one from his rage. For he already began, through his mania, to make another Christ, who would not be Mary's natural son, but would come from her as a ghost. Thus Helvidius, the fool, also wanted to give Mary more sons after Christ, from these words of the evangelist: "and Joseph did not recognize his bride Mary until she gave birth to her first son"; he wanted to understand this as if she had had more sons after the first son; the coarse fool. To this St. Jerome answered finely. Summa, he is hostile to the seed of the woman, and would like to make it null and void, or at least uncertain. Therefore, the evangelists describe the line of the lineage so diligently that the Jews should not be angry and think that there must be another Jesus of whom such great things were said, but this one (whom they knew well), the Son of Mary, could not be. Ah yes (they say), it is the same one, the only JEsus, the son of Mary, the son of David Abraham and of all ancestors.

Therefore it was necessary that his mother should be a virgin, a young virgin, a holy virgin, redeemed from original sin and cleansed by the Holy Spirit, bearing no more than One Son, One Jesus, who could be her Siljah, fruit, her womb seed, without a father, an only Christ for us. But here is not time to strike out such things; for I would have to preach how the seed of the woman must be a blessing, promised to Abraha, that is, how he must be God. I have written and spoken of this elsewhere, so I will leave it at that.

169. that the rabbis would insist on the He and Cholem in the Shiloh, does not concern me, I can well do away with the Cholem: if Shiloh should not read Silah.

feminino genere, yet the fruit of the woman would be alone, because there is no man, and would have to be called the virgins' son of Judah, or of Judah. But Deut. 28, 53, the man stands with the woman who eats her children; here the fruit of the woman alone, Silo, stands without a man. Many fine sermons will be preached and books written, which are forgotten and lost in time; as we now see that a good book or sermon hardly lasts a year, and, as they say, a new song is sung for a year, without which there are few people who keep it for their descendants; the crowd lets it pass, and always waits for a new one; thus the devil keeps the world forever in error, the small crowd stays with the one it has received, John 8:31. 8, 31.

1) So it has happened, so it goes, from the beginning to the end of the world, that great things happen, and yet little is respected; the others let it go and forget it.

(170) Now Isaiah is a fine vocabulary, who, as a master, interpreted to us the word silo, and the seed of the woman, as if to say, "Do you want to know what silo means, what the seed of the woman means? I will tell you: It is a miraculous sign that Messiah shall be the son of a virgin, and his mother shall be an Alma, who conceives in her virginal siljah, or womb, without the help of a man. St. Elisabeth is also fine, when she joyfully received Mariam and said: "Giving is the fruit of your womb" [Luc. 1, 42.], that is Silo, the fruit *matricis tuae*, your Siljah, or your womb alone, and no man; because my womb child has a father, called Zachariä.

So David also sings Psalm 22:10 in the person of Christ: "You have pulled me out of my mother's womb. Here he calls himself Silo, who was drawn from his mother's womb (not from his father's loins, like all other children). Item v. 11: "Upon you I am drawn from my mother's womb; you are my God from my mother's womb." Such cannot be said of any child of Adam, all of whom were born in wrath and sin, and without God.

1) In the editions "Joh. 2.", which cannot be correct. Other passages that would fit here are: 1 Joh. 2, 27. 28. 2 Tim. 3, 14.

This one alone is God's child and in grace, the moment and the Virgin Mary, his mother, as is right and just. There he is taken from his mother's womb, and yet has to suffer shall be a new thing," he says, "which has not been before such great torture, which is worthy of the grace of God on earth. From the beginning children were born, 2c. regiments were established, evil and good people lived,

Further David says Psalm 110, 3: "Out of the mother, improved and worsened, as it is still going on, and will go out of the dawn comes the dew of your birth. Just as the on until the end of the world: but here the new miracle shall dew falls from the dawn, so your birth comes from the happen, which never happened before, namely a Nekefa mother (mother does not mean the whole person of the [xxxx] a woman, who is not a man, shall surround a man, woman, as in the fourth commandment, but that the that is, Mary shall conceive and give birth to God's Son. women are called mother in her body, *matricem* or Christ, our Lord, at the moment when Mary gave her full Siljah). Now the dew falls from heaven without the help word to the angel Gabriel and said: "Let it be done to me of all men, Mich. 5, 6. yes, even without clouds, even according to your word", was both God and perfect man in when the sky is bright and the dawn is most beautiful, it one person, as the dear Fathers received in the Concilio falls most sweetly; no one can say from where or where Ephesino against the Nestorium. For if this were not *the* it begins to fall. So also Christ came out of the mother, case, she could not be called *theotocos*, God's Mother, who is in the womb of the virgin Mary, that no father knows, indeed no man, nor she herself can tell nor know nor could Christ be called her Son; this has been how it happened that this beautiful dew, Christ, was discussed elsewhere, and is too long to discuss here. Now conceived and born in her mother or womb. It is called: let this be a new strange man, who is both God and man, conceived by the Holy Spirit, from above. in his mother's womb a child, however small it may be. He must have been small, as the Doctors, Damascenus, and

Accordingly, all Christians are called "born as the dew from heaven", Mich. 5, 6. Because we believe in Him, we more afterwards, calculate the same. Accordingly, are made like Him and are respected. Joh. 1, 12.: "He Elizabeth calls Mariam the mother of the Lord from the full gave them power to become children of God, born not of spirit, although Mary was perhaps barely a fortnight the flower, but of God." For no one can tell nor know pregnant at that time, at which time no child can live in where a Christian comes from; "for he is born of spirit other women, as is known.

and water," Jn. 3, 5. The water is seen as one feels the dew, but the birth no one sees. So we also are children, thoughts St. Bernard spins out of Moses, Deut. 12, 2. conceived and born of the Holy Spirit, like unto Christ, where he says: "If a woman is inseminated and gives birth to a child, she shall be unclean for seven days" 2c. Here except that we come by grace and for his sake: but he St. Bernard wonders why Moses lets his mouth run over hath it for his own person, lest he, the Son of God, should with such vain words: if a woman is inseminated; why does be born otherwise, being not in the old birth of sins and he not say briefly: "Every woman who bears a child shall be unclean for seven days"? For it is well known that all women must be inseminated if they are to bear children, death, as we prodigals of Adam. and none bears a child that is not inseminated. Then he smelled that Moses had kept his mouth shut and had not

174 To this we add the saying of Jeremiah 31:22: burned himself on the mother of the LORD, whom he had exempted from his commandment. "The Lord shall create a new thing in the earth, and a woman shall compass a man about her. This has been read and understood throughout Christianity by Christ.

Laws, that she should not be unclean like other women; that she might proclaim that the mother would come one day to bear a babe unprocreated, that is, to bear the silo, a mother's child without a father.

All these things I have written this time in honor, praise and thanksgiving to our dear Lord, to strengthen our faith, to scorn and annoy the wretched devil and his circumcised saints. For I know very well how they disgrace and blaspheme these 1) introduced sayings, so that no one may say that I do not know their thing, condemn them unheard, and I would not do such an outrage against them if I knew their mind. No (praise God), I know well what their wisdom is in the Scriptures, I have proved it in that 2) booklet, in the saying of Jacob Gen 49, Haggai 2, Daniel 9, and in the article of circumcision and of the nobility of blood; in this booklet in the shame of Haperes, 3) Isaiah 9, and the like. I did not want to act anything unconscious.

178. their art in the saying Jeremiah 31:22, where they say: "A woman will surround a man" should mean so much: the people of Israel is the woman, God the man, Now Israel has been a whore in idolatry; then she has converted and repented, so that the man, that is, God, again surrounded and reconciled. If now the words could give that, than cannot be, how can such a thing be called a new thing created on earth? Has the people of Israel never been such a whore and been converted again? Then ask the book of the judges. Here it will come that what a rabbi calls new, that is new, what he calls old, that is old, as above the rule gives full of the "left and right hand.

179. but this is still much higher, finer art; in this place they speak that the woman is the whore of Israel to understand; but when they have wedding, they lead the bride three times around the bridegroom, so that they do this saying of Jeremiah enough, a woman surrounds the

Man. Here Nekefa, the woman, must be called a virgin, there a whore. Why? Because the rabbis cannot fail to say that a whore is a virgin, and a virgin is a whore, according to the rule that the left hand is right when it is called a raven right. And also before never such new thing must have happened, when a woman or bride is led around the man three times, because Jeremiah speaks: "there shall be a new thing on earth, created by the Lord." But here a rabbi soon helped the matter and said that what he calls new is new, but what he calls old is old, *ut supra*.

The desperate devil-mongers think that the Holy Scripture is their own, like a piece of paper, from which they can carve little men, little birds, little houses, little cat chairs, as they like; and what they say, both their Jews and we Christians should accept as true.

Therefore, I will again pronounce judgment on the accursed rabbis. First of all: The holy scriptures are not of the Jews, not of the Gentiles, nor of the angels, much less of the devils, but of God alone, who alone spoke and wrote them, who alone shall interpret and interpret them where it is necessary; devils and men shall be pupils and listeners.

182 Secondly, we Christians are forbidden, in case of loss of divine graces and eternal life, to believe the Rabbis' reasoning and glosses in the Scriptures, or to consider them right. We may read it, to see what damned devilish work they do among themselves, to beware of it. For thus says Moses, Deut. 28, 28: "God will strike you with madness, blindness and a raging heart." Moses did not say this about the cursed Goyim, but about his circumcised saints, the noble blood, princes of heaven and earth, who call themselves Israel. Hereby is condemned by God Himself all their understanding, gloss and interpretation in the Scriptures as vain madness, blindness, frenzy, that all what they have worked these 1500 years in the Scriptures, God Himself speaks and judges not only false and lies, but also vain blindness,

1) Erlanger: the.

2) In the book Von den Juden und ihren Lügen, No. 51 in this volume.

3) I.e., in the first part of this book, which deals with the Shem Hamphorah.

4) Erlanger: the.

mad, insane thing. And as such a judgment is found in the work and in the deed, as you have seen above in the saying of Jacob Gen. 49, 10. Hagg. 2, 7. Dan. 9, 24. in the Shema of Hamphorah; Isa. 7, 14. of Alma; Jer. 31, 22. of Nekefa. Summa, they do the same in all sayings that speak of Messiah and right faith. A raging man must rage.

183) This judgment is confirmed by Is 29:13,14: "Therefore this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me, and they fear me according to the commandment of men, which they teach: so will I deal strangely with this people, most strangely and oddly, that the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid. This is not said of us Goyim, but of the people of Israel, who had excellent, wise, prudent men and prophets, and still have books of them; But because they have become a false, hypocritical lying people, who praise God with their mouths and go to the devil with their hearts, they shall also lose and not have the wisdom and understanding of the prophets, but as they pay God with their mouths (that is, with the shells) and serve the devil with their hearts (that is, with the core), so they shall also have the letters (the empty shells) in 1) the Scriptures, but they shall not smell the core, the right understanding.

184 Just before that, in the same chapter, v. 11, he says: "Let the prophecies of all the prophets be to you as the words of a sealed book or letter, which one gives to read [to] one who can read or not; [he] must say, I cannot read it, for it is sealed" 2c. Such is also the work in the blind raving Jews; for they have the book well, but there is no understanding, neither of the Messiah, nor Law of Moses in some verse, that the heathen and poets teach much better thing, neither the Jews, since they are also where best. The sayings are much more in the prophets, conjugation, construction, signification, and what more especially the Psalm 69, 23. f., which St. Paul introduces Rom. 11,9.: "Their table must become a rope before that they may turn into the and them.

become a retribution and a trap. Their face must become dark so that they do not see" 2c.

But 2 Cor. 3, 14. 15. 16. paints St. Paul right, since he speaks of these Jews from the time of Christ (because it cannot be understood by anyone else): "Until this day, when Moses is read, the covering remains over their hearts, because their minds are hardened. But if they turned to the Lord, the covering would be removed." So the Lord Himself also proclaimed to them Matt. 8:12: "The children of the kingdom shall be cast out into darkness"; and John 8:21: "I go, and ye shall seek Me, and die in your sins: for whither I go ye cannot come." And what does St. Paul do in all his epistles, but to call the Jews dogs, cuttings, and all blinded and hardened, from whom one should beware?

(186) Now, if a Christian wants to seek understanding in the Scriptures from the Jews over such a judgment and condemnation of the Jews, what else does he do but seek the face of the blind, the wisdom of the mad, the life of death, the grace and truth of the devil? It serves him right, if he also becomes insane, blind and furious, as his masters are, condemned by God 2). That one learns the language and grammar from them, that is fine and well done, just as they also do, learn from us the German language, from whales the French, and where they are, there they learn the language of the country; but our faith and understanding of the Scriptures they do not learn. So we should also learn the language from them, but avoid their faith and understanding, condemned by God.

187 Therefore, our Hebrew scholars (for which I have also asked them herewith for God's sake) should let this work be commanded to them and be concerned to purify the holy old Bible from the Jews' peres and Judas' slopes, where they could change the points, distinction, conjugation, construction, signification, and what more the grammatica has, and turn it from the Jews' mind, so that it may turn into the and them.

1) "in" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) "of God" is missing in the Erlanger.

with the New Testament, that they would do so confidently and with joy, as St. Paul teaches in Romans 12:7, that *prophetia* should be *analogous to* faith. For so they have done to us, that is, to the Bible these 1500 years. Where they have been able to turn the Bible away from our Messiah and faith with points, distinction, conjugation 2c. and make it dissimilar to the New Testament, they have done this with great and furious diligence, as can be seen above in the examples Gen 49:10, Haggai 2:7, Daniel 9:24, Isaiah 7:14 and the like.

188. as, 1) Isaiah 9, 5. as they make the text so, Vajikra Shemo, Pele 2c.: The Wonderful, Council, God, Hero, Eternal Father will call the Messiah Prince of Peace. Here one sees their courage, therefore one should discard their points and construction, and read as we read it, because there is the Grammatica of the letters gladly, so one for Vajikra liefet Vajikare, and all names in the Rominativo can stand. The Hebrewists will probably find more of these, so that the thieves may be given back with honor what they have stolen with shame these 1500 years, perhaps even longer. For the main thing must be true, that the old holy scripture goes and testifies to Messiah and our faith; whoever does not understand it then cannot have it.

For this reason I have said that Moses and the Scriptures are not known among the present Jews, nor is the old true Moses, so shamefully have they defiled him with their Judaic piss. For Moses wants to be a witness of the Messiah, that is certain. But because they disgrace the Messiah so much, it is impossible that they should understand Moses correctly in a pasuk. I would like to see this work charged to my dear lord and friend, M. Bernhard Ziegler at Leipzig, Hebrew professor, so that he would also excel once, as the other Hebrewists (praise to God) have not let themselves be seen without great fruit; for he is especially hostile to the Jewish Judaic piss, and could well do something, if the other Hebrewists were drawn to him, and purified the Hebrew Bible for us. For it shall be pure and good Hebrew again.

Christians who have the mind of Messiah must do so, as Paul says, 1 Cor. 1:24, "We have the mind of Messiah," and Luc. 24:45, "He opened their minds so that they might understand the Scriptures," and Matt. 13:11, "It has been given to you to understand the mystery of the Kingdom of Heaven.

190 Whether one would have to attack and reproach me, who sometimes lacked in interpretation, I will accept with thanks. For how often Jerome has failed! And I see how the two fine men, Sanctes 2) and Müllster have *studio incredibili et diligentia inimitabili* interpreted the Bible, done much good with it. But the rabbis are about too powerful for them, that they have also lacked the aualogia of faith, the rabbis' glosses too much. For I myself have followed their translation about too much, that I must recant, especially 2 Sam. 23, 3) *in verbis novissimis David*, as I will soon do.

In this way, the Jews' understanding of the Bible could be finely weakened, and there is the advantage that Moses and the prophets did not write with points that a new man's mind brought up after their time; therefore it is not necessary to keep them as rigid as the Jews would like, especially where they are used contrary to the New Testament. The same should be done with the *aequivocatio* and *distinctio*, where they serve against the New Testament. The Jews have a desire to make all their things doubtful and not certain. Therefore, where the *aequivocatio* occurs in a *vocabulo*, take the *significatio* that agrees with the New Testament, and it becomes certain; and the right *significatio* has a strong witness and support in the New Testament; so the Jews are left with the other *significatio*, that is, the empty shell and peres, without witness and support.

2) Sanctes Pagninus is mentioned in the "Interpretation of the First Book of Moses", Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. I, 363, § 202 and ibidem, Col. 451, § 46. - Sebastian Münster published the *Biblia hebraica* with his Latin translation at Basel in 1534. Cf. Lauterbach, p. 47, note Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XXII, 1704.

3) In the editions: "2 Sam. 22." Luther's interpretation of the last words of David" is found Walch, old edition, vol. III, 2780 ff.

192 Let these things be commanded to the Hebrews. Here I will leave it and have nothing more to do with the Jews, nor write any more about them or against them; they have had enough. To those who want to convert, God grant

his grace, that they (yet some) may know and praise with us GOD the Near, our Creator, together with our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and the Holy Spirit forever and ever, Amen.

The writing, which follows in the old edition of Walch here: "D. Luthers Vermahnung Wider die Juden, womit er seine zu Eisleben, kurz vor seinem Abschied aus diesem Leben Anno 1546 gehaltenen vier Predigten beschlossen" (Luther's admonition against the Jews, with which he concluded his four sermons delivered at Eisleben shortly before his departure from this life in 1546), is already included in the St. Louis edition, Vol. VII, 1264 ff. and therefore omitted here.

II Luther's Writings against the Turks, and of the Inextinguishable Hatred against the Christians.

53 D. Mart. Luther's writing about the war against the Turks. *)

The letter of 9 October 1528. Issued in April 1529.

To the Serene Highborn Prince and Lord, Lord Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Count of Katzenelnbogen, Ziegenhain and Nidda, my gracious Lord. Grace and peace in Christ JESu, our Lord and Savior.

1. noble, highborn prince, gracious lord. Five years ago, some people asked me to write about the war against the Turks and to exhort and incite our people to it; and now, because the Turk is approaching us, my friends are forcing me to complete this, especially because there are some clumsy preachers among us Germans (as I unfortunately hear), who imagine to the people that one should not and must not wage war against the Turks, but some are so foolish that they teach that it is not proper for any Christian,

to wield the secular sword or to rule. In addition, as our German people is a wild, savage people, yes, almost half devils, half men are, some of the Turks desire future and regiment.

(2) And such error and wickedness among the people are all blamed on Luther, and must be called the fruit of my gospel. Just as I must also bear the blame for the rebellion, and for all the evil that is now happening in the whole world, if they know otherwise; but contrary to God and His Word, they act as if they knew no other way, and seek cause to blaspheme the Holy Spirit and public, known truth, so that they may well deserve hell, and never ever attain repentance and forgiveness of their sins.

*This writing appeared in many individual editions (the Erlanger lists eight of them); with Hans Weiß in Wittenberg on April 16, 1529 (according to our date; three different editions bear the same date on the title); with Johannes Stüchs in Nuremberg in the same year; in 1542 in Wittenberg by Nickel Schirlentz; in 1543 in Frankfurt am Main by Georg Raben and Wegand Hanen Erben; finally an edition without indication of printer and place in 1529. In the collections: Wittenberger (1551), vol. II, p. 522b; Jenaer (1566), vol. IV, p. 430b; Altenburger, vol. IV, p. 524; Leipziger, vol. XXII, p. 339 and Erlanger, vol. 31, p. 31. The attribution alone is found in De Wette, vol. III, p. 386 and printed from it (as a duplicate) in the Erlanger, vol. 54, p. 46. We give the text according to the Erlanger, which brings an original print, comparing the Wittenberg and the Jena edition.

(3) For this reason it is necessary for me to write about the matter also for my own sake and for the sake of the gospel, to apologize, not to the blasphemers, who should not be good enough for me to apologize against them with one word; for the gospel should stink with them, and "be a stench of death unto death" [2 Cor. 2:16], as they deserve with their wanton blasphemy, but that the innocent consciences may not be further deceived by such blasphemers, and draw suspicion from me or my doctrine, or even be deceived into believing that it is not necessary to fight against the Turks.

However, I considered it good to omit such a booklet under the name of E. F. G., as a famous powerful prince, so that it would gain a better reputation, 1) and would be read more diligently [and so that], if it should ever come about that one would deal with a move against the Turks, the princes and lords would have a common memory. For I am willing to point out several pieces in it that will have to be considered, and that will be in the interest of power. Command hereby our merciful God in His paternal grace and mercy, that He may protect our Lord from all error and cunning of the devil, and enlighten and strengthen him to govern blessedly, amen.

[Den] 9. October 1528.

E. F. G.

willing

Martinus Luther.

1) Pope Leo the Tenth, in his bull, in which he banished me, among other articles, he also condemned this one, that I had said that to fight against the Turk is as much as to resist God, who visits our sin with such a rod. 2) From such an article may have taken those who say of me that I should resist and resist to fight against the Turk. I still freely confess that such an article is mine, and at that time was given by me.

1) Erlanger: win.

2) This article is the thirty-fourth in the bull of Leo X, which he issued against Luther on June 15, 1520. Walch, old edition, vol. XV, 1706. Compare also Luther's writing: "Grund und Ursach aller Artikel" (Reason and Cause of all Articles) 2c.

and defended. And if it stood in the world now, as it stood then, then I would and would have to set and defend the same even now. But it is not good that one has so soon forgotten 3) how things were then in the world, and what was my reason and cause, and nevertheless keeps my words and sends them elsewhere, where there is no such reason and cause. Who with such art could not also 4) make vain lies out of the gospel, or pretend that it is contrary to itself?

But this is how it was then: no one had taught or heard, nor did anyone know anything about the worldly authorities, where they came from, what their office or work was, or how they should serve God. The most learned (I do not want to name them) considered the worldly authority as a pagan, human, ungodly thing, as if it were an annual state of blessedness. Therefore, the priests and monks had persuaded kings and princes to do other things to serve God than to hear mass, to pray, and to establish masses.

Summa, princes and lords (as much as they would have liked to be pious) considered their status and office to be nothing, and for no worship, became right priests and monks (without wearing plates or caps); if they wanted to serve God, they had to go to the 5) churches. All gentlemen who lived at that time and experienced such things must testify to this, for my most gracious lord, Duke Frederick of blessed memory, was so pleased when I first wrote of the secular authorities that he had such a booklet copied, especially bound, and was very fond of it, that he might also see what his standing was before God.

At that time, the pope and the clergy were all in all, above all and through all, like a god in the world, and the secular authorities lay hidden in darkness and unknown. Now the pope nevertheless wanted to be a Christian with his troops, and yet he pretended to fight against the Turks. Above the two pieces, it increased, because I worked at that time in the doctrine, so the Christians and consciences.

3) So the Jenaers. Wittenberg and Erlangen: probably.

4) "also" is missing in the Erlanger.

5) "the" is missing in the Wittenberger.

I myself had not yet written anything about the secular authorities, so that the papists call me a hypocrite of the princes, because I dealt only with the spiritual state, as they should be Christians, and nothing about the secular. Just as they now reproach me seditiously, after I (by God's grace) 1) have written so gloriously and usefully about the secular authorities, as no teacher has ever done since the time of the apostles (unless St. Augustine), of which I can boast with a good conscience and with the testimony of the world.

Among the pieces of Christian doctrine I also dealt with that, where Christ speaks Matth. 5, 39. f.: A Christian should "not resist evil", but suffer everything, "go after the skirt, the cloak" and "let it be taken", also hold out the murderous cheeks. 2c, out of which pieces the pope with his high schools and monasteries had made a free counsel, which would not be commanded nor necessary for a Christian to keep, had thus perverted Christ's word and taught falsely in all the world and deceived the Christians.

Because they wanted to be Christians, yes, the best Christians, and yet fight against the Turk, bear no evil, nor suffer violence or injustice, I countered with this saying of Christ, that Christians should "not resist evil", but suffer everything and let it go; on top of that I put the article that Pope Leo vedammed. And I did this all the more gladly, so that I would take the lid off the Roman evil; for the popes were never serious about wanting to wage war against the Turks, but used the Turkish war as a cover, under which they played, and robbed the money with indulgences from German lands as often as they desired; as all the world well knew, but is now also forgotten.

(7) So they condemned my article not because it resisted the Turkish war, but because it tore down such little cloisters 2) and laid the road to Rome for the money. For where they would have wanted to wage war against the Turks in earnest, the Pope and the Cardinals had

probably so much of the 3) Pallis, Annalen, and other unspeakable access that they would not have needed such drudgery and robbery in German lands. Had there been a serious war in the simple opinion, I would have been able to make up my article better and 4) differently.

(8) I did not like that either, that they did so, 5) incited and provoked the Christians and the princes to attack and overrun the Turk, before we ourselves improved and lived as true Christians. Both of these things, and each of them in particular, are sufficient cause to oppose all war. For I will not advise a pagan or a Turk, let alone a Christian, to attack or start a war, which is nothing else than to advise bloodshed and destruction, which in the end is not fortunate, as I have also written in the booklet of warriors 6); so it never works out well if a knave wants to punish all that and not first become pious himself.

(9) But above all, I was moved by the fact that they were planning to fight against the Turks under the Christian name, teaching and inciting, just as if our people should be called an army of Christians against the Turks, as against Christ's enemies, which is strictly against Christ's teaching and name. It is against the doctrine when he says that Christians should "not resist evil" [Matt. 5:39], not quarrel or fight, not avenge or justify. It is against His name that in such an army there are perhaps barely five Christians, and perhaps worse people before God than the Turks, and yet they all want to use the name of Christ, which is the greatest sin that no Turk does, because Christ's name is used and honored for sins and disgrace. This would be especially true if the pope and the bishops were in the war, for they would profane and dishonor the name of Christ too much, since they are called to fight against the devil with God's word and prayer.

3) den" is missing in the Wittenberger.

4) Jenaer: more different.

5) In the old editions: "treib", which the Erlanger erroneously resolved with "treibt".

6) This writing is found in Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. X, 488 ff.

1) "by God's grace" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) In the old editions: "Helekeplin".

They would fight with the sword against flesh and blood, 1 Cor. 14:40]: How much less is the disorder to be which they are not commanded to do, but which they are suffered, that a Christian should leave his office, and take forbidden to do. another man's temporal office, or that a bishop or priest

(10) O how gladly should Christ receive me at the last should leave his office, and take a prince's or judge's judgment, if I, when required for the spiritual office (that I office? And again, that a prince should take the office of a should preach and take care of souls), should have left it, bishop and leave his office of prince; as such shameful and for it forfeited myself to war and the temporal sword. disorder still rages and prevails in the whole papacy, And how should Christ come that he or his own should contrary to its own canons and law.

have to do with the sword, war, and kill the bodies, when 13) Ask experience how well we have succeeded so far in the Turkish war, when we fought as Christians and under Christ's name, until we finally lost Rhodus 3) and to kill the people? For His ministry is to act with the gospel, and through His Spirit to save people from sins almost all of Hungary, and much of the German land as well. And so that one might feel and grasp that God is not life. For Joh. 6, 15, he fled and did not want to be "made with us to fight against the Turks, he has never given our a king". Before Pilato he confessed: "My kingdom is not of this world" [Joh. 18, 36.], and also commanded Petrum might have once dealt seriously with the Turkish war, in the garden to "take up his sword", and said: "Whoever although almost many or almost all imperial diets have been proclaimed and held for the sake of such things; takes the sword shall perish by the sword" [Matth. 26, 52. Nowhere does it seem that God mocks our imperial

(11) I do not say this because I wanted to teach that worldly authorities should not like Christians, or that a Christian should not want to wield the sword and serve God in worldly authority. If God wanted them all to be destroys Germany without effort and without resistance. Christians, or that no other ruler would have to be, he Why does this happen? Of course, so that my article, would be [a] Christian should stand better than it now which Pope Leo condemned, remains undamned but stands, and the Turk should not be so. I want to distinguish and separate the office and profession, so strong. And because the papists reject it out of courage without Scripture, the Turk must take it up and confirm it that each one should see to what he is appointed by God, with his fist and deed 4). If we do not want to learn it from the Scriptures, the Turk must teach us from the sheath, and follow and fulfill the same office faithfully and heartily, until we learn it with harm, that Christians should not get for God's service, as I have written about it elsewhere, especially in the booklet of warriors and secular nor resist the evil. Fools must be listened to with pistons. authorities 2).

(12) For even in the church, where Christians are to against the Turks in which we have not received great be one and the same, St. Paul does not want to suffer damage, if the bishops and clergy have been present? each one to submit to the ministry of the other, Rom. 12:4 How jam- and 1 Cor. 12:12 ff, but "each member" to his work.

1) In the old editions: Christians" instead of: a Christian. 2) This scripture is found in Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. X, 374 ff.

3) In the old editions: "Rodis".

4) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: with the That.

The fine King Lasla 1) of Varna was defeated by the Turk with his bishops, so that the Hungarians themselves blamed Cardinal Juliano for such misfortune, and were therefore astonished. And now, recently, King Louis should perhaps have fought more blissfully if he had not led a priestly army or, as they boast, a Christian army against the Turk.

(15) And if I were emperor, king or prince in the campaign against the Turk, I would admonish my bishops and priests to stay at home, to wait in their office, with praying, fasting, reading, preaching, and poor people, (2) as they are taught and required not only by the holy Scriptures, but also by their own spiritual law. But if they, as the disobedient ones against God and their own right, wanted to be in the war, I wanted to teach them by force to wait for their office, and not let me and my army be put in God's wrath and all the way through their disobedience; For it should be more harmless for me to have three devils in the army than a disobedient, renegade bishop who forgets his office and submits to an unauthorized person, for there can be no happiness with such people who oppose God and their own rights.

(16) I have heard of fine men of war who thought that the king of France, when he was defeated and captured by the emperor before Pavia, had all his misfortune because he had the pope's people, or, as they boast, the church's people with him. For after they came into his camp with a great cry, Ecclesia, Ecclesia! here church, here church! there was no more luck. This is what the men of war say, and perhaps they do not know the reasons why the pope (who wants to be a Christian, yes, the highest and best Christian preacher) does not have the right to lead a church army or Christian army, because the church should not fight, nor fight with the sword, it has other enemies than flesh and blood, which are called the evil devils in the air [Eph. 6, 12]. That is why she has also an-

The people of the land must not mix with the emperor's or ruler's wars, for the Scripture says: there shall be no happiness where one disobeys God.

17 Again, if I were a man of war, and saw a priest's or cross-panel in the field, even if it were a crucifix itself, I would run away as if the devil were chasing me; and even if they won a victory by God's decree, I still did not want to partake of the spoils and pleasures. 4) I had to call on Emperor Maximilian in the end, and let the same Emperor take over the game. If the evil iron-eater, Pope Julius, did not succeed, who was almost half a devil, he finally had to call upon Emperor Maximilian, and let the same rule the game, regardless of whether Julius had more money, weapons and people.

18 Thus I think that this next pope Clement almost succeeded in his wars, who was considered to be a god of war, until he lost Rome with all her goods by few and unarmed warriors. It is decided, Christ will teach them my article, that Christians should not wage war, and the damned article must therefore take revenge, for it is said by Christians, and wants to be undamned, but right and true. Although they do not turn to it, nor believe it, until they become more and more hardened and unrepentant, and go to ruins; then I say amen to them, amen.

(19) It is true that because they have temporal dominion and goods, they shall do and give of them 5) to the emperor and kings or princes what is proper to do and give of other temporal goods; indeed, such goods of the church (as they call it) shall especially serve and help above all other goods for the protection of the poor and 6) salvation of common estates; for to this end they are given, and not for a bishop to forget his office, and to war or fight with it. When Emperor Carl's banner or a prince is in the field, let every man run freshly and cheerfully under his banner, since he is sworn under it, as if he were a bishop.

4) In Walch's old edition and in the Erlanger: wolte.

5) Erlanger: daselbst von.

6) Erlanger: and to.

1) "Lasla" is the king of Hungary Vladislav III, who was defeated by the Turks under Murad II at Varna in 1444 together with the Transylvanian prince John Hunyad.

2) Walch and the Erlanger: wait.

3) In the old editions: "eins unbefohlens".

But if there is a bishop's, cardinal's, or pope's paneer, run away from it and say: I do not know the coin; if it were a prayer book, or the holy scripture preached in the church, I would also run to it 2c.

020 Before I exhort or provoke you to fight against the Turk, listen to me, for God's sake, and I will first teach you with a right conscience. For though I would, if I would let Adam go, be silent and watch the Turk avenge me against the tyrants (who persecute the gospel and do me all harm) and pay them, yet I will not do so, but serve both friends and enemies, that my sun also may rise both on the evil and the good, and rain on the thankful and the unthankful [Matt. 5:45].

24 First of all, since it is certain that the Turk has no right or command to pick a quarrel and attack lands that are not his, his warfare is, of course, pure sacrilege and robbery, by which God punishes the world, just as he sometimes punishes pious people through bad guys. For he does not fight out of necessity, or to protect his country in peace, as a proper ruler does, but he seeks to rob and damage other countries that do or have done nothing to him, like a sea robber or highwayman. He is God's servant and the devil's servant, there is no doubt about it.

22) Secondly, it must be known who the man is who is to wage war against the Turk, so that he may be sure that he has the command of God and is doing right, and is not in any way plotting to avenge himself, or otherwise having a foolish opinion and cause, so that, whether he strikes or is struck, he may be found in a blessed state and 1) divine office. There are two of these men, and they alone shall be two; one is called Christianus, the other Emperor Carolus. 2)

Christianus shall be the first with his army. For since the Turk is our Lord God's angry rod and the raging devil's servant, one must first of all strike the devil himself, his lord.

1) Wittenberger: or.

2) "Carolus" is missing in the Wittenberg.

and take the rod out of the hand of God, so that the Turk will be found in his power alone, without the help of the devil and God's hand. The same shall now be done by Mr. Christianus, that is, the pious, holy, dear Christians. Crowd. These are the people who are prepared for this war and know how to deal with it. For if the Turk's god (that is, the devil) is not defeated first, it is to be feared that the Turk will not be so easily defeated. Now the devil is a spirit that cannot be beaten with armor, guns, horse and man [Job 41,³⁾ 17. 18. ff.], and God's wrath cannot be reconciled with it, as it is written Ps. 147, 10. 11.: "He does not delight in the strength of a horse, nor in anyone's legs. The LORD delighteth in them that fear him, and in them that hope in his goodness." 4) Christian weapons and strength must do it.

24 Here you ask: Who then are the Christians, and where are they to be found? Answer: There are few of them, but they are everywhere, though they are few and far between, both under pious and wicked princes. For Christianity must remain to the end, as the article says: I believe a holy Christian church. But so it must be found: The pastors and preachers are to exhort their people most diligently to repentance and prayer. They are to do penance by denouncing our great innumerable sins and ingratitude, by which we have earned God's wrath and disfavor, so that He has given us into the hands of the devil and the Turk. And so that such preaching will be all the more effective, the examples and sayings of Scripture must be introduced, such as those of the flood, of Sodom and Gomorrah, of the children of Israel, and of how horribly and sometimes God punished the world, the land and the people, and they must emphasize how it is no wonder that we sin more grievously than they, even if we are punished more severely than they.

3) Here, as usual, the Erlangen edition has reprinted Walch's false Bible quotation: "Job 51, 17. 18," moreover, all Walch's other false quotations are reproduced in this writing, six in total.

4) Erlanger: wait.

5) Jenaer: and.

(25) Truly this strife must be begun in repentance, and we must amend our nature, or we shall strive in vain, as the prophet Jeremiah chap. 18:7-11 says: "I will soon speak 1) against a nation, and against a kingdom, to root it out, to destroy it, and to scatter it. But if such a people repents of its wickedness, against which I speak, then I also repent of the evil that I thought to do to it. Again, soon will I speak of a nation and kingdom, that I may plant and build them; but if they do evil in mine sight, and hearken not unto my voice, I shall repent of the good that I have spoken to them to do. Therefore say to those of Judah and to those of Jerusalem, saying, Behold, I am preparing evil for you, and I am thinking against you. Now therefore let every man turn from his evil way, and let your ways and your doings be righteous" 2c. We may truly let this saying be told to us, for God is thinking something evil against us because of our wickedness, and is certainly preparing the Turk against us, as the 7th Psalm, v. 13 f., also says: "If one will not convert, he has sharpened his sword, and strung his bow, and takes aim, and has laid deadly projectile upon it" 2c.

(26) In this connection, one must also refer to the sayings and examples of Scripture, where God allows Himself to be heard, as pleases Him, right repentance or correction, if 2) it is done in faith and trust in His word, as in the Old Testament of the Ninevehites, the kings David, Ahab, Manasseh, and the like; in the New of St. Peter, of the Prosecutor, of the Publican in the Gospel, and so on. And although I know that this teaching of mine will be ridiculous to the scholars and saints who have no need of repentance, as they consider it a bad and mean thing, which they have long since torn by the bootstraps, I have not left it alone for the sake of my poor sinners and mine, who are in great need of repentance and exhortation to repentance every day. Nevertheless, we remain all too lazy and lukewarm, and are not yet with those

Ninety-nine righteous [Luc. 15:7] will come over the mountain as far as they think they can.

27 After this, when they have been taught and admonished to confess their sin and amend their ways, they should then be exhorted to prayer with great diligence, showing how God is pleased with such prayer, as He has commanded and promised to answer it, and that no one despises his prayer or doubts it, but is certain of its answer with firm faith; as all this is set forth in many books of ours. For whoever doubts or prays for adventure, it would be better to leave it alone, because such prayer is a vain attempt of God and only makes the matter worse. That is why I would have opposed the procession as a pagan useless way, because it is more a show and appearance than a prayer. In the same way, I speak of saying mass a lot and calling on saints.

28 But it might do some good if, during mass, vespers, or after the sermon, the litany were sung or read in church, especially by the young people, and each one nevertheless sighed at home in his heart to Christ for mercy for a better life and for help against the Turk. I do not say of much long prayer, but of frequent and short sighing, with such one or two words: Oh help us, dear God the Father; have mercy on us, dear Lord Jesus Christ, or the like.

(29) Behold, such preaching shall meet and find Christians, and there shall be Christians who receive it and do it: it is not the matter whether thou knowest it not. The tyrants and bishops may also be admonished to desist from their raging and persecuting against the word of God, and not to hinder our prayer. But if they do not cease, we must not slacken our prayers, and we must hope and dare that they may enjoy our prayers and be preserved together with us, or that we may be rewarded for their raging and be destroyed together with them. For they are so wicked and blinded, if God were to give happiness against the Turk, that they should ascribe it to their holiness and merit and boast against us. Again, if it turned out badly, they should certainly never-

1) The Wittenbergers asked here and in other places of this scripture to quote the words as they are found in the later Bible editions.

2) Erlanger: so the.

3) Wittenberger: I's.

They are not only wicked, manifest, sinful and evil, but they also defend themselves and cannot teach a single thing rightly about how to pray, and they are worse than the Turks. Well, you must let God's judgment come home to you.

30 In such exhortation to prayer, one must also introduce scriptural sayings and examples, in which one finds how strong and powerful the prayer of a man has been at times, as the prayer of Elijah [1 Kings 17:1], of which St. Jacob boasts [Jac 5:17], item, Elisha and other prophets, kings David, Solomon, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Josiah, 1) Ezekias 2c. Item, how God promised Abraham to spare the land of Sodom and Gomorrah for the sake of five righteous people 2c. [Gen. 18, 28.) For "a righteous prayer is able to do much (says St. Jacob in his epistle [Cap. 5, 16.]) if it endures." And here it is to be indicated that they take care, and do not anger God, where they do not want to pray, and do not fall into judgment, Ezech. 13:5, where God says, "You have not set yourselves against Me, nor made yourselves a wall for the house of Israel, to stand against the battle in the day of the Lord. And Cap. 22:30, 31: "I sought a man among them to be a middle wall, to stand against me for the land, that I should not destroy it; but I found none. Therefore I poured out my wrath upon them, and consumed them in the fire of my fury, and paid them according to their deserts, saith the LORD."

31 From this you can see that God wants to have and is fiercely angry with those who do not resist His wrath and defend themselves against it. This means, as I said above, to take the rod from the hand of God. Here one should fast, who wanted to fast there. Here one should kneel, bend down and fall to the ground, since it is serious. For what has been bending down and kneeling in monasteries and convents up to now has had no seriousness, and has been quite a monkey game, as it still is. I admonish

1) "Josias" by us after 2 Kings 22:19, 20, instead of "Jesis" in the Erlangen and "Jesaias" in the Wittenberg and the Jena; because obviously the name of a king must stand here.

not in vain the pastors and preachers that they do and practice such things well among the people, for I see well that it is truly up to the preachers if the people are to improve or pray. Preaching, if Luther is scolded and blasphemed, and repentance along with prayer is not done. But where God's word rings out and is presented to the people purely and faithfully, 2) it is not without fruit. But they must preach as those who preach to the saints, since repentance and faith have been completely unlearned, and talk something higher.

The great need should move us to such a prayer against the Turk. For the Turk (as we have said) is a servant of the devil, who not only destroys the land and the people with his sword, which we will hear hereafter, but also devastates the Christian faith and our dear Lord Jesus Christ. For although some praise his rule in that he lets everyone believe what they want, only that he wants to be a worldly lord, such praise is not true. For he truly does not allow Christians to meet publicly, and 3) no one must confess Christ publicly, nor preach or teach against Mahomet. But what kind of freedom of faith is this, since one does not have to preach or confess Christ? Since our salvation stands in the same confession, as Paul says Rom. 10, 9: "To confess with the mouth makes one blessed", and Christ has very harshly commanded to confess and teach his gospel [Matth. 10, 32].

Because the faith must be silent and secret among such a wild and desolate people and in such a harsh and great regime, how can it last or remain, if it takes effort and work, even if one preaches most faithfully and diligently? That is why it goes and must go; what is caught from the Christians in Turkey or otherwise comes in, all falls there and becomes Turkish, so that seldom anyone remains; for they lack the living bread of souls, and see it freely.

2) The words: "und rein und treulich dem Volke vorgetragen wird" are missing in the Jena and Erlangen editions, also in Walch.

3) Wittenberger: it must.

The Turks are carnal creatures and must therefore join them.

(34) How can Christ be more powerfully disturbed than by these two things, namely, by force and by cunning? By force: to resist the preaching and the word; by cunning: to set before the eyes and provoke to oneself evil and dangerous examples daily. So that we do not lose our Lord Christ, His word and faith, we must pray against the Turk no differently than against other enemies of our salvation and all good, as against the devil himself.

35 And here the people should be informed of all the desolate life and conduct that the Turk leads, so that they may feel the need for prayer all the more keenly. I have often been annoyed and disturbed 1) by the fact that neither our great lords nor our scholars have taken the trouble to find out about the Turks in both spiritual and secular spheres, and that they are so close to us, for it is said that they also have monasteries and convents. Some have invented outright lies about the Turks to provoke us Germans against them; but there is nothing to be gained from lies, there is all too much truth. I will tell my dear Christians, as much as I know of the certain truth, some pieces, so that they may be moved and provoked all the more to pray diligently and with earnestness against the enemy of Christ, their Lord.

I have several pieces of Mahomet's Alkoran, which might be called a sermon or textbook in German, as the Pope's Decretal is called; if I have time, I must translate it. 2) so that everyone can see what a rotten, shameful book it is. First of all, he praises 3) Christ and Mary almost very much, as if they alone were without sin; but he thinks nothing more of him than of a holy prophet, like Jeremiah or Jonah, but denies that he is the Son of God and true God. He also does not believe that Chri-

stus was the Savior of the world, died for our sins, but preached in his time and directed his ministry before his end, like another prophet.

37 But he praises and exalts himself, and boasts how he has spoken with God and the angels, and how he is commanded to bring the world to his faith, now that Christ's ministry is over as a prophet, and to conquer or punish them with the sword where they are unwilling, and the boasting of the sword is much in it. Therefore the Turks think much higher and greater of their Mahomet than of Christ, because Christ's ministry has come to an end, and Mahomet's ministry is now in its final stage.

38 From this everyone can see that Mahomet is a destroyer of our Lord Christ and his kingdom. For whoever denies the pieces of Christ, that he is the Son of God, and died for us, and still lives and reigns at the right hand of God, what more does he have in Christ? Father, Son, Holy Spirit, baptism, sacrament, gospel, faith, and all Christian doctrine and nature are gone, and in place of Christ there is nothing more than Mahomet with his doctrine of his own works, and especially of the sword. This is the main part of the Turkish faith, in which all abominations, all errors, all devils lie in one heap.

(39) The world is still falling down, as if it were cutting with disciples of the Turkish faith. For it pleases reason out of measure that Christ is not God, as the Jews also believe, and especially the work that one should rule and wield the sword, and hover above in the world; there 4) then the devil shuts up. So it is a faith patched together from the faith of the Jews, Christians and Gentiles. For from the Christians he has that he praises Christ and Mary highly, also the apostles and other saints more. From the Jews they have that they do not drink wine, fast some time of the year, bathe themselves and, like the Nazarene, eat on 5) the earth. And so they continue in such holy works, as our monks do in part, and hope for eternal life on the last day. For they

4) i. e. pushes.

5) Thus the Jenaers. Wittenberg and Erlangen: "und auf".

1) Wittenberger: me still.

2) Marginal gloss of the Jena edition: "As he did afterwards. This refers to the text No. 56 in this volume: "Bruder Richards Verlegung des Alkorans" u. s. w.

3) "wohl" is missing in the Wittenberger.

nevertheless believe the resurrection of the dead, the holy people, which yet few papists believe.

40 What devout Christian heart would not be afraid of such an enemy of Christ? because we see that the Turk leaves no article of our faith without the one of the resurrection of the dead. There Christ is no Redeemer, Savior, King, no forgiveness of sins, no grace nor Holy Spirit. And what shall I say much: in the article it is all disturbed that Christ should be inferior and inferior to Mahomet. Who would not rather be dead than live under such a regime, when he must be silent about his Christ, and see and hear such blasphemy and abominations against him, and yet so mightily he tears down where he gains a land that one also willingly gives himself into it. Therefore pray, whoever can pray, that such an abomination will not become our Lord, and that we will not be punished with such a terrible rod of divine wrath.

41 Secondly, the Turk's Alkoran or faith not only disturbs the Christian faith, but also the entire secular regime. For his Mahomet (as has been said) commands to rule with the sword, and the most and noblest work in his Alkoran is the sword. And so, in truth, the Turk is nothing but a real murderer or highwayman, as the deed proves before one's eyes. St. Augustine also calls other kingdoms great robberies, and the 76th Psalm, v. 5, calls them "mountains of robbery" because an empire rarely arises without robbery, violence and injustice, or is at least taken and possessed by evil people, often with vain injustice, so that the Scriptures, Gen. 10, 9, also call the first prince on earth, Nimrod, a mighty hunter.

(42) But none ever arose with such murder and robbery, and became so powerful, as the Turks, who still murder and rob daily. For it is commanded them in their law, as a good divine work, that they should rob, murder, and devour and destroy, as they do, thinking that they are doing God a service. Therefore, it is not a divine order.

It is not the duty of the authorities, like others, to keep the peace, to protect the pious and to punish the wicked, but, as I have said, a pure wrath of God and punishment on the unbelieving world. And this same work of murdering and robbing is pleasing to the flesh without, so that it floats above and throws everyone's body and goods under itself; how much more must it be pleasing when a commandment is added to it, as if God wanted it that way and was pleased with it. For this reason, the Turks consider those to be the best who work diligently to increase the Turkish empire and continue to rob and murder.

And such a piece must also follow from the first piece. For Christ speaks Joh. 8,44. that the devil is a liar and a murderer. With the lie he kills the souls, with the murder the body. Where he wins with the lie, he does not celebrate and does not fail, he follows with murder. So, since Mahomet was possessed by the lying spirit, and the devil had murdered the souls through his Alkoran, and had disturbed the Christian faith, he had to leave, and also take the sword, and attack the bodies to murder. And so the Turkish faith did not come so far with preaching and miracles, but with the sword and murder, and it truly succeeded through God's wrath, so that, because all the world has a desire for the sword, robbery and murder, one day one would come who would give it enough murder and robbery.

(44) Yes, commonly all the spirits of the rotten ones, when the spirit of lies has possessed them and seduced them from the right faith, they have not been able to refrain from it; after the lie they have also come to murder, and have subjected themselves to the sword, as a sign that they were children of the father of all lies and murder. So we read how the Arians became murderers, that also one of the greatest bishops of Alexandria, called Lucius, drove the orthodox out of the city, and entered the ship, personally holding a mere sword in his hand, until the orthodox had all entered and had to leave. And many other murders they committed, the tender holy orders, already ready at the time, which is now at twelve hundred years.

45 Item, what murderers have been to

St. Augustine's times the Donatists, the same holy father shows superfluous in his writings, which is also at eleven hundred years; so even temporally the clergy rose; that makes, they were well with name and larvae bishops among the Christians, but because they fell from the truth, were subject to the lying spirit, they had to go away completely in his service, and become 1) wolves and murderers. And what did Muenzer seek now in our times, but to become a new Turkish emperor? He was possessed by the lying spirit, so there was no stopping him; he had to take up the other work of the devil as well, the sword, murder and rob, as the spirit of murder drove him, and caused such turmoil and misery.

46 And what should I say about the most holy. Father Pope? Is it not because he and his bishops have become world rulers, and have fallen from the Gospel through the lying spirit to their own human doctrine, that they have committed vain murder until this very hour? Read the histories from that time on, and you will find how the popes and bishops have made it their business to set emperors, kings, princes, countries and people on each other, and to wage war themselves, and to help murder and shed blood. Why? Because the lying spirit does nothing else, because after he has made his disciples lie teachers and seducers, he has not rest, he also makes them murderers, robbers and bloodhounds. For who has commanded them to wield the sword, to wage war, to incite and provoke to murder and war, which should wait for preaching and praying?

(47) They reproach me and mine for sedition, but when have I ever sought or provoked the sword, and not rather taught and kept peace and obedience? except that I have instructed and exhorted worldly authorities in their office to administer peace and justice. By the fruits one should know the tree [Matth. 7, 16]. I and mine keep and teach peace; the pope with his own wars, murders, robs, not only his repugnants, but burns,

condemns and persecutes even the innocent, the pious, the orthodox, as a true end-Christian. For he does this sitting in the temple of God [2 Thess. 2, 4] as a head of the church, which the Turk does not do. But as the pope is the end-Christ, so the Turk is the devil incarnate. Our and Christianity's prayer goes against both of them. They shall also go down to hell, and should the last day do it, which (I hope) will not be long.

48 Summa, as it is said, where the spirit of lies rules, there the spirit of murder is also with him, he comes to the work, or is prevented. If he is prevented from the work, he laughs, praises and rejoices when the murder takes place, and approves of the worst, because he thinks it is right. But pious Christians do not rejoice in murder, not even in the accidents of their enemies. Since Mahomet's Alkoran is such a great and manifold liar that he leaves nothing to Christian truth, how could it be otherwise than that he would also become a great and powerful murderer, both under the appearance of truth and justice? As null the lie disturbs the spiritual state of faith and truth, so murder disturbs all worldly order, so established by God. For it is not possible, where murder and robbery are in practice, that there is a fine, praiseworthy worldly order, because before war and murder they cannot respect peace nor wait for it, as one can well see with the warriors, therefore also the Turks do not respect building and planting very much.

49 The third part is that Mahomet's Alkoran does not respect the marriage state, but allows everyone to take wives as much as he wants. Hence it is the custom among the Turks for a man to have ten or twenty wives, and to leave and sell them again as he pleases, and when he pleases; for the wives are of no great value and are despised in Turkey, being bought and sold like cattle. Whether now perhaps some few do not need such free law, nevertheless such law applies and goes freely, who wants to do it. But such a being is not a marriage, and cannot be a marriage, because no one takes or has a wife of the opinion to remain with her forever as one.

1) "and" is missing in the Jena.

Body, as God's word says in Gen. 2, 24: "The man shall cleave to his wife, and two shall be one body"; that the marriage of the Turks is almost like the chaste life that warrior servants lead with their free women; for Turks are warriors, they must keep themselves warlike. Mars and Venus, say the poets, want to be with each other.

50 These three pieces I now want to tell, which I am certain from the Alkoran of the Turks. For what else I have heard, I will not bring forth, because I cannot be sure. Let there be some Christians among the Turks; let there be some 1) monks among them; let there be some respectable laymen: but what good can there be in the regiment and in the whole Turkish way and being, because according to their Alkoran these three things reign freely among them, namely, lies, murder, adultery, and everyone must keep silent about Christian truth, that they may neither punish nor correct such three things, but must look on and, as I see to it, at least approve of them with silence. How can a gruesome, dangerous, terrible prison be, but live under such regiment? Lying disturbs (as I said) spiritual status; murder disturbs worldly status; illegitimacy disturbs marital status. Now take away from the world *veram religionem, verampolitiam, verum oeconomiam*, that is, right spiritual being, right worldly authority, right housekeeping: what remains in the world but vain flesh, world and devil? There is a life, 2) as the life of good fellows, so with harlots' households.

(51) But that it is said how the Turks are faithful and kind to one another, and take care to speak the truth, I will gladly believe, and think that they have more good and fine virtue in them. No man is so bad, he has something good about him. Sometimes a free woman has such a good nature in herself as hardly ten honest matrons have. So the devil also wants to have a cover and be a beautiful angel, as an angel of light [2 Cor. 11:14], therefore he is a good man.

1) Taken by us from the old edition of Walch. In the editions: "jr eigen", which is hardly correct.

2) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer and Erlanger: Da ein Leben ist.

He also applies before some works, as works of light.

Murderers and robbers are much more faithful and friendly among themselves than their neighbors, yes, even more than many Christians. For where the devil receives the three pieces, lies, murder, and adultery, as the right stones and workpieces for the foundation of hell, he may well suffer, yes, help, that carnal love and faithfulness, as precious gems, which are nothing but straw and hay, are built upon them, he knows well that [it] will not remain before the fire in the end. In the same way, where there is right faith, right authority, right marriage, he is opposed to little love and faithfulness appearing there, and also to little being shown, so that he may also disgrace and despise the foundation.

And, what is more, when the Turks go to battle, their slogan and their cry is no other word than Alla, Alla, and they cry out so that heaven and earth resound. But Alla is called God in their Arabic language, from the broken Hebrew Eloha. For they have learned in their Alkoran that they should always praise these words: There is no God but God; which are all the right devil's words. For what is it said: there is no God but God? And yet he singles out no god before others. The devil is also a god, and they honor him with such a voice, there is no doubt about it. Just as the Pabst's warriors shout: Ecclesia, Ecclesia! yes, of course, the devil's Ecclesia. That is why I believe that the Turks do more in war than they do themselves; he gives them courage and cunning, leads their sword and fist, horse and man. How do you think about the holy people, who can call God in battle, when they have destroyed Christ and all God's words and works, as you have heard?

54 To holiness belongs also that he suffers no images, and is even holier than our iconoclasts; for our iconoclasts suffer and like to have images on the florins, pennies, rings and jewels, but the Turk none at all, coins vain letters on his coin. He is also a coiner, because he eradicates all authority and suffers no order in the secular state, as, princes, counts, lords, nobility, and others.

He is not a feudal lord, but is the sole lord of everything in his country, giving only wages and no goods or authority. He is also papist, for he believes to be holy and blessed by works, and considers it no sin to disturb Christ, to destroy authorities, to destroy marriage. Which three things the pope also does, but in a different way, namely with hypocrisy, as the Turk does with violence and sword. Summa, as I said, there is the basic soup of all abominations and errors.

(55) I will tell this to the first man, that is, to the Christian crowd, so that he may know and see what great need there is to pray, and that one must first strike the Turk's alla, that is, his god, the devil, and thus push his power and divinity away from him; otherwise, I am concerned, the sword will do little. For this man should not physically fight with the Turk, as the Pope and his followers teach, nor resist him with his fist, but recognize the Turk for God's ruthlessness and wrath, which the Christians must either suffer, if God visits their sin, or fight against him and chase him away with repentance, weeping and prayer alone. If anyone despises this counsel, let him despise it; I will see what he will do to the Turk.

The other man.

The other man who is due to fight against the Turks is Emperor Carol, 1) or whoever is the emperor; for the Turk attacks his subjects and his emperorship, who is obliged to defend his own, as a proper authority set by God. However, I hereby state that I do not want to provoke or instruct anyone to fight against the Turk, unless the first way is first kept, of which it is said above that one first atones and reconciles with God 2c. If anyone wants to get at this, let him dare his adventure. It behooves me to speak no further than to tell each man his office and to instruct his conscience.

57 I can see that kings and princes are so lax and careless in their attitude against the

Turks, that I immediately have a great worry, they despise God and the Turk too highly, or perhaps do not know how powerful a lord the Turk is, that no king of a desolate country, be it which it wants, is alone enough to resist him, unless God wants to do miraculous signs. Now I cannot provide myself with any miraculous signs, nor with special graces of God over Germany, where one does not mend one's ways and honors the word of God differently than has been done so far.

58 Well, enough has been said about that, whoever wants to let him say it. Let us now talk about the emperor.

59) And 2) first, if one wants to wage war against the Turk, that one does so under the emperor's command, banner and name. For then every man can assure his conscience that he will certainly walk in obedience to the divine order, because we know that the emperor is our rightful ruler and head; and whoever is obedient to him in such a case is also obedient to God; but whoever is disobedient to him is also disobedient to God; but if he dies in obedience, he dies in good standing, and where he has otherwise atoned, and believes in Christ, he is saved. I think that everyone will want to know this better than I can teach it, and God would have them know it as well as they think they do. But let us talk about it further.

(60) Secondly, the emperor's banner and obedience should be just and simple, so that the emperor seeks nothing else but the work and duty of his office, to protect his subjects; and those who are under his banner also seek the work and duty of obedience. You should understand this simplicity to mean that one should not fight against the Turk for the reasons for which emperors and princes have been tempted to fight until now, such as to gain great honor, fame and property, to increase land, or out of anger and revenge, and all such things. For therein vain selfishness is sought, and not righteousness or obedience. That is why we have had no luck so far, neither in fighting nor in advising against the Turks.

2) "And" is missing in the Wittenberger.

3) Wittenberger: also God.

1) Wittenberger: "is the Roman Keiser, who nu Keiser is."

61, Therefore, let this incitement and agitation stand, since the emperor and princes have been incited to fight against the Turks, as the head of Christendom, as the protector of the church and protector of the faith, so that he should eradicate the Turkish faith, and have thus based the incitement and exhortation on the Turks' wickedness and evil. Not so, for the emperor is not the head of Christendom, nor the protector of the gospel or the faith. The church and the faith must have another protector than the emperor and kings are; they are commonly the worst enemies of Christianity and the faith, as the 2nd Psalm, v. 2, says, and the church everywhere complains. And with such irritation and exhortation one only makes it worse and angers God the more, because one reaches into his honor and work, and wants to appropriate it to men; which is idolatry and blasphemy.

Even if the emperor should exterminate the infidels and unbelievers, he would have to attack the pope, bishops and clergy, perhaps not sparing ours and his own; for there is enough abominable idolatry in his empire that it is not necessary to deny the Turks because of it. There are too many Turks, Jews, pagans, and unbelievers among us, both with publicly false doctrine and with an annoyingly shameful life. Let the Turk believe and live as he pleases, just as the papacy and other false Christians are allowed to live.

The Emperor's sword has nothing to do with faith, it belongs to physical, worldly matters, so that God will not become angry with us, if we pervert and confuse His order, and He in turn will also pervert and confuse us in all misfortune, as it is written: "You pervert with the perverted" [Ps. 18:27]. As we may well feel and grasp the happiness we have had against the Turks, since they have caused heartache and sorrow with the Cruciata, 2) with indulgences and the giving of the cross, and have thus incited the Christians to the sword and to war against the Turks, who, after all, have been associated with the

1) Wittenberger: den.

2) Cruciata will probably mean the cruise.

Word and prayer should contend against the devil and unbelief.

64 Rather, this is what should be done: to admonish the emperor and princes of their office and duty, that they think diligently and earnestly to handle their subjects in peace and protection against the Turks, God grant that they are Christians for themselves or not, although it would almost be good that they were Christians. But since it is and remains uncertain whether they are Christians, but it is certain that they are emperors and princes, that is, that they are commanded by God to protect their subjects, and that they owe it to Him to do so, one should let go of the uncertainty and play the game of conscience, drive them with diligent preaching and exhortation, and weigh down their consciences to the utmost, as they owe it to God, not to let their subjects be so miserably ruined, and as they do great and excellent sin, not to consider their office in this, and not to appear with help and counsel to the best of their ability to those who are to live under their protection with body and goods and are bound by oaths and debts.

For it seems to me, as much as I have sensed in our imperial assemblies, that neither emperors nor princes themselves believe that they are emperors or princes. For they are acting as if it were at their discretion and pleasure whether they should save and protect their subjects from Turkish violence or not; and the princes do not care about anything, nor do they think that they are highly indebted and obligated before God to be helpful and supportive to the emperor in this with their bodies and goods. Each of them lets it go and pass as if it were none of his business, or had neither commandment nor necessity that compels him to do so, 3) but as if it were in his free will to do or not to do.

66) Just as now, the common man does not think that he owes God and the world, if he has a skilled son, to put him in school and let him study, but everyone thinks that he has free power to raise his son according to his will, that it remains God's word and order where they are.

3) Walch and Erlanger: zwinge. In the old editions: zwünge.

want. Yes, the city councils and almost all authorities do the same, letting the schools dissolve as if they were free of them and had indulgences for it. No one thinks 1) that God earnestly commands and wills to draw the skilled children to His praise and work, which cannot be done without the schools; but for worldly nourishment everyone is now in a hurry and haste 2) with his children, as if God and Christendom had no more pastors, preachers, ministers, and the worldly authorities no more chancellors, councilors, or scribes. But of that another time; the pen must remain empress, or God will let us see another.

This is also what emperors, kings and princes do. They do not consider that God's commandment requires them to protect their subjects; it should be up to them to do so when they feel like it or have a good time to do so. Rather, let us all do so; let no one look at what he is commanded to do and what God commands and requires him to do; but let all our actions and duties be of our own free will, and God will give us happiness and grace, so that both of us, here by the Turk and there by the devil, will be plagued forever.

68 So then a useless launderer (a legate, I would say) should come from Rome, and admonish and incite the estates of the empire against the Turk with reports of how the enemy of the Christian faith has done so much harm to Christianity, and the emperor, as the sovereign of the church and protector of the faith, should do 2c. to this, just as if they themselves were great friends of the Christian faith. But I say to him: They have led your mother to beer for you, you impotent chatterer, for you do nothing with that, as if the emperor should once do a good Christian unbidden work, which is at his discretion, and his conscience is not touched by it, or he is reminded of his necessary office, commanded by God, but put at home to his good will.

69. but so should a legacy on the

1) Wittenberger: commemorates.

2) "Eile" here is noun and "jedermann" the dative. Dietz, Wörterbuch, s. v. "eile".

3) "that" is missing in the Erlanger.

If you want to be emperors and princes, act as emperors and princes, or the Turk will teach you through God's wrath and disfavor. Germany, or the Empire, has been given to you by God and commanded that you should protect, govern, advise and help it, and not only should, but also must, at the loss of your souls' blessedness and divine favors and graces.

70 But now it is clear that you are not in earnest, nor do you believe it, but you consider your office a joke and a disgrace, just as if it were a mummery for carnival. For you let your subjects, who are commanded to you by God, be miserably tormented by the Turk, led away, violated, plundered, strangled and sold. Do you not think that, because God has commanded you such an office and given you money and people for it, you can do it well and carry it out, that he will demand from your hands all your subjects, whom you have so shamefully abandoned, and meanwhile you have danced, bragged, flaunted and played?

For if you seriously believed that you were appointed and ordered by God to be emperors and princes, you would leave off for a while the building and struggling for high seats and other useless splendor and faithfully counsel how you would fulfill your office and God's commandment, and save your conscience from all the blood and sorrow of your subjects, which the Turk commits against them. For how can God or a godly heart think otherwise of you than that you are enemies of your subjects, or that you have a secret alliance with the Turk, or at least that you consider yourselves neither emperors nor princes, but mere dolls and puppets, where children play along? Otherwise it would be impossible for your conscience to leave you alone, since you seriously considered yourselves to be sovereigns set by God, that you should not even speak and counsel about such things in a different way than has been done so far, because you see that you yourselves are Turks.

4) Banketen - Banketiren, holding banquets.

Become without ceasing to your own subjects.

72. Yes, meanwhile take before you Luther's things, and act in the devil's name, whether one may eat meat during fasting, and nuns may take men and the like, of which you are not commanded to act, nor has God given you a single commandment to do so; And meanwhile hang in the smoke this serious, strict commandment of God, so that he has set you as patrons over poor Germany, and meanwhile become murderers, traitors and bloodhounds to your own pious, faithful, obedient subjects, and let, yes, throw them meanwhile 1) into the jaws of the Turk, as a reward, so that they put body and money, goods and honor with you and advance them to you. A good orator can see here what I would like to say if I were skilled in the art of oratory, and what a legate should do and say at the Diet if he wanted to perform his duties faithfully and honestly.

That is why I said above that Carolus, or 2) the emperor, should be the man to fight against the Turk, and under his banner it should go. O! such is so easy that [it] has long since torn at everyone's shoes, and Luther herewith teaches nothing new, but a vain, rotten old thing. Yes, my dear, the emperor should truly look at himself with different eyes than he has done so far, and you should also look at his banner with different eyes. I speak well of the same emperor and panier, since you speak of, but you do not speak of the eyes, since I speak of. God's commandment is to be seen in the banner, which says: Protect the righteous, punish the wicked. Tell me, how many are those who can read such things in Caesar's banner, or believe them in earnest? Don't you think that their conscience would frighten them if they looked at the banner, as they would have to acknowledge themselves highly guilty before God of neglecting to protect and help their faithful subjects? Dear, it is not a bad silk cloth, a banner, there are letters on it, who will read them, the tickling and the panketiren shall well pass away.

74 However, the fact that it has been considered bad up to now

The fact that the princes considered it a silk cloth proves itself, because the emperor would have thrown it up long ago; then the princes would have followed, and the Turk would not have become so powerful. But since the princes called it the emperor's panier with their mouths, and yet were disobedient with their fists, and in fact considered it to be a mere silk cloth, it went as it is now before our eyes. And may God grant that we may not henceforth be too slow, I with my admonition, and the lords with their banner, and may it be done to us as it was done to the children of Israel, who at first would not fight against the Amorites, when God commanded, but afterwards, when they would, they were smitten, for God would not be with them. But 3) Let no one despair; repentance and righteousness always find grace.

After that, when emperors and princes realize that they owe such protection to their subjects out of God's commandment, mail should also admonish them that they should not be presumptuous and do so out of defiance, or rely on their own power or ideas, as one finds many foolish princes who say: I have the right and justification, therefore I will do it. They go there with pride and insistence on their power, but in the end they also win the fight in their necks. For if they did not feel their power, justice would move them little enough, as is proven in other matters, where they do not respect the law.

Therefore, it is not enough for you to know that God has commanded you to do this or that; you must also do it with fear and humility. For God does not command nor command anyone to do anything by his own counsel or power, but he also wants to be in the game and to be feared. Yes, he wants to do it through us and be asked for it, so that we do not presume and forget his help, as the Psalter says, Ps. 147, 11: "The Lord is pleased with those who fear him and wait for his goodness. Otherwise, we should think that we can do it, and that we do not need God's help, and that we do not take advantage of His goodness.

3) Erlanger: Still.

4) "wohl" is missing in the Wittenberger.

5) "not" is missing in the Wittenberger.

1) "dieweil" is missing in the Wittenberg.
2) "Carolus or" is missing in the Wittenberg.

of victory and the honor that is his alone.

Therefore an emperor or a prince should learn the verse in the Psalter, Ps. 44, 7, 8: "I will not rely on my bow, and my sword will not help me. But thou wilt save us from our enemies, and put to shame them that hate us," and what more the same whole Psalm says. And Ps. 60:12, 13, 14: "O Lord God, you do not go out to our army. Help us in our distress, for the help of men is of no avail. With God we will do deeds, he will trample our enemies" 2c. Many kings and great princes, from the beginning to this day, have had to make such and such sayings come true with their own examples, which nevertheless had for themselves God's commandment, justification and right; therefore, let emperors and princes not be a joke.

78. Here read the excellent example, Judges 20:18, 21, 23. 20, 18. 21. 23. that the children of Israel were twice defeated by the Benjamites, despite the fact that God had called them to fight and had the best of rights. But their defiance and presumption overthrew them, as the text there says: *fidentes fortitudine et numero*. It is true, horse, man, weapons and everything that is necessary for fighting, one should have, if it can be obtained, so that one does not tempt God. But if one has it, 1) one should not defy it, so that one does not forget or despise God, for it is written: "all victory comes from heaven" [1 Macc. 3, 19].

If these two things are there, God's commandment and our humility, then there is no danger or need, as far as the other man, the emperor, is concerned, then we are strong enough for all the world and there must be happiness and salvation. But if there is no good fortune, then there is certainly a lack of both of these, so that either one does not get it out of obedience to divine command, or out of presumption, or the first man of war, the Christian, 2) is not there with his prayer.

(80) And is it not necessary here to admonish that one seek neither honor nor spoil in the dispute; for he who disputes with humility and in obedience to divine command, and alone, be-

If a man, in accordance with his office, simply means to protect and shield his subjects, he will probably forget the honor and the spoils. Yes, it will come to him unsought more abundantly and more gloriously than he may wish.

(81) Here shall someone say, Where shall such pious men of war be found, who will keep such things? Answer: The gospel is preached to all the world, and yet very few believe; nor does Christianity believe and remain the same. So I also write these lessons, not hoping that they will be accepted by all; indeed, the more part shall laugh and mock at me for it. It is enough for me, where I could teach some princes and subjects with this book; even if they are the fewest number, there is no power in my hands, there should still be victory and happiness enough. And if God wanted me to get only the emperor or the one who should get in his name and command, I would be very hopeful. It has happened several times, yes, it happens commonly, that God gives happiness and salvation to a whole country and kingdom through a single man, just as he also brings a whole country into all trouble and misery through a knave at court, as Solomon says in Ecclesiastes: "A single knave does great harm" [Eccl. 9:18].

82. So we read of Naaman, the captain of the king of Syria, that God gave happiness and salvation to the whole country through the same man, 2 Kings 5:1. So He gave great happiness to the kingdom 3) in Egypt through Saint Joseph [Gen. 39:5]. And 2 Kings 3:14, Elisha said to Jehoram king of Israel, "I would not look upon thee, if Jehoshaphat king of Judah were not there." And so, for the same time, the wicked kings of Israel and Edom had to be helped for the sake of a few pious men, who otherwise would have been ruined in all distress. And in the book of Judges one can see what good God did through Ehud, Gideon, Deborah, Samson and such individuals, although the people were not worthy of it [Judges 3, 21. 4, 4. 7, 24. ff. 16, 30.]. Again, what great harm did the Doeg, so to the

1) Erlanger: so shall.

2) In the old editions: the Christians.

3) Wittenberger: Kings.

What did Absalom do against his father David with the help and advice of Ahithophel, 2 Sam. 16, 22. 23!

This is why I speak, so that we should not be frightened nor moved by the fact that the greater number of unbelievers or unbelievers are fighting under the emperor's banner. Again, it must be remembered that a single Abraham is able to do much, Gen. 14:15 ff. and Cap. 18:24 ff. So it is also certain that among the Turks, as the devil's army, there is no one who is a Christian or has a humble and right heart. 1 Sam. 14, 6. The pious Jonathan said: "It is not difficult for God to give the victory by many or by few", and he himself did a great battle against the Philistines, which Saul was not able to do with the whole army 1). Therefore, it does not matter if the group is not good, if only the head and some of the nobles are righteous; although it would be good if they were all righteous, but this is not possible.

Furthermore, I hear that in German lands one finds those who desire the future of the Turk and his regiment, who would rather be under the Turk than under the emperor or prince. With such people it should be a nasty fight against the Turk. I know no better counsel against them than to exhort the pastors and preachers to diligently stand in the pulpit and faithfully instruct such people, to strike out their driving iniquity, how perfectly they are guilty of innumerable sins, and to incriminate themselves before God, where they are found in opinion. For it is a pity enough who must suffer the Turk to be his overlord, and bear his regiment; but willingly submit to it, or desire it, if he neither needs it nor is forced to it, he shall be shown what sin he commits, and how horribly he runs.

First, that such people become unfaithful and perjure themselves against their authorities, to whom they have sworn and obeyed, which is a great sin before God that does not go unpunished. For because of such perjury, the

1) "not" is missing in the Wittenberger.

Even the good king Zedekiah perished miserably because he did not keep the oath he had taken to the pagan emperor in Babylon [2 Kings 24:20, 25:7]. Perhaps such people think, or allow themselves to think, that it is in their power and arbitrariness to move from one lord to another; thus they proceed as if they were free to do and let what they want in this, forgetting and not considering God's commandment and their oath, so that they are tricked and guilty to remain obedient until they are forced out of it by force, or are killed over it. Just as the peasants in the next uprising also assumed, and were beaten over it. 2) For as one shall not strangle himself, but suffer if he be strangled by force by others: so shall no man turn himself out of obedience and oaths, unless he be brought out by others either by force, or by favor and leave.

86) The preachers must do this 3) with such people diligently and well, as they are compelled to do by their preaching ministry, in which they are obligated to warn and protect their parishioners from sin and harm to their souls. For he who willingly turns away from his master and goes to the Turk can never remain under the Turk with a good conscience, but his heart will always say to him and punish him thus: "Behold, you have become unfaithful to your overlord, and have robbed him of the obedience he owes, and have deprived him of his right and authority over you. Now no sin can be forgiven, the stolen goods must be restored; but how wilt thou restore to thy lord, when thou art under the Turk, and canst not restore?

(87) So both of them must go, that you must eternally strive and work, as you come again from the Turk to your overlord, or must eternally have remorse, sorrow and unrest in your conscience (God grant that despair and eternal death do not follow), that you have willingly given yourself under the Turks without need against your oath and duty, and must therefore be there with your body, but with your heart and soul.

2) Marginal gloss of the Wittenberg and Jena editions: Anno 1525."

3) Wittenberger: This.

know you yearn over. What have you won? Why didn't you 1) stay over earlier?

88 Secondly, that such faithless, apostate, perjured people commit a much more heinous sin than all this, namely, that they make themselves partakers of all the abominations and wickedness of the Turks. For whoever willingly gives himself up to the Turks makes himself their companion and accomplice in all their deeds. Now we have heard what kind of a man the Turk is, namely, a destroyer, enemy and blasphemer of our Lord Jesus Christ, and instead of the gospel and faith he sets up his shameful mahomet and all lies; in addition, he devastates all worldly authority and domestic or marital status, and his wars are nothing else but murder and bloodshed, as a true devil's testimony.

Behold, he who joins himself to the Turk must be subject to such terrible abominations, and all the murder, and all the blood that the Turk has ever shed, also all the lies and corruption, so that he disturbs Christ's kingdom and deceives souls, will come upon his head. It is a pity enough if someone has to be under such a bloodhound and devil with violence and unwillingness, see and hear his abominations, as the pious Lot had to do and suffer in Sodom, as St. Peter writes [1 Petr. 2, 7]; it is not necessary to seek or desire such willingly.

(90) How much rather should one die twice as an obedient man under his overlord in war, than that he, like a poor Lot, should be brought by force under such Sodom and Gomorrah; let it not be said that a pious man should desire to give himself willingly to it, in addition with disobedience and against God's commandment and his own duty. That would mean not only making oneself a party to all the wickedness of the Turk and the devil, but also strengthening and promoting it. Just as Judas not only took part in the wickedness of the Jews against Christ, but also strengthened and helped them. Pilate did not act as evil as Judas, as Christ testifies Joh. 19, 11.

1) So the Jenaer. Wittenberg and Erlangen: "bleibst", which by the way is also the imperfectum.

91 Thirdly, this also is to be imagined of such people by the preachers: If they already give themselves up among the Turks, then they have not improved anything for themselves, and their hopes and aspirations will be far lacking. For it is the Turk's way that he does not let all who are or have anything stay where they live, but sends them far away to another country, where they will be sold and have to serve. And go ye after them according to the saying, Run out of the rain, and fall into the water; and: Take up a plate, and break a dish; that evil may become evil. And it hardly serves them right; for the Turk is a true man of war, who knows how to deal with land and people, and how to win and keep both, better than our emperor, kings and princes. He trusts and does not believe such renegade people, and has the insistence that he can do it, and must not do so to the people, as our princes do.

This, I say, is what preachers and pastors must do with such apostate people, with diligent exhortation and deterrence, for it is also the truth and necessity. If there are those who despise such exhortation and do not let all this move them, let them always go to the devil, as St. Paul had to let the Greeks, and St. Peter the Jews, so that nothing shall frighten the others. Yes, I would, if it came to a quarrel, that none of them would be or remain under the emperor's banner, but that all of them would already be with the Turks; they would be beaten the sooner and would be more harmful than useful to the Turks in the quarrel, as they are both in God's, the devil's and the world's disfavor, and as they are certainly condemned to hell. For it is good to fight against such evil people, who are so publicly and certainly condemned by God and the world.

(93) One finds many a desolate, desperate wicked man; but what has some sense will undoubtedly turn to such admonition, and be moved to remain under obedience, and not so brazenly cast their soul into hell to the devil, but will much rather live under their overlord with

2) "them" is missing in the Erlanger.

all wealth and let the Turks strangle them over it.

You say again, "If the pope is as evil as the Turk, whom you yourself call the end-Christ, with his clergy and followers; the Turk, on the other hand, is as pious as the pope, for he confesses the four Gospels and Moses along with the prophets; if one were to argue against the Turk, one would have to argue just as well, or much more, against the pope. 2c. Answer: I cannot deny it, the Turk considers the four Gospels divine and right, as well as the prophets, also praises Christ and his mother almost, but he nevertheless believes that his Mahomet is above Christ, and that Christ is no God; as is said above. Just 1) as we Christians also recognize the Old Testament for divine Scripture; but still, now that it is fulfilled and, as St. Peter says, Apost. 15, 10, is too heavy without God's grace, it is annulled by the gospel, so that it no longer binds us.

95 Mahomet does the same with the gospel, claiming that it is right, but that it has long since become obsolete and is too difficult to keep, namely, in those things where Christ teaches that one should leave everything for His sake, and love God with all one's heart, and the like [Matth. 19, 29, 22, 37]. Therefore God had to give another new law, which was not so hard and the world could keep, and that same law was the Alkoran. But if someone asks why he does not perform a miraculous sign to confirm such a new law, he says, "It is not necessary and in vain, for people had many miraculous signs before, when the Law of Moses and the Gospel went out, and yet they did not believe. Therefore his alkoran must not be confirmed by vain miraculous signs, but with the sword, which is more powerful than the miraculous signs. And so it has happened, and still happens, that with the Turks, instead of miraculous signs, the sword performs all things.

96 Again, the pope is not much more pious and looks like Mahomet out of proportion.

1) Here we have deleted "but" because it is too much.

similar, for he also praises with his mouth the Gospels and the whole of the Holy Scriptures, but he thinks that there are many things in them [too difficult and impossible], 2) and the very same things that the Turks and Mahomet consider too difficult and impossible, as Matth. 5, 27. ff. Therefore, he interprets them and makes consilia out of them, that is, counsels that no one is obliged to keep, except those who desire it; as Paris, along with other high schools, monasteries and convents, has taught this unashamedly up to now.

97 Therefore he does not rule with the gospel or the word of God, but has also made a new law and an alchemy, namely his decree, and drives it with the ban, just as the Turk drives his alchemy with the sword; he also calls the ban his spiritual sword, which is and should be called the word of God alone, Eph. 6, 17. 6, 17. Nevertheless, where he can, he also uses the secular sword, or at least invokes it and incites and provokes others to do so. And I am confident that if the pope could wield the secular sword as mightily as the Turk, there would perhaps be less lack of good will than with the Turk, as they have often tried.

98. and God also presses upon them both with the same plague, and strikes them with blindness, so that they are like St. Paul Rom. 1, 28. says about the shameful vice of dumb sins, that God gives them a wrong mind, because they pervert God's word. For both papistry and turkey are so blind and nonsensical that they both impudently commit dumb sins as an honest and praiseworthy thing. And because they do not respect the marriage state, it serves them right that it is a dog's wedding (and God wants it to be a dog's wedding), yes, that it is a French wedding and Florentine brides with them, and they make believe that it is well done.

For I hear horribly about horribly what a public glorious Sodoma Turkey is. Everyone who has looked around a little in Rome and in the French lands knows with what kind of wrath and plague God avenges the forbidden marriage there.

2) The sense requires an addition of the kind we have added here in the brackets.

and punishes that Sodom and Gomorrah, which were sunk with fire and brimstone before [Genesis 19:24], must be a joke and a prelude against these abominations, so that I am also very sorry for this piece of the Turkish regiment, yes, it should be very unpleasant in German lands.

What shall we do now? Shall we also war against the papacy, as well as against the 1) Turk, because one is as pious as the other? Answer: One as well as the other, so no one is wronged; for the same sin shall have the same punishment. This is what I mean, if the pope and his followers wanted to attack the empire with the sword, as the Turk does, then he should be as good as the Turk; as happened to him the other day before Pavia by Emperor Carl's army. For there is God's judgment: "He who takes the sword shall perish by the sword." [For I do not advise you to fight against the Turk or the Pope because of his false faith and life, but because of his murder and destruction.

But the best thing about the papacy is that he [the pope] does not yet have the sword, as the Turk does, otherwise he would certainly also subordinate himself to bring all the world under him, and yet he would bring them nowhere, except to his Alkoran, that is, to his decree faith. For he respects and knows the gospel or Christian faith as little as the Turk, even though he pretends to great Turkish holiness by fasting (which he himself does not keep), and [the papists] are thus worthy of glory, that they are nevertheless like the Turk, even though they are contrary to Christ 2c.

But against the papacy, because of its error and evil nature, the first man, Mr. Christianus, has awakened, and attacks him with prayer and God's word, has also met that they feel it, and rage. But no raging helps them, the axe is laid to the tree, the tree must be uprooted, where they do not bring other fruit. When I see that they have no intention of mending their ways, but become more and more stiff-necked the longer they go on, and want to stick their heads through it and boast: Three

or above, bishop or physician. And keep them so pious, before they improve themselves or abandon their shameful behavior (which they themselves and all the world confess is neither good nor bad), that they go to their companion and brother, the holy Turk. Well then, may our heavenly Father also hear their own prayer soon, so that, as they say, they may become bishops or bathers, amen! they want it that way, amen! that be done, and come true, as it pleases God. 2)

You say further: How can the Emperor Carl fight against the Turk at this time, because he has such great obstacles and treachery against him from kings, princes, Venetians, and almost everyone? Answer: What cannot be lifted, let it lie. If we cannot go any further, we must let our Lord Jesus Christ advise and help us through his future, which cannot be far away. For the world has come to an end, the Roman Empire is almost gone and torn apart, and stands just as the kingdom of the Jews stood; when Christ's birth was near, the Jews had almost nothing left of their kingdom, Herod was the last. 4) So it seems to me now, because the Roman Empire is almost gone, that Christ's future is at the door, and the Turk is the last of this empire, as a handover 5) after the Roman Empire. And just as Herod and the Jews were enemies of each other, and yet held together against Christ, so the Turk and the papacy are also enemies of each other, and yet hold together against Christ and his kingdom.

However, whatever the emperor can do for his own against the Turk, he should do, so that, even if he cannot completely control such an abomination, he may, as much as possible, defend and endure to protect and save his subjects. To which protection the emperor should not only be moved by his duty, office and God's commandment, not only by the unchristian and desolate regiment,

2) Wittenberger: Amen.

3) So in all editions; "which" i.e. the day of his future.

4) "Letze" - Farewell. Walch and the Erlanger: "die Letzte.

5) d. i. Addition.

1) "den" is missing in the Erlanger.

that the Turk brings into the country, of which is said above, but also the misery and misery that happens to the subjects; which no doubt they know better than I, how the Turk acts cruelly with those whom he leads away captive, as with cattle, drags, drags, 1) drives away what can go, but what cannot go, quickly stabbed, whether young or old 2c.

(105) All this and the like should move all princes and the whole empire to mercy, so that they forget or leave their own affairs and quarrels for a while, and with all seriousness unitedly help the wretched, so that it does not go completely, as it did with Constantinople and Greece, which also quarreled so lukewarmly with each other and waited for their affairs until the Turk overpowered them all with each other; as he has already almost come close to us in the same matter. But if it is not to be, and our unrepentant life makes us worthless of all grace, counsel and comfort, then we must let it go and suffer under the devil; but with that, those who should help here are inexcusable and do not.

I want to say and testify clearly that I did not call Emperor Carol 2) the man who should fight against the Turk for nothing. Other kings, princes or authorities who despise Emperor Carol, or are not subjects, or do not want to be obedient, I will leave them to their adventures. They shall do nothing on my advice or admonition; I have written this to Emperor Carol and his followers, the others are none of my business; for I know the pride of some kings and princes who would like Emperor Carol to be nothing, and they themselves to be the heroes and champions who have brought honor against the Turk; I almost grant them honor, but if they are beaten over it, they will have it. Why don't they keep to the right head and proper authority with humility? 3) The rebellion in the peasants is punished; should

1) Wittenberger: puts d. i. beats.

2) "Carol" is missing in the Wittenberg, here and in the following passages where "the emperor" is mentioned.

3) From here to the end of the paragraph is missing in the Wittenberg. This omission seems to us to be intentional.

But if the rebellion in the princes and lords is also to be punished, I fear that very few princes and lords should remain. Well, God grant that the Turk may not become a master of such punishment, amen.

In the end, I will advise you kindly and faithfully, if it comes to the point that you want to fight against the Turk, then you should arm yourself and send in such a way that we do not hold the Turk in low esteem, and place ourselves, as we Germans are wont to do, and come armed with twenty or thirty thousand men. And even if we were fortunate enough to win, we would not press on, and would sit down again and have a drink until the need arose again.

108. And although I am unskilled in teaching such things, and they themselves certainly know better, or should ever know better; But because I see that they are so childish about it, I must think that either the princes and our Germans do not know or believe in the power and authority of the Turk, or that they are not serious about fighting against the Turk, but perhaps, just as the pope has robbed money from German lands in the name of the Turkish war and indulgences, so they now want to fool us about money, too, according to the papal example.

For this reason, my advice is that one should not make so little of the armaments and not sacrifice our poor Germans to the flesh bank. 4) It would be much better not to start the conflict at all, and to give the Turks their land and people in time, without bloodshed in vain, than to let them win with such an easy battle and shameful bloodshed, as happened in Hungary with King Ludwigen.

For warring against the Turk is not like warring against the King of France, Venetian, or Pope; he is a different man of war. He has people and money in abundance; he has beaten the soldier twice in a row, and the people have listened to him. Rather, his people sit in the armor every day, that he with three or four hundred thousand men soon

4) Wittenberger: would be sheerly so good.

If you cut off a hundred thousand men from him, he will soon be back with that many men, and yet he will still have the emphasis.

111 Therefore it is nothing to meet him with fifty or sixty thousand men, if there are not so many or more in ambush. For, my dear, count his land; he has all Greece, Asia, Syria, Egypt, Arabia, etc., which is so much land that even if Hispania, France, England, Germany, Welsh, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and Denmark are all counted together, they are still not equal to his land. And he is in addition all powerful in excellent ready obedience. And he is also (as I said) in daily armament and exercises of battle, so that he can press on and deliver two, three, four great battles one after the other, as he has proved with the Soldan. There is another majesty with this Gog and Magog than with our kings and princes [Ezek. 38, 2].

I say this because I am afraid that my Germans know it or do not believe it, perhaps they think they are powerful enough on their own and consider the Turk to be a lord like the king of France, whom they easily want to resist. But I will truly be excused, and not have my tongue and pen weighed down with blood, if a king or prince alone opposes the Turk. For it is said that God is tempted when someone of little power sets himself against a more powerful king, as Christ also indicates in the Gospel Luke 14:31. Especially because our kings are not so skillful that divine miracles can be performed on them.

The king of Bohemia is now a powerful prince, but God forbid that he should lie alone against the Turks, but have Emperor Carol as his captain, and press with all his might. Well, if you do not believe it, I will let you learn it from experience. I know well what kind of power the Turk has. The historians and geographers lie to me, 1) in addition to the daily news.

1) Walch and the Erlanger: mir denn.

Experience; which they do not do to me, that I know.

I do not say this to discourage the kings and princes from fighting against the Turks, but to admonish them to prepare themselves wisely and seriously, and not to attack things so childishly and sleepily; for I would like to see bloodshed and lost wars occur in vain, wherever they may be. But this seriousness would be, if our kings and princes would meanwhile wall up their affairs on one clan and here both, head and heart, both, hands and feet, would be united, so that a single body of a mighty group would be, from which, if a battle would be lost, one would have to follow up, and not, as has happened so far, let individual kings and princes go up: Yesterday the king of Hungary, today the king of Poland, tomorrow the king of Bohemia, until the Turk devours them one after the other, and nothing is done with it, except that our people are betrayed and sacrificed to the flesh bank, and useless blood is wasted.

For where our kings and princes unitedly stood by and helped each other, and the Christian man prayed for them, I would be undaunted and of great hope that the Turk would cease his raging and find a man like Emperor Carol who would be a match for him. But if not, but should go and stand as it goes and stands now, that no one wants to be one with the other, nor faithful to each other, each for himself a man, or with a beggar rider service to the field, I must let it happen, will also 2) gladly help pray; But it will be a weak prayer, because I can have little faith that it will be heard, because such a great thing is done so childishly, presumptuously and carelessly, since I know that God is tempted and may have no pleasure in it.

But what do our dear lords do? They think it is a joke; and, although it is true that the Turk is on our neck, even though he did not want to go out against us this year, he is still coming every hour.

2) In the old editions: zwarten.

is equipped and skillfully available to attack us unarmed and do that which he has forbidden you. Yes, the evil and unprepared when he wants. This is how our princes spirit wants to hear you.

act now, as they plague Luther and the gospel; this is the But herewith I want to keep my conscience safe. For Turk, this is where the power lies, this must go. Just as whatever measures and ways I advise for the Turkish they are doing now at Speyer, where the greatest thing is war, this booklet shall be my witness. If anyone else to eat meat and fish, and such foolish things.

May God honor you, you unfaithful heads of your poor goes, I will let him go; God grant that he may win or lose. people. What devil makes you deal so violently with I will not enjoy his victory, and I will not repay his defeat, spiritual, unpleasant matters that concern God and the but I will be excused from all the blood that has been conscience, and so lazily and lazily do the things that God shed in vain. For although I know that with this book I will has commanded you to do and that concern you and your not find a merciful master in the Turk, if it comes before him, I have nevertheless indicated the truth to my poor people, now in the greatest and nearest need, and Germans, as much as I am aware of it, and both, the thereby only hinders all those who sincerely mean well grateful and the ungrateful, want to advise and serve and would gladly do so? Yes, meanwhile sing and listen faithfully. If it helps, it helps; if it does not help, let our to the mass of the Holy Spirit, he has great pleasure in it, dear Lord Jesus Christ help, and come down from heaven with the last judgment, and strike both Turks and and will almost be merciful to you disobedient, unruly Pope to the ground, together with all tyrants and ungodly people, because you leave what he has commanded you, men, and deliver us from all sins and from all evil, amen.

54. Luther's Army Sermon against the Turk. *)

28 October 1529.

A Sermon to the Army against the Turk. Anno 1529.

Although I have given almost sufficient instruction in my booklet on the Turkish War as to the conscience and manner in which the war against the Turks should be conducted, I have the grace with my dear Germans that they neither believe nor listen to me until they wait too long, and faith comes into their hands, and then there is neither help nor counsel.

(2) Just as it happened to the people of Israel when they heard the prophets (as 2 Kings 17:13 ff).

We have been in the same situation now; no one wanted to believe what I wrote about the Turks. The same thing has happened to us 1) now; no one wanted to believe what I wrote about the Turk, until we now experienced it with such 2) great sorrow, and saw so many thousands of people strangled and led away in so few days. That is what we wanted. And if God had not helped us so miraculously and so unawares, we would only have experienced real misery in German lands.

1) "us" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) "so" is missing in the Wittenberger.

*On October 20, 1529, Luther informed Nie. Hausmann that he was working on this writing, on October 28 he wrote to Wenc. Link that the same would be printed (thereafter our time determination), and on January 3, 1530 Luther sent him and the Cordatus copies of the second edition. It was first published by Nickel Schirlentz in Wittenberg in 1529 and was reissued by him in 1530 and 1542. Furthermore, individual editions were published by Joh. Stüchs in Nuremberg in 1530 and by Georg Rau (Rhaw) in Wittenberg, 1541. In the collections: in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, 538b; in the Jena (1566), vol. IV, p. 472; in the Altenburg, vol. IV, p. 565; in the Leipziger, vol. XXII, p. 356; and in the Erlanger, vol. 3I, p. 80. We reproduce the text according to the Erlanger, which printed the first original edition, comparing the Wittenberg and Jena editions.

3 And if I know my dear Germans well, the full swine, 5 These things I have said against the unrepentant, then they should, according to their ways, sit down again stubborn enemies and persecutors of the word of Christ. and drink and live in safety with good courage, and not But because there are nevertheless many in the German need such a great mercy, shown, but forget it with all lands who love the word, and Christ doubtless has not a ingratitude and think: Ha! the Turk is now gone and fled, small number of members in them, for their sake this what do we want to worry much and spend useless costs sermon is to go out to comfort and admonish them in on it? he may never come back; so that we may honestly these dreadful and dangerous times. For the devil seeks receive our well-deserved punishment from God. Well, I through his witness, the Turk, not only to destroy the can do no more. When I said that one should not despise worldly rule, but also the kingdom of Christ and its holy the power of the Turk, that was a mocking and vain members from the faith, as Daniel says in chapter 7, v. 8. speech; there were many princes more powerful than he; Therefore I will divide this sermon into two parts. First, to I should not frighten the German princes so much nor instruct the consciences, then to admonish the fists. make them despondent. Let now the same jealousy come (6) To instruct the conscience is a good thing, that we forth, and comfort the princes, and despise the Turk's may know what the Turk is, and what he is to be held for, power. I mean, the Turk has made them liars and my according to the Scriptures. For the Scriptures tell us of words true.

(4) But for the sake of the wicked and blasphemers of Christendom before the latter day. One of them is a Christ they have not begun, neither have they left spiritual tyrant, who uses cunning or false worship and anything for their sake. Kings and princes, bishops and doctrine against the true Christian faith and gospel. Daniel priests have so far driven out and persecuted the gospel, writes in the 11th Cap., V. 36. ff, 4) that he should rise shed much blood and inflicted all plagues and above all gods, and above all worship 2c., whom St. Paul misfortunes on the servants of Christ, and the blasphemy also calls the end-Christ, 2 Thess. 2, 4. This is the Pabst and disgrace against the publicly recognized truth has with his Pabstthum, of which we have written enough. been so disgracefully great, and the people so The other one with the sword, bodily and outwardly, exceedingly wicked and wanton, that I have had to in the most horrible way, of which Daniel prophesies prophesy that Germany would soon have to pay God for mightily in chapter 7, v. 7 f., and Christ Matth. 24, 15. a foolishness; the same now goes forth and begins. God about a tribulation that has not been seen on earth, that help us and be merciful to us, amen. For since they are is the Turk. Therefore, because the end of the world is at so perfectly angry and wicked against Christ, that they hand, the devil must first attack Christianity with both his have wronged His word and His servants, 1) and He must power in the most terrible way and give us the right last suffer and be weak against them, He truly does right, moments before we go to heaven. Whoever then wants according to the saying: "No one was ever 2) so wicked, to be a Christian at this time, let him take heart in Christ, but a more wicked man came upon him" and departs, lets and only do not think of peace and good days from now himself be wicked, but sends to such wicked angry nobles on: the time of such tribulation and prophecy is here; another wicked man, the Turk, who wants to watch, likewise our defiance and consolation for the future of because they want to be wicked, which one will be wicked Christ and our redemption is also not far away, but will over the other. Now be evil who can be evil, now it is a quickly follow, as we will hear.

1) "exceedingly wicked" -- to be exceedingly wicked against, etc., in the following: to surpass in wickedness.

2) Erlanger: ward.

3) Walch and the Erlangeners: applies.

4) Here the Erlangen edition again reprinted Walch's false Bible quote "Dan. 12, 39.", furthermore all Walch's other false quotes in this writing, in total eleven.

(8) Therefore hold fast, and be sure, that the Turk is certainly the last and fiercest wrath of the devil against Christ, that he may drive out the bottom of the barrel, and pour out his fury altogether against Christ's kingdom; and also the greatest punishment of God on earth against the ungrateful and ungodly despisers and persecutors of Christ and his word, and without doubt the forerunner of hell and eternal punishment. For Daniel says that after the Turk judgment and hell shall quickly follow [Dan. 7:10]. And it is clear from the deed how horribly he strangles, impales and chops up people, children, women, young and old, who have done nothing to him, and acts as if he were the angry devil himself in the flesh, for no kingdom has ever raged with murder and rage as he does. Let us hear this from the prophet Daniel.

9 Daniel described four empires that would come on earth before the end of the world, as we read in Dan. 7, [v. 3-12],¹⁾ that he "saw four great beasts coming up out of the sea. The first was like a lioness, and had eagle's wings. The other was like a bear, and had three rows of teeth in its mouth. The third was like a parde, and had four wings and four heads. The fourth was a cruel and strange beast, and very strong, and had great iron teeth, so that it ate and tore about it, and what remained it trampled with its feet, and had ten horns.

(10) I looked at the horns, and behold, between them grew another little horn, before which three of the first horns were cut off; and that horn had eyes like men's eyes, and its mouth spake abominably. I watched until chairs were set and the old man sat down. The court was held, and the books were opened. I watched because of the horrible words the horn spoke, and I saw,

that the animal was killed, and its corpse perished, and was thrown into the fire to burn, and the other animals' power was also suspended."

II This is the text of Daniel, told in the shortest possible way, as much as is necessary for us now. Now the interpretation follows in the same chapter [v. 16 to 27], where he speaks:

(12) I came to one who was standing by, and asked him the truth about all this. And he laid it out for me, and taught me thus. These four great beasts are four emperors who shall come on earth; but the saints of the Most High shall possess the kingdom forever.

(13) Then I would have liked to know what the fourth beast was, which was almost cruel, which had iron teeth and paws, and ate and tore, and trampled the rest with its feet, and what the ten horns on its head were. And what the other horn was, before which three horns had fallen, and of the same horn that had eyes, and a mouth, the abominable thing spake, and was greater than the rest. I looked, and behold, the horn fought against the saints, and prevailed against them, until the old man came and held judgment with the saints of the Most High, and the time came for the saints to possess the kingdom.

14] "And he said thus: The fourth beast will be the fourth empire on earth, which will be greater than all kingdoms, and will devour, trample and crush all lands. The ten horns are ten kings who belong to such an empire. And after him shall arise another, mightier than the first, and shall humble three kings. And he shall speak against the Most High, and shall tread down the saints of the Most High, and shall presume to change the order and the law; and they shall be delivered into his hand for a time, and for some time, and for a little time. So the judgment will be held, that the power will be abolished and broken, and finally perish. 2) But the kingdom, Ge-

2) Walch and the Erlangeners: "umkonnt". Jenaer: "Umkomme". Wittenberger: "umbracht werde". The Wittenberg edition closely follows the text of our Bible in the rendering of this entire passage of Daniel. Our redaction is found in the Jena and Erlanger.

1) In the editions of Nickel Schirlentz from 1530 and 1542, a woodcut is inserted here, on which the three parts of the world and the four animals, which Daniel describes, are depicted; likewise in the Wittenberg and Jena editions. The citation that follows is reproduced in the Wittenberg edition with the words of our Bible, Dan. 7, 2-12, with some omissions. Our redaction is found in the Jena and Erlanger.

Let the power and authority that is under the whole heaven be given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is eternal, and let all kings serve and obey him.

15 This prophecy of Daniel is interpreted unanimously by all teachers of the four following empires. The first, the empire of Assyria and Babylonia. The other, the empire of Persia and Medes. The third, the Empire of the great Alexander and the Greeks. The fourth, the Roman Empire, which is the greatest, most powerful and cruel, and also the last on earth, as here Daniel clearly shows that after the fourth beast or empire follows judgment, and no other empire, but the kingdom of the saints, which is eternal. 2c.

Since 1) it is certain, and there is no doubt, that on earth the Roman Empire will be the last, as Daniel shows in chapter 2, v. 32, in the great image or pillar, which had a golden head, silver breast, bronze hips and iron thighs, it must follow that the Turk will be in the Roman Empire and must be included in the fourth beast. For this is decided: since the Roman Empire is the last, the Turk will and can never become as powerful as the Roman Empire was, otherwise not four but five empires would come on earth. Therefore, the Turk does not have to become emperor, nor does he have to establish a new or separate empire, as he may well have in mind. But he will and must certainly lack it, or Daniel would become a liar, which is not possible.

(17) Moreover, since the Turk is so great and powerful and is said to be in the Roman Empire, we must look for him in the Roman Empire and find him among the horns of the fourth beast, for it must be such a mighty thing as proclaimed in the Scriptures. Well, "horn" means a kingdom in the Scriptures, as here Daniel himself says that the ten horns are ten kings who belong to the fourth empire. So the Turk cannot be one of the ten, for the same horns are the kingdoms belonging to the Roman Empire.

have belonged, since it stood in its full power, as namely Hispania, France, Italia, Africa, Aegyptus, Syria, Asia, Grácia, Germany 2c. Such countries 2) the Romans have had all in full power, before then the 3) Mahomet or Turk has come.

(18) Daniel says that after the ten horns comes the little horn between the ten horns. Here the Turk comes and is found. For just as the little horn grows up among the ten and pushes away three of them, so a kingdom must come that grows in the aforementioned countries and kingdoms of the fourth beast or empire and gains three of them. All this shows and testifies also the work, and agrees with the text that Mahomet must be the same little horn, because he arose from little beginning. But he has grown in such a way that he has repelled and taken three horns in the Roman Empire, namely Egyptum, Greece and Asiam. For the Soldan 4) and Saracen have long had two of these horns or kingdoms inside, Egypt and Asiam, and have thus remained seated inside, as the Turk also sits inside to this day, and has gained the third horn, Greece, in addition. No one else has done this, and we see it before our eyes that it has happened: this is Mahomet's kingdom, there we have the little horn for sure.

(19) Even though the Turk chased away the soldier and took over such lands and held his court or seat elsewhere than the soldier did, it is not a different or new kingdom, but the same kingdom of Mahomet. For both, soldier and Turk, are of the same and equal faith, namely of⁵⁾ Mahomet. But that one drives out the other has also happened in almost all empires, that one brother has driven out the other, a magistrate has driven out his lord. How did it happen in Persia, since they moved the imperial seat and court from Media to Persia, nevertheless the same empire remained;

2) Wittenberger: "Such land", that is, such land. Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: Such land.

3) "the" is missing in the Wittenberger.

4) In the old editions, the spelling varies, sometimes the word is written "Soldan", sometimes "Soltan".

5) Wittenberger: den.

and the Assyrian Empire was transferred from Nineveh to Babylon, and the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople. So also now Mahomet's empire has been moved from Alcayr to Constantinople with the court camp, but nevertheless the same empire of Mahomet has remained. For the person and the court may well change in a kingdom, but the kingdom remains for itself in its manner, rule, faith and all its essence.

(20) Now that we have this same little horn, Mahomet and his kingdom, we can easily and clearly learn from Daniel what the Turk and the Mahometan kingdom are to be considered, and also what he is worth in the sight of God. First of all, he is supposed to be a mighty lord, as he is supposed to win three horns from the Roman Empire, that is, three almost the best kingdoms, as Egypt, Greciam, Asiam, and to keep them, and thus to be mightier than any of the ten horns. This is the clear text, and is thus found in the work; for no king, so gewest under the Romans, as France, Hispania, Welschland, Germany 2c., is so powerful as the Turkish or Mahometan empire, which the Turk now has. And thus sits almost in the middle of the Roman Empire, yes, in the Roman emperor's house, at Constantinople, as the small horn among the ten horns in the fourth animal means.

(21) Secondly, the horn has the eyes of man, which is Mahomet's alchemy or law, so that he rules; in which law there is no divine eye, but only human reason, without God's Word and Spirit. For his law teaches nothing but what human wit and reason can well suffer. And what he found in the Gospel, which was too difficult and high to believe, that he has delivered, especially that Christ is God and has redeemed us with his death 2c. This is what Daniel means when he points to the eye of the horn and says: "He will be subject to change the law and order, hear God's order, as the gospel and Christian doctrine.

22) Thirdly, it has a mouth that speaks abominable things, which are the cruel blasphemies, so that Mahomet not only denies Christ, but also completely abolishes Him, pretending that he is above Christ, much higher.

and more worthy in the sight of God than all angels, all saints, all creatures, and above Christ himself; as is clearly stated in his Alkoran, and the Turks boast daily, and the longer the more abominably they practice such blasphemies. Therefore Daniel speaks here of the same horn, and points to its great mouth: He will speak against the Most High, that is, teach against Christ, blaspheme him and defile him, so that 1) he does not consider him to be the Most High, but a bad and much lesser prophet than himself, and says that Christ's teaching has come to an end, since Mahomet has come.

23 Fourth, that he wages war against the saints of the Most High. This is not to be glossed over; I think we have seen and felt it so far. For the Turk is not so hostile to any people on earth as he is to the Christians, nor does he fight against anyone with such a thirst for blood as he does against the Christians, so that he may fulfill this prophecy of Daniel. Daniel calls the Christians saints of the Most High. For though there be many false Christians among the multitude, yet because the gospel and the sacrament, commanded by Christ, abide in one country, there are certainly many Christians in that same country; and though there be few of them, yet that same country, for their faith, preaching, and gospel, yea, for Christ's sake, which is the name, word, spirit, and sacrament there, is called Christian country, and the true saints of God. Therefore there are still many Christians in Turkey, and perhaps more than in any other country, as they are captives and must serve the Turk who has won them; as Daniel says here, that he should conquer against the saints and rule over them.

(24) As it happened in the days of Elijah the prophet among the people of Israel, when there were so many wicked and so few pious people that Elijah himself thought he was alone, and therefore desired to be dead [1 Kings 2:19, 4, 18], but yet there were found about seven thousand whom God had not forgiven.

1) "that" is missing in the Wittenberg.

2) Here is a striking example of how thoughtlessly the Erlangen edition was published. In Walch's edition, the number of the book was missing and the Erlangen edition printed: "Kings 19:4, 18" without adding the omission.

He had kept them pious and holy, for whose sake the people of Israel were called God's people and God's saints, as his name, word and spirit dwelt with them. As has happened now and up to now under the papacy, since everything has been so corrupted with human teachings and works that almost no Christians have been seen any more; but nevertheless some have had to be there, because Christ's name, baptism, gospel, sacrament, 2c. For the sake of which the whole country is called the land of the Christians, and they are called Christendom or Christ's people and God's saints, because St. Paul says in 2 Thess. 2, 4: The end-Christ, the Pope, should sit in the temple of God; now the temple of God is Christendom or the saints of God, as Daniel speaks.

(25) In this saying of Daniel, we must pay more attention and judge according to the Turk's opinion and will than according to the number of Christians. For the Turk does not take into account here how many or few holy Christians there are among us; he considers us all Christians, just as the name Christ is common to us all. For he is hostile to the Christian name, which the devil would gladly suppress with the sword of Mahomet; just as he also suppresses it with false doctrine among us, and thus wants to take revenge on our Lord Christ. Thus Daniel wants to say that according to the Turk's conscience and opinion all Christians (that is, saints of God) are whom he wars against, and considers that there is no worse nation on earth than the Christians. That is why the Turks call us no other than Paganos, that is, pagans; but they consider themselves the holiest people on earth.

The fifth, that he is fortunate in the wars against the Christians, and generally prevails and retains the victory. The same thing makes the Turks so proud, hardened and secure in their faith that they have no doubt that their faith is right and the Christians' is wrong, since God gives them so much victory and thus abandons the Christians, but they do not know that it is proclaimed here in Daniel that the Christians will be punished here on earth for their sin and that the innocent will be made martyrs. For

Christ must have martyrs, that is why 1) he has always let his own succumb bodily and be weak; again, his enemies succumb and be mighty, so that he may sweep and purify his own, after which his enemies, when they have well begun and have come to the highest, will be brought home with hellish fire forever. The blind, senseless people do not know such a judgment and way, and think, because Christ presents himself so weakly, that there is no people on earth more pleasant than they. But they will run away and the game will suddenly turn before they think, as follows.

27) Sixthly, the last day and the kingdom of the saints shall quickly come upon the Turkish kingdom and rages, as Daniel says here, that the horn's wars and victories shall last until the old man comes and sits in judgment. The Turks do not believe that God will redeem us and cast them into hell. But how long this will last, that he is so victorious, no one can know; for Christ says that no one should know about that day, except the Father alone [Matth. 24, 36Z. As Daniel also says here with dark words: "They will be given into his hands for a time, and for some time, and for a little while, and then the judgment will be held [Dan. 7:25].

(28) From which it appears that the kingdom of the Turk shall be overthrown from heaven, and that no king shall come to subdue him and become mightier after him; as Daniel also says here that the body of the fourth beast, after the great 2) blasphemy of the little horn, shall be cast into the fire to be burned. Revelation 20:9 also says that Gog and Magog will be consumed by fire from heaven. The same is written in Ezekiel Cap. 39, 6, that God would rain fire and brimstone on Gog and Magog and on their army. Now there is no doubt that Gog was the Turk who came from the land of Gog, or the Tartars, in Asia, as the Histories prove.

29) Nevertheless Christ has given signs, so that it may be known when the last day is near, and therefore when the last day will come.

1) So the Erlangen. Wittenberg and Jena: had.

2) "large" is missing in the Wittenberger.

Turk will have an end, then we could certainly prophesy that the last day must be at the door. For since Daniel says here that in the fourth beast the little horn shall be the mightiest and last, and we see publicly that in the lands of the Roman Empire there is none mightier than the Turk, and after him shall come no more; so the half of the Turk's scripture is already fulfilled, for he has the three horns gone (as said), and Daniel gives him no more horn. Accordingly, it is to be hoped that the Turk will henceforth gain no more land of the Roman Empire, and what he does in Hungary and the German lands will be the last gossip and scramble that he will have with ours and ours with him, and thus an end; so that he may well pluck Hungary and Germany, but will not possess them quietly, as he possesses Asiam and Egypt. For Daniel gives him three horns, and no more; if he plucks and tears a little from the borders and neighbors, that is his nightcap for a good night.

(30) Therefore the war and victory of Mahomet, of which Daniel says, has happened and been fulfilled most in Asia, Grecia, Egypt, and will come to an end when he is most powerful and best equipped, so that he floats and drives safely, as no one can resist him or resist him, and still intends to gain much land. Just when the same hour will come, when he will still want to do so much, and will be defiant and greedy, then Christ will come upon him with brimstone and fire and ask why he has so horribly persecuted and plagued his saints, who have done him no harm, without any cause. Amen. For the scriptures are all fulfilled, so many signs have happened this time, and so great light of the gospel is present, and such great blasphemy, wantonness, iniquity in the world, as never was, nor could be more grievous, must break down and come to an end. 1)

(31) So far we have seen what the Turk and his Mahometan kingdom are to be considered according to the Scriptures, namely, that he is an enemy of God, and a blasphemer and persecutor of Christ and His saints through

1) In the Jena one is added: Amen.

Sword and war, so that he is immediately directed and instituted to rage with sword and wars against Christ and his own. For although other kings of old have also persecuted Christians with the sword, yet their kingdom and reign were not instituted and directed to blaspheme Christ and wage war against him, but happened by chance, out of an abuse. If one king has persecuted, another king 2) has subsequently been good, and has let it go, so that it is not the kingdoms or regiments themselves that have striven against Christ, but the persons who have had the regiment have sometimes been evil. But Mahomet's sword and kingdom are directed against Christ, as if he had nothing else to do and could not use his sword better than to blaspheme and fight against Christ.

32. From this every man can judge his conscience and assure himself, if he is called upon to fight against the Turk, how he should think and conduct himself, namely, that he should have no doubt who fights against the Turk (if he starts war), that he fights against God's enemy and Christ's blasphemers, yes, against the devil himself, so that he may not worry whether he is slaying a Turk, shedding innocent blood, or slaying a Christian, but is certainly slaying an enemy of God and blasphemer of Christ, whom God Himself has condemned to hellfire by the Scriptures of Daniel for an enemy of Christ and His saints. Therefore, no Christian can be a friend of God in the Turkish army, denying Christ and becoming an enemy of God and His saints, but are all of the devil's own and possessed with the devil, like their master Mahomet and the Turkish emperor himself. For you must well grasp and notice the words of Daniel, when he ascribes to the little horn the blasphemy against God and the strife against the saints of God; which words bear no good, but all evil and wickedness, from the Turk or Mahomet.

33. that is why in the previous booklet

2) "King" is missing in the Wittenberg.

so faithfully that one should not wage war against the Turk as under the name of the Christians, nor should one attack him with war as an enemy of the Christians. For here you hear that the victory against the Christians and the saints has been proclaimed to Mahomet or the Turk, as has happened so far in the three horns that he has pushed off, that is, in Grecia, Asia and Egypt. Christ wants to be weak and suffer on earth with his own, so that he may make fools of the mighty and put them to shame, and he needs their rage to make heaven full of martyrs and saints for him (even though they are ignorant of it), so that his kingdom will be full the sooner, and he 1) will come to judgment and give the tyrants their reward before they have a chance.

34. But I have advised and still advise thus: that every one should be diligent to be a Christian, willing and ready to suffer from the Turk and everyone, but should not fight as a Christian or under a Christian's name, but let your worldly overlord get you, under the same banner and name you should travel, as a worldly subject, according to the body that is sworn to his overlord to be obedient with body and goods; this is what God will have of you, Romans 13:1 ff. 13, 1. ff. Tit. 3, 1. and especially where such a conflict is not done for the sake of gain or honor, but to protect and shield country and people, wife and child, 2c. as this war is against the Turks. Thus we read of the dear holy St. Moritz and his companions and many other saints, that they went into battle, not as Christians, nor against the Christians, but as submissive obedient citizens or knights, demanded and summoned by their emperor, or other of their authorities, whom they were obliged to serve with body and goods, and were not called a Christian army or people, nor a Christian battle, but the emperor's people or army,

35 Behold, then, your conscience is right and fine, and you can be a courageous, joyful man, so that such heart and courage will undoubtedly make your body and horse the stronger. For thou art sure that in thy overlord's obedience, and in

You must not fear that you will meet innocent blood in the Turks' army, because you have heard that they have been sent by God as his enemies to death and hell. You must not worry or fear that you will meet innocent blood in the Turks' army, because you have heard that they are condemned to death and hell by God as his enemies. And it is granted to you by your overlord that you shall execute such judgment on the Turk, and now your fist and spear is and is called God's fist and spear, and thus you are God's, the greatest of all lords, executioner or executioner, against his great damned enemy; how could you argue more honestly and more praiseworthily?

(36) But if he should stab thee, or slay thee, how canst thou die a more righteous death, if thou be otherwise a Christian? For, first of all, Daniel stands there, and makes thee a saint, saying, The Turk fighteth against the saints of God; that on the Turk's and the devil's side there standeth the road, that he, as a murderer, may strike vain innocent and holy blood, and make as many holy martyrs as he slayeth on our side. Just as it is certain that he will strike vain innocent blood, because he attacks those he has no right nor cause to, and carries out such murders without command and necessity. It is also certain that he makes many martyrs (for there must be Christians among them where the Turk fights against the saints, as Daniel says), and so the Turk does to you what Daniel says of him, namely, that he is a murderer of saints and a maker of martyrs.

Secondly, your conscience is well assured that you will be found out and stabbed by God's commandment in your overlord's simple obedience. And if it is to be changed, you should a hundred thousand times rather be a Christian, an obedient citizen or knight, stabbed by the Turk, than have the victory of the Turkish emperor himself with all his goods and honor. For, as I said, you are certainly a saint if you act like a Christian and fight in obedience; heaven is yours, there is no doubt about it. But what is the Turk's victory and honor, even of all the world, against heaven and eternal life?

38) Remember, how would you have done if you had lived in the time of the martyrs, when you had been

2) "of" is missing in the Wittenberg.

1) "he" is missing in the Wittenberger.

would also have strangled the evil emperors and tyrants for the sake of Christ? Or, how would you do now, if the pope, bishops, our emperor or tyrants strangled you for the sake of the gospel, as happens to many? You would still have to 1) believe that they would make you a saint and a martyr, and be sure that you would be found in a right state and obedience. Now what is the Turk but such an evil tyrant who kills God's saints and makes them martyrs? Without the Turk doing this with all his might, without ceasing, and making many more saints before all others; as is fitting at the end of the world, that the devil should give our Lord Christ a good, rich death. Dear, it is an excellent word that Daniel says that the Turk should not torture a few individual saints, as other emperors do, but should attack them with all his might and overcome them. In the battle, however, many more saints must be defeated than there are individual martyrs who are martyred from time to time in addition to the battle.

Thou knowest well that thou must die some day, and that thou shalt not be sure of any day or hour of death. How, then, if such a battle against the Turk should be your hour, and thus ordained by God? Should you not rather, even with joy, surrender yourself to God in such an honest holy death (since you have so many divine causes, commands and orders, and are sure that you will not die in your sins, but in God's command and obedience, perhaps in a moment you will come out of all misery, and go to heaven to seek Christ), than that you should lie on your bed, and long struggle with your sins, with death and the devil, and bite, and fight, and wrestle, in all your travels and troubles, and yet not have such glorious commandments of God? Here you die alone for yourself, and a faint gland or pestilence eats you away; there, says Daniel, many saints die with you, and have divine, holy, lovely companies that ride with you.

40. summa, who can drive all kinds of the

1) Wittenberg and Jena: müssest.

Death, in which we daily float in water, in fire, in the field, at home, in the air, on earth? So many beasts, so many pestilences are around us; one falls from the roof, one from the horse, one falls into his knife; some hang, stab, drown themselves; one otherwise perishes, one so perishes; one is slain for the sake of money, one for the sake of a woman, one for the sake of a word, yes, some for the sake of charity: We have to wait for many such deaths every day, and some of us dare to do so with joy, since there is no just cause nor divine command, and the journey to get there is yearly and difficult, and we should be so lazy or despondent here, since we have certain commands and pleasures from God to obey our authorities with body and soul; and if we are found to be Christians, we will certainly have eternal life with the saints. Would that such death were to be sought at the end of the world, when the hour is at hand. And whoever will not be moved to this, no cheaper curse could be wished for him than that he should fall to the Turk and become a Turk, the servant of the devil, as his master, the Turk, is, condemned by God to death and hell.

41 I speak all this for those who are Christians or would like to be Christians, so that they may know how to judge and comfort themselves at this time, so that they may not be too afraid of the Turk or of the devil, his God. For if the Turk were to devour the Christians all at once (if it were possible), he would gain nothing by it, except that his damnation would be all the greater and would come all the more quickly, and would lead the Christians to heaven all the sooner. Let him be as angry and furious as he always wants to be, with all the devils as well, so he must be servant and servant of the Christians, and just with this help for their good, so that he means to destroy them, because Daniel stands there and says that they are saints whom he strikes and chokes. Thus says St. Peter, "And who is he that can hurt you, if ye pursue good?" [1 Pet. 3, 13.] David also in the 116th Psalm, v. 15. "O how delicious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." And in the 72nd Psalm, v. 14: "And their blood is precious in his sight." Such and such comforting ones,

2) Wittenberger: in.

Glorious sayings make such a judgment that the Turk is a murderer of saints and thus does himself the greatest harm eternally; again, that his anger and murder must serve here temporally and help the Christians to great eternal glory, without his thanks, will and knowledge.

Who is the best at deceiving and murdering the other? The Turk murders the Christians temporally, to eternal life, but in the same he murders himself, to eternal hellish fire with all the devils. For the Christians have too glorious, powerful sayings, as we have heard. And Daniel calls them saints, and the Turk a murderer of saints; he will not gain much, and the Christians will not lose much. But so Mahomet shall be paid with his own, and the Christians shall be avenged on themselves, and receive his reward from themselves. Therefore I do not consider it a masterpiece that the Turk, in order to frighten the Christians, cuts up their children, stabs them and impales them on the fence posts, and what else cannot be done, strangles everything and acts cruelly. It is a great fool's play, even in the sight of the world; for no pious man would be frightened by seeing his child and wife hacked to pieces and impaled, but would rather become angry and bitter, and would dare to put on the stocking and the stalk, and whatever else was left; and even if he were dead, the rest would or should become all the more bitter and angry, and dare to put everything on the devil's limb.

But in the eyes of the Christians, such rage is much less terrible, for they know that such impaled and chopped up wretched little children and pious people are vain saints, and that the Turk could not do them so much good for the hundredth part, if he also made each one a Turkish emperor himself, as he does by acting so cruelly out of the devil's wrath, for he thereby sacrifices them to God in heaven. Nor could the whole world avenge itself on him so richly and gloriously as he avenges such people on himself, for he thrusts himself into the abyss of hell.

(44) Yes, you say, he laughs at it and asks nothing of it with all his people. 2) Well, let him laugh at it, too, and not be worthy to believe or know it. Christ will soon 3) drive away his laughter and teach him all this. For I write this (as I said) to the Christians for comfort, and not to the Turks or Turks to laugh at. Daniel has written enough to him before 4) all of us, proclaiming him an enemy and blasphemer of God, condemned to hellish fire. If Daniel's writing is despised, it does not matter if our writing is also despised; we have the text, which does not teach us, nor does it prove to us, that God's saints are those against whom the Turk contends. If they are saints of God, a Christian does not ask much about how cruelly the Turk or the devil deals with the children and Christians on the outside of their bodies; there must be angels waiting for their souls and carrying them on their hands and bringing them to heaven.

45 For it is written in Ps 91:11, 12: "He hath commanded his angels concerning thee, that they should bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone. So also saith Christ Matt. 18:10: "Verily I say unto you, that their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." We read in the books of Kings about the prophet Elisha, how he showed whole mountains full of fiery chariots and horsemen around him to his servant, against the Syrians. 2 Kings 6:17 If there were so many angels around the city for physical protection, how much more do you think that here in such a conflict the angels are there to receive and protect the souls of the Christians, or, as Daniel says, the saints of God? But that the Christians are not always protected bodily by the angels, as in the Old Testament, I have indicated above, that Christ will and must suffer here on earth, be weak and allow himself to be killed, so that his kingdom may be hastily increased and filled. For his

2) After "His", Walch's old edition has a question mark. The Erlanger has reprinted this as well.

3) Wittenberger: probably.

4) In the old editions: "for all of us", i.e. before we all lived. Cf. Dietz, Wörterbuch, p. 739, Col. 2, 2).

5) Wittenberger: such a whole.

1) Stocking - hull.

Kingdom is not bodily on earth, therefore his controversy is strongest when there is much suffering and many become martyrs; as he answers St. Paul 2 Cor. 12, 9. "Be content with my grace, for my power is made perfect in weakness."

46 In this case, Christians do the same, allowing them to enjoy the grace that they are Christians and saints of God through our Lord Christ, as Daniel says. And if it will not be otherwise, they will let the Turks win, boast and brag, but they will remain weak and let themselves be martyred. For they see that just as when they die there are vain angels waiting for their souls, so again in the Turkish army there are vain devils waiting for the Turks' souls and thrust them into the abyss of hell. Not that they should 1) throw away their arms and weapons, and thus let themselves be murdered by the Turks without defense, as the martyrs did and still do and should do, apart from their warlike deeds; But because Christians are subject to temporal authority, body and soul, and they are all called upon and summoned, each by his own authority, to fight against the Turks, let them do so as faithful, obedient subjects (as they certainly do, if they are true Christians) and gladly clench their fists and confidently strike, murder, rob and do harm as much as they can, because they have a vein to stir. For this is what their temporal authorities give them, to whom they owe obedience and such service, and God wants from them even unto death, Rom. 13, 1. Tit. 3, 1.

(47) Just as the holy martyrs of old did (as said above). When they were challenged by the emperor against a tyrant or other enemies, they did not throw down their arms and weapons and let themselves be murdered as the tyrant wished, for in doing so they would not have served their emperor well, indeed, they would have done much harm, but they faithfully clenched their fists and, according to their lord's command, happily stabbed and smashed, when they knew and thought that they would not be able to be considered as a "martyr" at that time.

Christians, but as servants and subjects of the emperor, were required with body and goods to fight, to strangle and to harm the enemies; and those who were slain in this way became vain saints, who were found to be not only true Christians, but also pious, obedient, faithful subjects. Christians should do the same, for the Turk is an enemy and a tyrant, not only against Christ but also against the emperor and our authorities; if the authorities demand it, they should go and throw themselves in like obedient subjects. If they are slain, well then, they have not only been Christians, but also obedient, faithful subjects, who have given body and goods to their overlords in obedience to God; blessed and holy are they forever, like the pious Uriah [2 Sam. 11, 17].

48 But because the Turk is nevertheless God's rod and a plague on sin, both of Christians and unbelievers or false Christians, let no one take such comfort and defiance, as has been said so far, and drive foolhardily and say: I am a Christian, I want it; but first convert and amend his life, and so come to such comfort and defiance with fear and earnest prayer. For I have said above that because Germany is so full of wickedness and blasphemy that it is too great a power and cries out to heaven, it cannot be otherwise if we do not amend ourselves and desist from persecution and blasphemy of the gospel, we must stand our ground and suffer a distemper; if the Turk does not do it, then something else must do it. Unless the last day itself comes. But if distemper or the last day comes, he who is a Christian and has corrected himself can suffer it and will be saved; the others must be punished and lost. I have written enough about this, that one should reform and pray, in a 3) booklet about the Turkish war, that it is not necessary to recover here.

2) "it" is missing in the Erlanger.

3) Thus the Wittenbergers and the Jenaers. Erlanger: that. Meant is the previous writing in this volume. Perhaps: "my" ?

1) Wittenbergers: they the.

The other part of the sermon against the Turk. 1) take all mercy from them and keep war people with it.

That is enough of the first part of this sermon, namely, *Quod non tollit Christus, tollit fiscus*. So it shall be, if thou to instruct and comfort the consciences. Now let us take wilt not give one florin for peace, to God for love and the other thing before us, also to admonish the fist, that service, give now ten or twenty for strife, to God for is, that one should dare and willingly stretch body and punishment and repentance. If we have received good goods to it; and where the authorities demand an from the LORD (says Job), why will we not suffer evil estimate for this dispute, that one should give the same also? [Job 2:10.]

as one owes, Rom. 13:7. In the same way, where it 51: To every activity there is a season, says demands the person or body, one should also run to it, Solomon, Ecclesiastes 3:1. Hitherto it has been the time because God has commanded obedience. For our noble of peace, now it is the time of strife; hitherto it has been squires have so far splurged, feasted, raced, prided the time of splendor and splendor, now it is the time of themselves, flaunted themselves with all too superfluous sorrow and labor; hitherto it has been the time of usury, food and clothing, thereby pouring all money out of the time of stealing, the time of scratching, now it is the German lands and corrupting themselves in body and time of spending, the time of paying and the time of goods (apart from what is sinful against God). It is time exertion; hitherto eating, drinking, dancing, rejoicing, 2) that they also prove their status and office and let it be laughing time, but now grieving, frightening, fearing, seen with seriousness that they are of nobility. Similarly, weeping time; hitherto resting, 3) sleeping, idling, safe the burghers and merchants have atoned long enough for living time; but now waking, restlessness, creating, their lust with excessive jewelry and innumerable usury weeping time. If we can gladly have that good time, and and avarice; if they have so long disguised, committed or yet thank God nothing for it, nor recognize it, let us now gathered so many hundreds of thousands of florins, they also tolerate this evil time and learn to thank God for that should also once repent of it for the sake of their hope, good time.

for which they have so far had such good quiet peace, and abused it.

50 So also the craftsmen and peasants have for so long deserved a good repentance by transgressing, toiling, stealing and robbing, in addition to other great willfulness and disobedience, especially since the gospel has come to light, through which they have become free and rich, redeemed from all toilers and beggars, so that they think they may no longer give to God nor to all his servants, but only to themselves, and snatch, on the market by transgressing as if they were stealing from the bag. For this they have had great peace, drunk, danced and sung in all security. Well, what they have saved, stolen and collected, what they have deprived their preachers and pastors of, they shall have brought together brother Veiten, the lansquenets, and have no thanks for it. The princes shall have it without

Yes, if God would always give us good times, and let us fill the earth up to heaven with all wickedness and courage, and let us be dear noblemen, we would like to suffer that, and so we are accustomed to good days and peace in all evil. Now we are lazy about the coming of evil times and strife, and we want to look askance and sour, to give treasure or to travel ourselves. Yes, we should be ordered. Why did you disobey before, when God's word was told to you? Now hear the devil in the Turk, who would not hear God in Christ.

(53) But if thou barest thyself, and wilt not give nor travel, well, the Turk shall teach thee, when he cometh into the land, and do unto thee as he hath now done before Vienna, namely, that he shall require of thee neither treasure nor journey, but shall set on thee house and farm, and take thee cattle and fodder, money and goods,

1) This caption is missing in the Erlanger.

2) Walch and the Erlanger: Freuens.

3) "Ruhens" put by us instead of "ringens" in the old editions, which we consider a printing error, instead of: "rugens", i.e. resting. This word is immediately followed by: "unruhe", i.e. restlessness.

stabs you to death (even if you feel well), violates or strangles your wife and daughter before your eyes, chops up your children and impales them on your fence posts. And in addition, which is the worst, you must suffer all this and see it with an evil, despondent conscience, as a damned unchristian who has disobeyed God and his authorities; or take you away with them to Turkey, sell you there like a dog, so that you must serve all your life for a piece of bread and a drink of water, in constant labor day and night, driven with rods and knuckles, and yet earn neither wages nor thanks. And where there is a storm, you must be the home of the lost 1) and do all the work in the army. Above all, hear no gospel, learn nothing of Christ and your soul's salvation.

Then you would gladly give one of two cows to be appraised, you would gladly offer half of your goods yourself, you would gladly travel under your prince yourself, you would gladly feed a preacher yourself who preached to you four times a year, and yet 2) everything will be for nothing. Behold, this is what you want, this is what you are struggling for now. For the Turk is the man who will teach you what good time you have now, and how miserably, ungratefully, wickedly you have spent, missed and misused it against God, His servants and your neighbor. The Turk knows how to discipline and humiliate the nobility, to chastise and make the burghers obedient, to tame the peasants and to atone for their courageousness. Therefore, think and be pious, and pray to God that the Turk does not become your schoolmaster; I advise you to do so, for he has shown all too horribly before Vienna how a fierce, impure disciplinarian he is.

I would wish (since our sins before God have left us so much wit and courage) that all Germans would be so minded that not a speck nor a village could be plundered nor led away by the Turk, but, if it came to such seriousness and yet, that what could defend itself would defend itself. Young and old, man

and wife, manservant and maidservant, until they were all strangled, and even burned down house and yard and ruined everything, so that the Turks would find nothing 3) but young children, whom they would spear and hack to pieces without that, if they took us away alive, and we could not help them. And that this should be done with prior prayer to God, in which they commanded everything to His grace, and as in obedience to the authorities, as said above. It would be better to leave the Turk an empty country than a full one. And who knows what such a Thurst would create among the Turks? If we are led away, it is much worse for us than if we are strangled, as we heard above. And it is a great risk that we would fall from the Christian faith to the Turkish faith in Turkey, to the devil in hell.

56 The Romans themselves wrote of the German women that they had fought and fought in battle in the past, just as the men had. And which maid or virgin has not strangled an enemy, must remain a virgin as punishment. Thus the new histories write of the Turks, when they invaded Lemno in Greece and stabbed the gatekeeper, the gatekeeper's daughter, seeing her father dead, took up his defense, 4) and fought the Turks in the gate until the citizens came and drove the Turks away. The Turks themselves also do this, that they prefer to be strangled rather than captured, and do not accept any prisoners again, even though they would like to return home.

For I do not respect such a small house, where one would want to defend oneself from it, the enemies would have to leave hair over it. But the men of war know all this better than I, who know nothing about such opportunities and runs, but I speak of this because in such a case it must be risky, and no mercy can be hoped for from the Turk when he leads us away, but must suffer all misfortune, mockery and ridicule in body, and in addition in spiritual peril of the souls, be deprived of the word and their annoying Mahometan life.

3) In the old editions: "fünden." Walch and the Erlangeners: find.

4) Wittenberger: accepted.

1) "Der Verlorne Haufe" - the troop. Compare Tischreden, Cap. 62, § 1. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XXII, 1438. Also "die erste Angriffscolonne," Seidemann, Münzer, p. 84.

2) "doch" is missing in the Erlanger.

I thought it would be best to command God and, out of duty and obedience to the authorities, to resist as long as and in whatever way one could, and not to let oneself be captured, but to choke, shoot and stab the Turks until we were lying there. For the fact that you 1) thought to keep your life for the sake of the young children is nothing, because you have heard that the Turks stab, chop and spear all such children and what they may not carry with them, so that you can neither help nor save them 2) but would only have to see greater misery and wretchedness in them. 3)

(58) Though they carry away the children with thee, hope not that they will leave them with thee: nothing shall be done. In Turkey the Christians who are taken captive are sold like cattle and like sows; they pay no attention to who is father, mother, child or wife here; the woman is sold there, the man here. So it is with parents and children, that neither is left with the other, as the buyers and sellers wish. That it would be better everywhere to defend oneself at home and let oneself be strangled, in obedience to God's will and the authorities, than to give oneself up to such a dangerous, shameful prison. This is my good wish, but I think it will remain a wish. For I say this for the benefit of my dear Christian Germans, who would like to be informed; the others do not need it, they themselves are full of conceit, sackcloth and barrel. But if we want to fight and defend ourselves against the Turk, we will have to think differently and in a new way, and we will have to get used to it in a different way, both with heart and hand, than we have been used to so far.

(59) Here I must also admonish and comfort the Germans who are already captives in Turkey, or who may yet be captives. Like the example of the holy prophet Jeremiah [Cap. 29, 5. ff.], who also wrote a letter to Babylon, admonishing his captive Jews to be patient in prison and to remain steadfast in their faith until the end.

1) "du" is missing in the Erlanger.

2) Wittenberger: rathen.

3) Erlanger: must.

the time of their redemption, that they should not be offended at the faith and worship of the Babylonians, which was great and had a good appearance, so that many Jews fell away. As I then hear and read, that also the Christians fall away very much and accept the Turk's or Mahomet's faith willingly and uncereemoniously for the sake of the great appearance they have in their faith. Therefore, my dear brother, be warned and admonished that you remain in the right Christian faith and do not deny or forget your dear Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who died for your sin.

60. Now therefore, since you still have room and place, learn the Ten Commandments, your Lord's Prayer, the faith, and learn them well, especially this article, where we say: "And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered 4) under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died and was buried, descended into hell, rose from the dead on the third day, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. "2c. For it is by this article that we are called Christians, and by this article that we are called, baptized, counted, and accepted into Christianity by the gospel, and by this article that we receive the Holy Spirit and the forgiveness of sins, and the resurrection from the dead, and eternal life. For this article makes us God's children and Christ's brethren, that we may become like Him forever and joint heirs.

(61) And by this article our faith is set apart from all other faiths on earth. For the Jews do not have it, nor the Turks, nor the Saracens, nor any pope, nor any false Christian, nor any other unbeliever, but only the true Christians. Therefore, where you come to Turkey, where you cannot have preachers or books, recite to yourself, whether in bed or at work, whether in word or thought, your Lord's Prayer, the faith, and the Ten Commandments. Ulld if you look at this article

4) "hat" is missing in the Wittenberger.

Press your thumb on one of your fingers, or otherwise give yourself a sign with your hand or foot, so that you may

well imagine this article and make it clear to yourself, and especially where you may see a Turkish anger or have a challenge, and pray with the Lord's Prayer that God will keep you from anger, and keep you pure and firm in this article, for your life and blessedness lie in this article. In nowhere to be found. For there the women are in a special the same way, St. Jeremiah admonishes his Jews in Babylon that when they see the idols of gold and silver, even our imprisoned brothers in Turkey complain about they should remember their God in Jerusalem and say to themselves: O LORD, thee only shall 2) be worshipped quietly, orderly and spiritually adorn themselves and 2c. [So do thou also here, when thou shalt see among the Turks a great appearance of holiness, be not moved, but thought into thy heart, and say, Verily, Christians do not say, Though thou be an angel, yet art thou not Jesus Christ; O Lord JESU, in thee only do I believe, help me 2c.

Among the other annoyances of the Turks, the most distinguished is that their priests or clergy lead such a serious, brave, strict life that one might consider them angels and not men, that it is a joke against them with all our clergy and monks in the papacy. They are often enraptured, even over the table with the people, so that they sit as if they were dead; they also sometimes perform great miraculous signs. Who should not be annoyed and moved by such things? But you, if such things happen to you, know and remember that they neither know nor think anything of your article, or of your Lord Jesus Christ, therefore it must be false. For the devil also can be serious, see sourly, fast much, do false wonders, 3) and holiness [Cap. 18, 14], and said against the beautiful, 5) delight his own; but JESUM CHRISTUM he may not suffer nor hear. Therefore, know that such Turkish saints are the devil's saints, who by their own great works want to become godly and blessed, and help others, without and apart from the one Savior JESUS CHRIST; and thus deceive both themselves and all others who do not receive this article from JESUS CHRIST.

4) Our monks want to help us to heaven with their own holiness. 63 Secondly, you will also find that they often come together in their churches for prayer, and pray with such discipline, silence and beautiful outward gestures, that with us in our churches such discipline and silence is article, for your life and blessedness lie in this article. In nowhere to be found. For there the women are in a special the same way, St. Jeremiah admonishes his Jews in Babylon that when they see the idols of gold and silver, even our imprisoned brothers in Turkey complain about they should remember their God in Jerusalem and say to themselves: O LORD, thee only shall 2) be worshipped quietly, orderly and spiritually adorn themselves and 2c. [So do thou also here, when thou shalt see among the Turks a great appearance of holiness, be not moved, but thought into thy heart, and say, Verily, Christians do not say, Though thou be an angel, yet art thou not Jesus Christ; O Lord JESU, in thee only do I believe, help me 2c. 64 Then press with the thumb on one finger, and think on Jesus Christ, whom they neither have nor regard. For Christ judges in the Gospel, Luc. 7, 44, that the poor sinner would be more pious with few offerings than Simon the leper with all his splendor. And the poor sinner, the tax collector, had to be better without fasting and celebrations than the arrogant Pharisee with his fasting and all his serious, see sourly, fast much, do false wonders, 3) and holiness [Cap. 18, 14], and said against the beautiful, 5) delight his own; but JESUM CHRISTUM he may not suffer nor hear. Therefore, know that such Turkish saints are the devil's saints, who by their own great works want to become godly and blessed, and help others, without and apart from the one Savior JESUS CHRIST; and thus deceive both themselves and all others who do not receive this article from JESUS CHRIST. 65 Thirdly, you will also find pilgrimages to the Turkish saints there, who did not die in the Christian faith but in Mahomet's faith, as they confess and boast; there the Turks pledge themselves, run and call upon them, as well as

1) Wittenberger: den.

2) So the Bible. In the editions: solle.

3) Wittenberger: Miraculous Signs.

4) "us" is missing in the Wittenberger.

5) Instead of "hübschen" in the Wittenberg: "schön gleißenden".

6) "which after all were holy to look upon" is missing in the Erlanger.

We went to our pilgrimages and called on our saints. Many are also helped, and many great signs happen, just as they have happened with us. We have written often and much about such false miraculous signs, which happen with us from the saints (as we are meant) and during the pilgrimages, that also some dead people have been raised, blind people have received their sight, lame people have walked, and the like; as Christ proclaimed Matth. 24, 24, that "the false Christs and false prophets should do such miracles, that even the elect might be deceived", the same as St. Paul proclaims in 2 Thess. 2, 9. For it is a small thing for the devil to afflict a man, so that he and everyone do not think otherwise 1) than that he is blind, lame, dead. After that, when he has made his idolatry, and has driven people away from Christ, for example, to call on the Holy One (that is, himself), then he ceases to afflict, so that man believes that his Holy One has helped him. He can also do so much art that he can sometimes drive away real sickness and heal real damage. For he is a doctor above all doctors in medicine, and a prince of the world. See what wonders he does with and through his magicians, how strangely he helps them to do incomprehensible things.

66. what he did to the holy man Job, what thunder and tempest he made in the air, and burned him all his goods, and slew him his children. In addition, he smote his own body with terrible and wicked sores [Job 1:14, 15, Cap. 2:7]. Behold, how he led our Lord Christ himself in the air to the temple, and from the temple to the high mountain, as if he were his God, and showed him all the kingdoms of the earth in a moment [Matt. 4:5, 8]. Can he now make weather, create pox, lead in the air, and thus play with the saints, as well as with Christ himself: what should he not be able to do with his ungodly and unbelievers? Therefore be warned, if thou shalt see or hear signs in Turkey, that thou remember thyself, saying, And if thou shalt raise up all the dead, and all the signs, that thou shalt not be able to do them.

1) Erlanger: wähnet.

If you deny and blaspheme Christ, or do not want to know Him, the devil will believe you instead of me; I would much rather stay with my weak Christ without signs and wonders than fall to your strong and mighty miracle-worker.

67) And in Turkey the advantage is that one can easily know such false miracles and beware of them, because they are not done in Christ's name, but against Christ's name, in the name of Mahomet. For, as I said, they think nothing of Christ, but rather mock and blaspheme the Christians with the name of Christ, as with an unfit holy name, which forsakes its own and does not help them against Mahomet. But with us under the papacy, such false signs are much more dangerous and difficult to recognize, because they happen with us, as with the Christians, and under the name of Christ, as from his Christian saints. Then he has his devilish game, to lead people away from Christ under the name of Christ in the fastest and most nimble way, as Christ says, that such false Christs would also deceive the elect [Matth. 24, 24].

68 Fourthly, you will see that the Turks, according to their outward appearance, are brave, strict and respectable. They do not drink wine, do not drink and eat as we Germans do, do not dress so frivolously and deliciously, do not build so splendidly, do not flaunt so, do not swear and curse so, have great, excellent obedience, discipline and honor to their emperor and lord, and have their regiment outwardly composed and pregnant, as we would like to have it in German lands. And although their law permits that a man may have twelve wives, and maids or concubines, as much as he likes, and yet all children are equal heirs, yet they keep all such wives in great constraint and obedience, so that even the man seldom speaks to his wives before the people, or sits lightly with her or jokes. For although the man entrusts such wives to him through the priests, he still keeps them.

2) Wittenberger: one.

3) "Germans" is missing in the Erlanger.

But they have the right and the power to let her go whichever way she wants, according to whether she deserves it or whether he 1) is fond of her or resents her. Hereby they force their wives violently. And even though such a marriage is not a marriage before God, but more of a sham than a marriage, they still keep their wives in such restraint and beautiful deeds that there is no such arrogance, lasciviousness, frivolity, and other superfluous adornment, food, and splendor among their wives as there is among us.

69 Now such an appearance is as great an annoyance to an unrepentant and weak Christian as there was no image of gold to the Jews in Babylon, and no Carthusian monastery is with us, because with us there is no order so holy that does not drink wine, and no woman or virgin must live in such restraint. Therefore, look ahead and press your finger with your thumb, for you will not find your Christ in this piece either. What good is such a beautiful thing if it is apart from and against Christ? Then you may well say the saying: It is beautiful evil, 2) but with us Alber is solid. For it is better to drink wine in moderation in Christ and to be merry, than to pretend to such an excellent sour thing apart from Christ, which neither prophets nor apostles nor Christ himself pretended. For Christ ate and drank both with men 3) and women, both with Pharisees and publicans. But the Turks must do it higher and better than God and His own Son, whom they blaspheme and persecute, as our clergy and gospel teachers do with us. Know therefore that Christ's kingdom does not stand in food or drink, nor in outward deeds, but in the faith of the heart, Luc. 17:20. And do not let such glitter challenge you [Rom. 14:23].

70. over this annoyance now beats the

It is a great fortune that the Turks have become so powerful, have so much victory, have so often defeated the Christians (as they think), and have so far increased so magnificently that no reason can interpret it otherwise than that their holiness deserves it, and that their faith and nature are so pleasing to God. They become so stubborn, hard and obdurate that one thinks it is impossible to convert a Turk.

71 Again, they hold that there is no nation more wicked than the Christians, and no faith more shameful than the Christian faith. And therefore they fall into such exuberant pride, to blaspheme and disgrace Christ and his Christians, that they praise and mock one another, saying: the Christians are women, but the Turks are their men; as if they alone were vain heroes and giants, and we Christians vain women and sissies, but do not know how sour it will end with them. The proud Babylonians were also men, and the Jews had to be women, but the same women remained both man and master in the end, since the Babylonians kept neither skin nor hair.

72. Behold, under this holy appearance of the Turks lie hidden, yes, unconcealed, so many monstrous, terrible abominations; Not only do they deny Christ, but they also blaspheme and defile him with his blood, death, resurrection, and with all the good he has done the world, and set their mahomet over him, so that they also blaspheme God the Father, and honor the devil in God's stead, after which they are also such bloodhounds, shedding so much blood and committing murder in so many countries as has never been heard of on earth. In addition, they practice such wicked and sodomitic unchastity that it is not to be said in front of chaste people, without what that is, that they respect marriage so little. They are also the greatest robbers and corrupters of all countries and people.

73 And who will tell all such abominations, of which they consider none to be sin, but all vain virtue? This means blindness over all blindness, and all such things are adorned with outward appearances (as said), so that many Christians fall away and return to their faith, and to such abominable, ugly things.

1) "he" is missing in the Jena.

2) In the church postilla, Walch, St. Louis edition, vol. XI, 20, § 48 at the end, there is another version of this saying: "It is already evil", but there should also be read as here: "It is beautifully evil", which all editions offer here. Also there is like here the sense: Everything what has a beautiful appearance is evil. The opinion of the opposite word: "It is Alber solid", is this: What is foolish in the sight of the world has firmness. Cf. 1 Cor. 1, 21. 27.

3) Wittenberger: Mannen. Jenaer: Man.

beautiful devils willingly give themselves. 1) Indeed, where there is such false holiness, there must be all vices in one heap; as we well see in our clergy that their blasphemy, arrogance, murder, avarice, fornication and all vices are without measure.

74 But they comfort themselves with this saying: "Do you think that God should let so many people err and be condemned for so long? just as our end-Christ comforts himself; which saying or thought can also push a dilapidated Christian and strengthen a stiff-necked boy. Just as the Jews of old sat down against the holy prophets and said: God is not so angry, he will not do so evil, as Micah writes [Cap. 3, 5] and the others. But one must put this saying and thought out of sight, and not judge of God's work or judgment according to man's work or judgment. For it does not depend on whether many or few people believe or do not believe, are condemned or saved, but on what God has commanded or forbidden, on what is his word or not his word: then one should look and think, and not pay attention to the whole world, even if they all lead to the devil. For God and His word remain, though heaven and earth pass away [Matt. 24:35]. Therefore hold fast, hold fast, I say, to your Christ, that you may be safe from such arrows and storms of the devil and remain a Christian, and you will be saved. Let the Turks and all the wicked, if they will not do otherwise, go to the devil. This is the exhortation to the prisoners, that they may stand firm in the faith against all troubles and temptations.

Now let us also comfort them, that they may be patient in their prison, and willingly suffer and bear all their miseries for God's sake. Now then, if God decrees that you be captured by the Turk, led away and sold, and that you must live at their will and be a servant, think that you will patiently and willingly accept such misery and service, sent by God, and suffer for God's sake, and most faithfully and diligently serve your Lord, to whom you are bound.

serve, regardless of the fact that you are a Christian and your master is a pagan or a Turk, therefore he 2) should not be worthy that you should be his servant. And by all means do not run away, as some do 3) and think they are doing right and well. Some also drown themselves, or otherwise strangle. Not so, dear brother, you must think that you have lost your freedom and have become your own, from which you cannot work yourself without sin and disobedience, without the will and knowledge of your Lord. For you are robbing and stealing from your master your body, which he has bought or otherwise brought to himself, so that henceforth it is not your property but his, like cattle or other property.

For now is the time to obey and keep the sayings of St. Peter and Paul, which teach that servants or bondsmen should be obedient, faithful, humble, honorable, and diligent to their physical masters, not otherwise than as serving Christ the Lord Himself, even though the masters are unbelievers or wicked; as you may read 1 Cor. 7, 21. f. Eph. 6, 5. 6. and Col. 3, 22.: "Ye servants, be obedient in all things unto your fleshly masters, not with service before your eyes, as to please men, but with singleness of heart and godliness. "2c. Also 1 Petr. 2, 18. For where you are otherwise a right Christian, such service and misery do you no harm. Yes, where you can be Christian and patient, it is good for you and useful for your salvation, as your cross, in which your faith is practiced and proven.

Remember the examples of all the saints. See how the archfather Jacob served the mischievous and wicked Laban, his brother-in-law, for Rachel, and faithfully endured his service, Gen. 29:20, 21. And after that his son Joseph, how he, stolen from his father and sold by his own brothers, served his pagan master so faithfully in Egypt, and was imprisoned for it, but finally came out gloriously and became a lord of the land, Gen. 39:4.

2) "he" is missing in the Wittenberger.

3) We have deleted the brackets around the words: "as some do".

1) Wittenberger: to give.

Egypt, 2 Mos. 1, 13. f., and yet none ran from his service, however unsleeping or pagan and wicked their masters were.

78] After this: Was not this a hard service, when the kingdom of Israel was led into Assyria, and afterward the kingdom of Judah into Babylon? King, queen, princes, priests, prophets, and many holier people than thou, had to serve and be servants, like Daniel and his companions (Daniel 1:4) under the cruel king, since they had to wait daily for much danger to body and soul, and also had to endure, with all shame and mockery, as the 137th Psalm well indicates: *Super flumina BabyIonis etc..* Admittedly, there were also impatient Jews who cried, lamented, cursed and murmured, and some fell from Judaism and became Gentiles. But it still had to be; the pious had patience, did not run away, but served with all faithfulness and diligence, like Daniel and his companions, and remained in the right faith; therefore they were also exalted, 1) and graciously and miraculously redeemed by God.

And coming to the New Testament, did not Christ have to let the Jews and the Gentiles 2) Pilatum and Herodem do with them what they wanted? Did not St. Paul have to be imprisoned, and almost all the apostles, some cast out into misery and banished, as St. John in Patmos, and afterwards many holy martyrs from Rome and other cities, driven from house and home, wife and child, to distant, desolate islands, and there work in quarries, and other hard labor, like the donkeys? Why would you have it better than your Lord Christ Himself, with all His saints in the Old and New Testaments? The disciple should not have it better than his master (says Christ), then he is righteous when he is like his master, Luc. 6, 40.

80 Thou doest no more with displeasure and impatience, than to vex thy lord, whose servant thou hast become, and to make him the more wicked, and to profane the doctrine and the name.

Christ, as if Christians were such wicked, unfaithful, false people, who would not serve, but would run away and steal for themselves, as the peelers and thieves, and thereby become harder and more hardened in their faith. Again, if you served faithfully and diligently, you would adorn and praise the gospel and the name of Christ, so that your master and perhaps many others, however wicked they were, would have to say: Well, now the Christians are a faithful, obedient, pious, humble, diligent people; and in addition you would put the Turks' faith to shame and perhaps convert many, if they saw that the Christians so far surpass the Turks in humility, patience, diligence, faithfulness and such virtues. 3) This is what St. Paul means when he says in Titus 3:8 that servants should adorn the doctrine of our Lord in all things.

For how wicked can it be to serve a Turk or a heathen, if you are and remain a believer and a Christian? Many a man here must serve a knave, a tyrant, or a wicked lord. Yes, how we must do under the papacy, since our tyrants catch us, force us, chase us away, drive us out, burn us, behead us, drown us, and do worse to us than the Turks do to you! We still have to yield, endure, suffer, serve, help, counsel, pray, lift and carry; all of which you would have to dare and wait for with us, if you wanted to be a Christian with us and confess Christ; for the pope is much worse than the Turk in this respect.

The Turk does not force anyone to deny Christ and adhere to his faith; and even if he rages to the utmost with the physical murder of Christians, he does nothing with it (as much as there is in him), except that he makes heaven full of saints. For his blasphemy against Christ and his outward appearance of holiness do not compel, but tempt and entice. But the pope, precisely because he does not want to be an enemy or a Turk, but the dear father, yes, the most holy father and the most faithful shepherd, he fills hell with vain Christians (as much as there is in him). For he tears the noble souls from Christ through his blasphemous

1) Wittenberger: heard.

2) In Walch and in the Erlanger there is a comma after "Heiden".

3) Walch and the Erlangeners: surpassed.

This is true spiritual murder, and almost as good as Mahomet's or the Turk's doctrine and blasphemy. But where he is not allowed such infernal devilish seductions, he also takes on the Turk's way and also murders in the flesh; if he could do it, without a doubt, he would probably commit greater murder and bloodshed than the Turk, as they have so far proven with so many wars, agitations and irritations under emperors and kings.

Summa, wherever we go, there is the right host, the devil, at home. If we come to the Turk, we go to the devil; if we stay under the pope, we fall into hell. Vain devils on both sides and everywhere. Unfortunately, this is the way things are in the world now, and the sayings of Christ and Saint Paul are in full swing, that in the last days there will be a dangerous and cruel time [2 Tim. 3:1], when the devil, having been loosed, will deceive all the world and cause such misery and distress, 1) that no man will be saved unless God shortens those days for the sake of His elect [Matth. 24:22]. It must therefore come to pass that the devil will attack Christianity with all his might on all sides, both physically and spiritually, and try his best and highest on it; thus an end.

Therefore let us watch and be courageous in firm faith in Christ, and let every man keep himself obedient under his authority, and wait what God will do, and let go what goes, let it go as it goes, for there is no hope of any more good; the pots are broken and the soup is spilled, we may dare to pick up the pieces and, as much as possible, be of good cheer, as Christ teaches us and says of this evil time Luc. 21, 28: "When ye see these things coming to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads: for your redemption cometh, and is at hand."

85 But lest I forget, when thou art under the Turk, and must serve as it is said, thou shalt not do such service.

You must neither understand nor interpret it further, for as far as it is useful to your master for his goods. But if he wanted to force you to fight against the Christians, you should not be obedient, but rather suffer everything he can do to you, yes, much rather die. For you hear here that Daniel writes of the Turk that his quarrel is against the saints of God, who have done him no harm, and spills innocent blood. You must beware lest you make yourself a party to this, just as you must not fall prey to his blasphemous idol and Mahomet, even though you must serve under him.

86) The pious Naaman, 2 Kings 5:17 ff, remained in the service of his lord the king and also worshipped with him in his temple, but still he did not worship his idol. And the dear holy martyrs, St. Moritz and his companions, when the emperor called them to fight against the Christians, they did not want to do it, threw away their weapons and said: if he wanted to fight against the Christians, he should not look for others, they themselves, as Christian men, would be ready to suffer what he wanted. In the same way, you should also serve the Turks, so that you do not strive against the Christians or against God, but only help his house and goods for the best.

(87) I have also said and advised 2) all those who live under our emperor, pope and princes that they should not be used to fight against the gospel or against Christians or to persecute them. For in so doing they will bring innocent blood upon themselves, and be no better 3) than the Turks. "One must be more obedient to God than to men" [Acts 5:29]. God has not given any lord authority or subjected people to such an extent that he should strive or fight against God and His word. And in such a case, no subject owes or is related to his authorities a hair's breadth. Indeed, there is then no longer any authority where this happens, but the subjects are obliged to serve the authority physically for the best,

1) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: anrichten.

2) "I" is missing in Walch and in the Erlanger.

3) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer, Walch and the Erlanger: bessers.

that peace may be preserved on earth, and that this bodily life may be the more secure 1) and prosperous.

88. But may God, the Father of all grace and wisdom, graciously forgive us this time.

1) "his" is missing in the Wittenberger.

and prepare us with wisdom and strength, so that we may walk wisely and manfully, and await the future of our dear Lord Jesus Christ with joy, and blessedly depart from this valley of tears. To him be praise and thanksgiving, honor and glory forever and ever, amen.

55. M. Luther's exhortation to prayer against the Turk.)

About the end of August 1541.

One says: He who cannot be advised cannot be helped. We Germans have heard the dear word of God many years ago, through which God, the Father of all mercy, enlightened us and called us from the horrible abominations of the papal darkness and idolatry into his holy light and kingdom. But how gratefully and sincerely we have accepted and kept this is terrible enough to see even today. For, just as if the former sins were too few, since we have angered God to the utmost (though unknowingly) with masses, purgatory, the service of saints, and other works and righteousness of our own, and have filled all corners with such great idolatries, and thought to serve God especially in them, we go over them and persecute the dear Word, which calls us to repentance from such abominations, and knowingly and wantonly defend such idolatry with fire, water, rope, sword, cursing and blasphemy, so that it would be no wonder if God had not only let Turks, but also vain devils flood over Germany, or had let them flood long ago.

For how can he suffer the length? He must handle and protect truth and justice at last, punish evil and the evil poisonous blasphemers and tyrants, otherwise he would lose his divinity, and

Finally, no one can be taken for a God, where everyone should do for and for what he desires, and despise God with His word and commandment as surely and shamefully as if He were a fool or a rascal, 2) who would not be serious about His. He is not serious about his commandments. Therefore he must make it so that one must grasp it, it is serious and not joking.

(3) Above this, we who have accepted the gospel and boast of the word also fulfill the saying Rom. 2:24: "God's name is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you. For, except for a few who take it seriously and gratefully accept it, the rest are so ungrateful, so wanton, so insolent, and live no differently than if God had given us his word for this reason and delivered us from the pabst with his devilish prison, so that we might freely do what we desire, and so that his word might serve not for his glory and our salvation, but for our will, when it cost the blood and death of his dear Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior, that such things should be so abundantly preached to us.

2) Göckelmännle'm - Gaukelmännlein, Närrchen.

*This writing is probably caused by the request of the Elector Johann Friedrich, which he sent to Luther and Bugenhagen at the beginning of August 1541 (it is found in Burkhardt, Briefwechsel, p. 392), to exhort the people to pray against the Turks. It can be assumed that Luther complied with this request without delay, and that the document probably went out in August. It was first published by Nickel Schirlentz in Wittenberg in 1541 and was reprinted by him in the following year. In addition, there are other editions from 1541, without indication of place and printer. In the collections: in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 553 k; in the Jena (1568), vol. VII, p. 433b; in the Altenburg, vol. VII, p. 473; in the Leipzig, vol. XXII, p. 390, and in the Erlangen, vol. 32, p. 74. We give the text according to the Erlangen, which brings the first original print, comparing the Wittenberg and the Jena.

(4) For, to begin with, what desperately wicked sects and heresies have arisen, such as coining men, dissenters, Anabaptists, and many more, all under the name and pretense of the gospel, who, being freed by the gospel from the pope's ban and tyranny, were safe to teach and do what they pleased; which, however, should not have hissed in the time when the pope was God and Lord. Then came the great god Mammon or avarice; how he possessed not only peasants and burghers, but quite rudely nobles, counts, princes and lords, so that one can hardly read of the like in all histories. The nobility wants to have everything that peasants and burghers have, yes, they want to be princes; the peasants increase grain, barley and everything besides the nobility, and make muthwillige theuring, since otherwise God has let grow enough. The citizen also values in his craft what and how he wants.

(5) Thus it is known beforehand what kind of wickedness the servants and maids practice in houses, what kind of stealing, unfaithfulness and all kinds of wickedness they do, so that all the fathers of the house complain and cry out about the servants. So also the stealing, one neighbor to the other, is no measure. Item, the workers or workmen, how they are masters! They take enough money, work what they want, how they want and when they want. Even if they spoil it and ruin it, no one can say a word against them. And, that I do not forget the lawyers, it has come to the point with the right that nobody likes to go into the right, if he has such a bright good thing, as the sun is clear in the bright middle day. I do not want to be hypocritical, but to tell the truth; the Imperial Court of Appeal, behold, what a devil's whore rules there, if it should be, as a divine jewel in German lands, some comfort to all those who suffer injustice. But see how they play along with those in Goslar, Minden and others, and help the desperate boy, Heinz Mordbrenner, in all evil matters, if they are not judges, nor can they understand, nor are they part of things concerning the gospel or the church.

So Germany is ripe and full of all kinds of sins against God, wants to defend it, and defies with God that I am unfortunately an all-too

I have often said that either the Turk or we ourselves must punish each other. I have forgotten the usurer; oh, how surely he lives and rages, as if he himself were god and lord in all lands; no one may oppose him. And when I wrote against him, the holy usurers laughed at me and said: Luther does not know what usury is; he may read his Matthaum and Psalter. Well then, if I am a preacher of Christ, and my word is the word of God, as I have no doubt, then either the Turk or another wrath of God shall teach you, accursed usurer, that Luther well understood and knew what usury is; that is worth a good guilder.

(7) However, these horrible pieces could still be borne for a while, but it has come to this that it cannot go on, that now some nobles, towns, even small dirty towns and villages are approaching, and want to defend their pastors and preachers, so that they should not punish sin and vice in the pulpit, or want to chase them away and starve them; in addition, whoever can take from them is holy. If they complain to the officials, they must be called stingy, whom no one can satisfy. They say, "In the past, a priest had thirty guilders and was well satisfied; now they want ninety and a hundred. But that they, the ministers, are stingy, thieving, robbing, and unfaithful to lords, that is Christian holiness.

8 Item, no one considers that whoever came before with thirty guilders can now hardly come with a hundred guilders. Why? Before, a bushel of grain was worth two, three pennies, an almond egg three pennies, and so on in all pieces; now the grain must be worth nine, ten, eleven, twelve pennies, an almond egg eighteen pennies. After that they say that the priests are stingy when they have increased the market and have taken sixty guilders from the poor man; he must be called stingy when he has ninety guilders, of which they have taken sixty from him. O right, right, that you miser should not be called miserly, but he who is maltreated by your miserliness should be called miserly;

so, so, so one must beat the Turk, if God, previously enraged in all ways, cannot give us happiness because of such outrageous willfulness and wickedness. What is a priest? Is good! But a Turk is a Turk, a devil is a devil, you may wait for them. If the priests, that is, God's servants and preachers, will not be, you will no longer be lord, peasant, nor citizen "Christian"; and if you will not respect the book and the teachers, nor honor them (for they are God's servants, and he who despises them despises God who sent them), your sword and shield will be less than paper and pen. You will and you shall know it.

(9) I am a certain prophet, so that I am sorry for myself, and I would like it to be a lie (as Micheas also wishes). I have often preached against avarice and wantonness, and said: Gather, gather, gather, dear peasants, burghers, nobles! Gather confidently, and give it freely enough; brother Vitus will come and find what you have gathered. You shall not keep it, which you so wantonly strive for (that is, steal and rob); you shall gather it for another, who will stab you to death for it, or at the very least beat your skin full and mock at it. Cause you to steal from the poor and needy, who cry out to heaven and do not let God rest until He hears them and punishes you miserly people, as Habakkuk 3:6 says: "Woe to him who increases his goods with other people's goods. Summa, it is almost like before the flood, Gen. 6, 12: "God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt: for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth." I am sure that if the world does not improve, but continues to increase in all kinds of evil, it must break the last break; and I have no other consolation or hope in such a being than that the last day is at the door, because it is getting too much that God will no longer be able to tolerate it.

10 Here you say: What shall we do then? Shall we despair, let go hands and feet, and give everything to the Turks without any resistance or opposition? No, by all means, I have no objection to that.

especially not that one should despair or despair. For just as God cannot tolerate the insolent iniquity and willfulness of which I have spoken above, so also He does not want one to despair or despair. He wants the middle road, and neither to the right nor to the left, as the Psalter says: "God is well pleased with those who fear Him and trust in His goodness" [Ps. 147, 11.]. Without any doubt, He is angry and displeased with those who despise or do not fear Him and His word, and with those who do not trust but doubt and despair.

(11) Therefore, there is still good advice for those who would only listen to it and let it be advised, namely, to begin to fear God and to trust in His goodness. If this were to happen, we know very well that neither the Turk nor the devil could have anything to do with us, for if God were with us, who would be against us? But who wants to and can bring people to such fear of God? The holy prophets have never been able to do this among the people of Israel, or even among a few of them, until the king of Babylon came and taught them, when he left no stone unturned, strangled everything or carried it away and devastated the land [2 Kings 25], so that they learned to fear God and to call upon Him. Thus one must listen to the fools with pistons, as Isaiah says: *Vexatio fst intellevtum aufitui* [Is. 28, 19.]. So the Turk is also our schoolmaster, and must prod us and teach us to fear God and pray, otherwise we will rot completely in sins and all security, as has happened until now.

If we now wish to be helped and advised, let us repent and amend the evil things mentioned above. Princes and lords are to establish justice in the land, control usury, prevent the avarice of the nobility, burghers and peasants, above all honor God's word, provide for, protect and promote schools, churches and their servants. Likewise, the nobility, burghers and peasants must be obedient in this respect, exercise discipline and respectability in towns and countries, and not allow craftsmen, workers and servants to exercise such great courage, but punish them freshly. Summa, one has the Catechismum German, clear, bright

enough; one knows well (praise God) what every state and person should do and not do, which we unfortunately did not know before and would have liked to do, then God will hear our prayer and certainly help us, as all the prophets and all the Scriptures promise us.

(13) But if we do not do this, and will not be advised, we cannot be helped. And it will be in vain for us to cry out that the Turk is a cruel tyrant, for it is of no use for a wicked child to cry out about a sharp rod; if it were pious, the rod would not be sharp, indeed it would not be a rod at all. It does not do (that is short) to be wicked and to want to be unruly; there must be both, one with the other, or both must cease at the same time. You pastors should preach this to the people with diligence, whether God might give them grace to listen and give them counsel, as God said to Jeremiah. And whether they would follow the example of the Ninivites, to whom their Turk was much closer than our Turk is to us, for they had only forty days until their destruction, Jonah 3:4, and yet they remained through their repentance, and when they gave them counsel, they were helped.

14) But if the people are hardened, and the evil has eaten so deeply that no repentance can be hoped for (as Ezekiel says about his brass pot, which had become so rusty that it could not be scoured nor cleaned, but had to be melted down again ¹⁾ and poured by the king of Babylon [Ezk 24:12]), what can we other innocent people do? Traun, here it will be said: If God wills it so; one neighbor owes the other a fire damage, then we must (as Ezekiel and Daniel did) with our people, kings, lords and churches, priests, prophets, everything over a pile. How would we have done if we had been in Jerusalem and had had to go with the same dear saints, prophets, kings and queens (as many other holy, pious people did at that time) to Babylon under the great tyrants from our fatherland? We would not lose God for that, nor go to the devil over it. For

Daniel and his companions also found God more abundantly at Babylon than they had found at Jerusalem; for God is omnipotent everywhere, and as Saint Peter says, Apost. 10, 35: "He who fears God, wherever he may be in all lands, is well pleasing to God; otherwise the Christians who now live and die under the Turk would all be condemned; but now they are his judges for that day, so now they must be his footstools.

15 Since we do not know that God wants us to do this (for we do not have Jeremiah or Ezekiel to tell us again by God or to command us to yield to the Turk, as the Jews had to yield to the king of Babylon by God's command), it behooves each one of us to defend himself according to his former calling and to do what he can, to the last breath. For we cannot, with a clear conscience, leave our profession until we are forced out of it by force, or are demanded anew by God through prophets or miraculous signs. Therefore we divide this matter into two parts: The bloody blasphemous papists we admonish to stop blaspheming God, and to be prepared differently against God's wrath; the ungrateful, wanton people we admonish to mend their ways, honor God's word, and call upon God. But if the 2) first part does not want to leave, but drags us with it into the distemper, then let us, namely the other part, the small group, not yet despair of God.

16. and although it is difficult for us to bear the burden of those sins, and to ask God not to repay us for them (for they are among us, and we are mixed with them, and either they must enjoy our prayers, or we must repay their sin), we nevertheless owe it to God to honor and believe Him, who tells us to wait for our calling and to do our part, and also tells and teaches us to pray, as He says Matth. 7, 7: "Ask and you shall receive, seek and you shall find, knock and it shall be opened to you", and Joh. 16, 23: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask in my name,

1) In the editions: melted.

2) Wittenberger and Erlanger: this.

he will give it to you," and John 14:14: "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, 1) that will I do;" and Psalm 50:15: "Call upon me in trouble, and I will help thee; and thou shalt thank and praise me."

(17) It is true that we are not Joshua, 2) who made the sun stand still in the sky by his prayer [Jos. 10:12], nor Moses, who cut apart the Red Sea by his heartfelt prayer [Ex. 14:16, 21. Nor Elijah, who scattered fire from heaven by his prayer [2 Kings 1:10], but we are nevertheless the same people to whom God has commanded His word, and through His Spirit has made it preach to us; yes, we are also such people as Moses, Joshua, Elijah and all the other saints. For we of the same God's Word and Spirit that they had, and we of the same God's preachers, servants and ministers that they were, though they were more glorious than we, yet had no higher, better God than we, nor better flesh and blood than we: for they were men like us, and the very creature of God that we are. I am speaking now of us poor sinners who nevertheless love Christ and seek His kingdom, not of the papists and false Christians.

(18) And God must (that I speak thus) hear our prayer as well as His prayer, for we are members of His church, that is, His dear Son's bride, whom He cannot despise when she cries out earnestly. Therefore it is not a great thing for God to do as great or greater works through us than He has done through them, as we have seen and experienced so far, that He has helped us mightily and wonderfully against the devil of the pope, who is somewhat greater than the devil of the Turk, if we could mean it or believe it. For thus he says John 14:12: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go to the Father.

19 Therefore, it is incumbent upon us preachers, as we are obligated to do, first to bring the people to repentance.

1) The words: "so wird er's - name" are missing in the Jena.

2) The Wittenberg and Erlangen editions have that concerning Moses first, Joshua second.

with diligence, as those (where the Turk should continue) are certain to die, and must miserably lose everything, body, goods, honor, wife, child, and (which is probably worse) the soul as well; for it is terrible to die in impenitent life (that is, to be eternally damned). Therefore, from the pulpit we should confidently shout and punish vice and sin, as Isaiah 58:1 says: "Preach confidently, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and proclaim to my people their wickedness, and to the house of Jacob their sin" 2c. And St. Paul 2 Tim. 4, 2. 3: 3) "Preach the word, persevere, whether in season or out of season, chastise, rebuke, exhort with all patience and doctrine; for there will be a time when they will not suffer sound doctrine."

20) Now if there are some who do not want to suffer such punishment in God's name, they may stay out of the church or go out in 4) the devil's name. Who holds the others here? They will do us no good nor help, but rather harm in such troubles, who will not hear God's word; but we cannot keep God's word silent for their sake; let them go to the devil and die like sows and dogs, without sacrament and grace, always buried on the shingle. For if we want to have a merciful God, we must truly suffer from Him that He punishes and reproves us as sinners and bad boys, and also confess that He does right, since 5) He reproves us sinners and bad boys, as David says: "Against You alone have I sinned, that You might be just in Your words" [Ps. 51:6]. True Christians like to hear that they are scolded and punished with God's word.

(21) But these, wishing to be unpunished, freely confess that they are the right desperate wretches, who thereby also sin against the Holy Spirit, as not wishing to suffer Him to punish them by His preaching ministry; or, have they fallen so far as to take our preaching and word for ours, that is, for man's?

3) Here the Erlangen edition has reprinted from Walch 2 Tim. 4, 23. besides two other wrong Bible citations of Walch in this writing.

4) "in" is missing in the Jena.

5) Erlanger: that.

If they do not want to keep the Christian word and therefore do not want to suffer, then they have long since fallen from the Christian faith, well worth and deserved that they hear Mahomet, the Turk, the Pope, the devil and his mother in place of God, amen, if they want it that way. But let them not be in our army; or, if they must be, let them not be in it, lest we everywhere rely on their help, but take care and pray that God will not make us pay for their wickedness, because we do not like it that they, as enemies of God, should despise his word, from which we desire help.

22 And especially the army preachers should admonish, beg, implore, and promise the warriors, including the wild, savage, and crude brother Vitus, 1) who is capable of much torture and wounding, 2) who is capable of suffering from the diseases of Francis, Pestilence, Sanct Veltens, Sanct Antonius, Sanct Quirinus, and 2c. that they will refrain from such blasphemies, and pray the Lord's Prayer and the faith instead. For they should know that we do not fight against flesh and blood, but against the devils in hell, and that the Turk remains undefeated with cursing and blasphemy. As that captain said to a warrior who could curse the enemy very much, "Do you hear, I do not have you in the army to curse Alexandro, but to fight against Alexander. Perhaps some will be admonished and will follow, first those who intend to be saved, but the others are not concerned, they will be better or worse. For for their sake nothing is and will be done in such troubles and great things, and God will not look at them but at the others, as Psalm 34, v. 16, says: "The eyes of the Lord look at those who fear him and wait for his goodness.

23 Thus it is recorded in Roman history that an emperor had a Christian band among other pagans, who knelt down in the field and prayed (as is proper for Christians) before the battle; then a storm came and struck the enemies from heaven. This was the emperor (though pagans) a dear people of war, and called them *χεραυνοβόλους*, that is, thunder-

1) i.e. the warrior servants.

2) Erlanger: "Wundersn". This reading is wrong, because here is aimed at the curse frequent with war servants: "God's wounds".

than those who could be struck with thunderbolts. In the same way, we could still do well if we would earnestly improve ourselves and pray heartily. For what God does and gives to the whole world, to the Gentiles and the Turks, to the evil and the good, He does all this through and for the sake of His dear children, that is, for the sake of Christians who fear Him, who recognize themselves as sinners, who gladly allow themselves to be punished, and who nevertheless cordially trust in Him, pray and call upon Him in all their needs; this is certainly true. Let this be said of the first work of our preaching ministry; he who has ears to hear, let him hear; he who has not, let him remain back there without an ear, earless, deaf and deafened, as long as he will or can, we must go.

(24) The other work is that we then turn to God with right prayer; for these are the two priestly offices, to turn to the people and teach them what is right and good, and then to turn to God and pray that we may do this and also obtain happiness and victory. As Samuel, 1 Sam. 12, 23, 24, says: "Far be it from me to sin against the Lord in this way, that I should cease to pray for you, and to teach you the good and right way; only fear the Lord, and serve him faithfully with all your heart." Here we hear that it is sin against God if we preachers do not teach the people rightly and pray for them, so it is also sin if the people do not obey nor fear God, who teaches them through our preaching ministry.

(25) The people are to be admonished about this, that they also pray; for the Lord's Prayer and all prayers are common to all Christians, whether they be preachers or hearers, but especially to the preacher, as he who is to lead the word, and to stand and walk at the head. But how one should pray has been abundantly taught in many books, namely, that one should not doubt in prayer [Jac. 1:6]. For whoever doubts whether he will be heard by God, let him stand in line and not be sworn to God and prayer. For he cannot and will not suffer to be doubted, that is, he cannot and will not have us call him a liar or an unfaithful God; but he who doubts does as much as if he said, "Lord God, I do not believe it, I do not know it.

Nor whether it be true that thou sayest, Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, 1) that will I do"; and the like many other sayings.

26 Therefore, where you want to pray, think that you kneel or step boldly and unashamedly (if you have recognized yourself as a sinner and want to be corrected, as said above) and speak to God like this: Lord God, heavenly Father, I ask, and I will have it without fail, that it should and must be Yes and Amen, that and no other, otherwise I will not pray nor ask; not that I am right, or worthy, I know well and confess that I do not deserve, yea, have deserved the infernal fire and thy eternal wrath with many great sins, but that I may be a little obedient in this, since 2) thou dost command and compel me to pray in the name of thy dear Son, our Lord JESu Christ; upon this defiance and consolation of thy causeless goodness, not upon my righteousness, I kneel or come before thee and pray for N. N. 2c.

27 Secondly, it is also sufficiently taught that one should not tempt God in prayer, that is, not set him the time, measure, goal, way, or person, how, when, where, or by what means he must hear us, but rather humbly send it all home to him, who, according to his divine incomprehensible wisdom, will certainly find it. But do not doubt (if it could be seen otherwise) that the prayer was certainly answered, as the angel Gabriel, Dan. 9, 23, says: "When you began to pray, the command went out" 2c. and was answered far higher and more than Daniel had asked. Such things, I say, are sufficiently taught beforehand in the Catechismo, and otherwise in many writings. Therefore, even in the present emergency against the Turk, we should keep it this way, and everyone should pray to himself.

In order that the people may be stirred to devotion and earnestness by public prayer in the church, I would be pleased, where it pleases the pastors and churches, that on feast days, after the sermon (whether in the morning or in the evening, or around each other), the 79th Psalm: "Lord, there are Gentiles fallen into your inheritance,

sing one choir after the other, as usual. After that, a well-tuned boy steps in front of the lectern in their choir, and sings alone the antiphon or tract: Domino, non secundum [Ps. 103, 10.]; after that, another boy sings the other tract: Domino, no womineris [Ps. 79, 8.]; and on it the whole choir kneeling: Adjuva nos Dous [Ps. 79, 9.]; allerdinge, wie man in der Fasten im Pabstthum gesang; denn es sehr devächtig lautet und siehet 2c., and the words rhyme well against the Turk, where one directs them with the heart. On it (where one wants) the layman may sing: Keep us, O Lord, in thy word, 3) Grant us peace, or the German Vater-Unser. The 79th [Psalm] should be alternated with the 20th Psalm, which prays for the authorities and those who work in conflict. If, however, such a song would be too long after the sermon, it could be sung instead of the Introit, or even under the Communion. This would be enough for public prayer (besides the Litania) ceremonies in this case. But if someone wants to pray in church or at home, and does not know a better word or way, he should take the Lord's Prayer before him and, if he pleases, stimulate his devotion with these or similar words:

(29) Heavenly Father, we deserve to be punished by you, but punish us according to your mercy and not according to your wrath. It is better for us to be delivered into thy hands than into the hands of men, or into the hands of the enemy; as David also asked [2 Sam. 24:14]. For great is thy mercy; we have sinned against thee, and have not kept thy commandments 2c. But you know, Almighty God the Father, that we have not sinned against the devil, the pope, the Turk, nor do they have any right or power to punish us, but you can and may use them as your fierce rod against us, who have sinned against you and deserved all misfortune.

(30) Yes, dear God, Heavenly Father, we have not committed any sin against them, so that they would have the right to punish us; but they would much rather have us go to heaven together with them.

1) The words: "in my name" are missing in the Jena.

2) Erlanger: that.

3) "Preservation - word" is missing in the Jena.

sinned most abominably against thee. For they inquire not whether we have disobeyed thee, blasphemed thee, committed all manner of idolatry, as they do, dealt in false doctrine, faith, and lies, committed adultery, fornication, murder, theft, robbery, sorcery, and all manner of evil against thee, they inquire not. But this is our sin against them, that we preach, believe, and confess thee, O God the Father, the only true God, and thy dear Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, an everlasting God; yea, this is the sin which we do against them. But if we denied you, the devil, the world, the pope and the Turk would leave us satisfied, as your dear Son says: "If you were of the world, the world would love yours" 2c. [John 15:19.]

(31) Behold now, thou merciful Father over us, and grave judge of our enemies, for they are thine enemies more than our enemies, and when they persecute and smite us, they themselves persecute and smite thee; for the word which we preach, believe, and confess is thine, not 1) ours, all the work of thy Holy Spirit in us. The devil does not want to suffer this, but wants to be our god instead of you, to create lies in us instead of your word. The Turk wants to put his Mahomet in the place of your dear Son Jesus Christ, because he blasphemes him and says that he is not a true God, that his Mahomet is higher and better than he is. If then it is sinful for us to hold, confess and praise you, the Father and your Son and the Holy Spirit, as the true, unified God, then you yourself are the sinner who works such things in us, and is called such things, and wants to have them. Therefore, when they hate, beat and punish us because of such things, they hate, beat and punish you themselves. Therefore wake up, dear Lord God, and sanctify your name, which they desecrate; strengthen your kingdom, which they destroy in us, and create your will, which they want to dampen in us, and do not let yourself be trampled underfoot for the sake of our sin by those who do not want to punish our sin in us, but want to erase your holy word, name and work in us, so that you do not become a god.

and have no people to preach, believe and confess you. 2)

See, such thoughts give you the words in the Lord's Prayer, if you look at them right: "Hallowed be your name, your kingdom come, your will be done" 2c. Therefore, you should also put such thoughts into your Lord's Prayer; as we see that all the prophets pray that God will spare their sins for the sake of His name, so that the Gentiles (who want to take the right name of God and not their sins) do not boast: Where is now their God? [Ps. 79, 10.] They rather care for the name of God, and that the enemies do not devastate God's word (which is the highest wrath), because they are punished for their sin. Therefore they confess their sin and ask for mercy, so that for their sake God and His name will not be destroyed; thus they turn and turn away God's wrath on the enemies, as they are enemies of His people, not for their sin, but for the sake of God, who has His name, word and kingdom in them.

33. Such and such prayer is, as said, of all prophets; as you see in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Psalms, who always confess their sin to God, but yet boast themselves innocent, yes, pious, righteous and holy against their enemies, not because of their work or sin, but that they have, worship, call upon and confess the right God, which God works in them, and thus must themselves be a sinner to the devil, Turk, pope, world, flesh, be wrong, be condemned, blasphemed and punished. Which he must suffer (or rather suffer unwillingly) for the sake of our sin, as St. Paul Rom. 2:24 says: "God's name is blasphemed for your sake among the Gentiles." Therefore, if we want to be God's people, we should be holy and pious, so that God does not have to suffer for our sins 4) or He will punish us terribly and make us suffer ourselves. And just as we do not want to take him for a god, so we will not take him for a god.

2) This entire prayer has been translated into Latin and included in the 7th volume of the Latin Wittenberg edition (toi. 1556), but there provided with a conclusion formed by a foreign hand.

3) "itself" is missing in the Erlanger.

4) "Sin" is missing in the Jena.

1) Erlanger: and not.

If he does not take us for his people, whom he wants to save and help, he will not take us for his people.

34 Let this be said of what we, who are in the spiritual ministry, should and can do. For even though I myself am often troubled that our sin and wickedness is too great, the unrepentant raving of the papists and the ingratitude of our part is overwhelming, that I would doubt our prayer, I am also moved by the example when God forbade the prophet Jeremiah not to pray or complain for his people, "for I will not hear you," Jeremiah 7:16, and again Jeremiah 15:1: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet have I no heart. 15, 1: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet have I no heart for this people; drive them away from me," and Ezek. 14, 14. If the three men, Noah, Daniel, Job, were among this people, they would save nothing but their own souls"; for truly it is far too horrible that we Germans, having spent the previous horrible life under the idolatries of the papists, now also, when God graciously visits us with the light of His unspeakable grace, blaspheme and profane the same, and exercise all courage against His servants and our neighbor. 2c.:

(35) But because I have not the new commandment which Jeremiah had, that I should not pray, though there be some right devout hearts, though few, yet doubtless many more than a Moses, or a Samuel, or a Noah, Daniel, Job, it will not be done in good conscience that we should despair and cease to pray of our own thirst and nobleness, but must keep the common and ancient commandment, "Pray, seek, knock. 7, 7], so that we will not be scolded as God scolds the prophets Ezek. 13, 5: "O Israel, thy prophets are as the foxes in the wilderness; they tread not before the gaps, nor make themselves a barrier about the house of Israel, nor stand in contention in the day of the LORD"; and Cap. 22:30: "I sought among them if there were any that would turn away wrath from me, that I might not destroy the land: but I found none. Therefore I poured out my wrath upon them, and with the fire of my fury I consumed them, and so gave them

their merit on their head" (says the Lord); thus also Isaiah, Cap. 64, 7. complains: "No one calls on your name" 2c.

Therefore, we must pray that whatever God wills may come to pass. If we do not get it this time, and what we would like to have now, nevertheless our prayer is certainly heard and pleasant (we know that), and much greater and better things must follow, neither we have asked; as St. Paul says Eph. 3, 20: "Who is abundant and mighty over all that we ask or understand. And, O blessed would we be, if we had to miss the Turks with this prayer this time, and yet would have acquired the last day for it soon after, which cannot be far away, and the Turk also (like the Pope) must be at his end, of that I have no doubt.

(37) And beware of the Turkish Epicurean faith, where some pretend: What shall I do? What is the use of praying? What good is much worrying? If it is done, it must be done. For thus the Turks believe and say: No one can die unless his hour comes; therefore they are so foolish and foolhardy and think they are doing well and doing right. Yes, it is true that what is done is done; but I am not commanded, but rather forbidden, to know what is done. Therefore, because I do not know what is done, God tempts those who go in for such ignorance and pervert; I am commanded to know what is to be done. And therefore his word is given unto us, that we should know what we ought to do, and not do that which we know not, but commit the same unto God, and keep our commandment, our profession, our office; God will and will alone know what is done, thou shalt not know it.

38) Joab, the captain of David's army, having enemies in the rear and in the front, did not say to Abishai his brother, "Wait, let us see what is done, and we will do it;" but he said, "Fight against Ammon. Ammon, I will fight against the Syrians. If the Syrians are too strong for me, come to my aid; if Ammon is too strong for you, I will come to your aid; be of good cheer, and let us be strong for our people,

and for the cities of our God; but let the Lord do what pleases him." So we also should judge ourselves in our offices, not according to the disposition, since we have no word, light, or science of it; but do it out of our eyes, heart, and all our senses, let it remain hidden in darkness and secret, and do what we know and are commanded to do by his word and imagined light. Then the misguided will probably find themselves and unsought, which otherwise cannot be found, and become vain epicureans, Turks, impudent stupid fools, or despondent and desperate miserable people. The devil rides such people to make them think they are clever and wise, and they do not see that it is the apple on which Adam and Eve, together with all their descendants, ate eternal death; they also wanted to know God's secret counsel and providence about what they were commanded, tempted God with it and transgressed His holy commandment.

After this work of ours, the clergy, think, you secular classes, also on your work, let yourselves be told and advised, listen to God's word and pray with us; establish justice in the country, punish usury and other more vices. Moderate the ugly, shameful drinking, gambling and expenses; send yourselves also 1) to the sacrament, and do not oppose it, as the others do, as if it were poison, or as if it were a disgrace to their status, to humble themselves therefore. If we want to confess the word, we must also truly receive the sacrament, which is instituted for confession, or (as Christ himself speaks) for remembrance; otherwise such contempt, that some may not go there for many years, cannot please God, and certainly there will be no good conscience nor earnestness toward God's word.

40 And when ye go against the Turk, be sure, and doubt not, that ye fight not against flesh and blood, that is, against men, lest I be your prophet, that a Turk shall smite many Christians: but be sure that ye fight against a great host of devils; for the host of the Turk is the host of devils. Therefore leave

Do not rely on your spear, sword, guns, power or quantity, for there the devils do not inquire; as we are well informed by experience so far, that the Turk has had vain victory and luck against us, and will have further, where we as men will war against men. Just as the pope and his devils could not be defeated without God's word, even though the emperors Friederici, Henrici 2) 2c. were powerful enough, but he trampled them all under his feet, because the devil was with him. We must learn to sing with the 44th Psalm, v. 7. "I do not rely on my bow, and my sword cannot help me" 2c. We must have angels with us against the devils, which will happen if we humble ourselves, pray and trust God in His Word.

41 When we have done our part, whether we prepare ourselves with prayer or defend ourselves, let us then say with Joab [2 Sam. 10:12], Let us go freshly, let God's will be done, as he has ordained and as it pleases him, to life or death. If he will have us punished and beaten, then we will die and suffer in our profession and his command, and for his name's sake, and thus become his martyrs; we have the advantage over that, that we will be judges and lords of the Turk, the Pope, the world and all devils forever, with Christ and all the angels. And what can the Turk and all devils do to us Christians? and how evil can he do it? He can neither give us nor take away our fiefdom. For life was taken from us long ago, in the beginning of the world, in paradise, through Adam's sin, in which we are already dead and dead all who are born of him, Rom. 5:12 (the Turk as well as we). On the other hand, Christ our Savior has long since restored and given it to us through His resurrection to all who believe and call upon Him and desire Him; but not to the Turks and unbelievers, nor to the devils, for they remain in death.

(42) This he may well do, that he may shorten the time of us mortals, that we may sooner be buried, and rot, and come to death.

2) This refers to Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and Henry IV. Cf. Walch, St. Louis Edition, Vol. XIX, 1964.

1) "also" is missing in the Erlanger.

He is not able to do anything more for us. As Christ himself comforts us Matth. 10, 28: "Do not be afraid of those who kill the body", and after that they have nothing that they can do to you. Vide, si placet, meas .ibidem annotationes. 1) And 1 Petr. 3:13, 14, 15: "And who is he that can hurt you, if ye follow that which is good? Even if you suffer for righteousness' sake, you will be blessed. Do not be afraid of their defiance, and do not be dismayed, but sanctify God the Lord in your hearts." For we do not fight to gain land and people, property and honor, or to establish and spread idolatry, but to preserve God's word and His church, especially for our dear youth and descendants, and we intend to fight the Turk so that he will not put his devilish filth and blasphemous Mahomet in the place of our dear Lord JESUS CHRIST; this is indeed the fundamental cause and serious opinion of our fight, death and life in this case; this is certainly true. Therefore we wage a godly war against the Turk, and are holy Christians and die blessedly.

43. so it may well be that the Turk, like the pope, would fall. For the two kingdoms, the Pabst's and the Turk's, are the last two abominations and God's wrath, as Revelation [14:8, 9] calls the false prophet and the beast, and must be seized together and thrown into the lake of fire. For this has never been heard of any kingdom from the beginning, that they so shamefully destroyed the marriage state, as the pope and the Turk do. The pope, under the pretense of chastity, has condemned them forbidden and unclean. The Turk tears man and woman from each other and gives and sells the women as if they were cows or calves; of this, and other things, I have written in the Sermon to the Gentiles 2). Summa, there is nothing different, because house-, city- and church-regiment disturb, both in the Pabstthum and Turkey.

1) The "Notes on the Evangelist Matthew," to which Luther refers here, can be found Walch, old edition, vol. VII. The passage in question, Matth. 10, 28, *ibid.* there, Col. 148 ff.

2) The previous number in this volume.

44 Lastly, let the children learn the Catechismum, whether they are led away in strife, yet know something of the Christian faith; who knows what God may work through them? Joseph was also sold in Egypt in his seventeenth year, but he had God's word and was able to keep his faith, and afterward he converted all of Egypt. So did Daniel and his companions in Babylon [Dan. 1, 8. f.]. Likewise, if the wives, being carried away, should live with other men in Turkey, both in bed and at meat, to be patient, and to suffer these things for Christ's sake, yet not to despair, as if they were damned: for the soul can do nothing, as the enemy doeth unto thy body. He who is a prisoner is a prisoner; God's word and faith remain uncaptured, just as Christ himself remains uncaptured. The preachers will be able to continue to teach and transfigure this. It is said: "marvelous, unsearchable, incomprehensible are His ways" [Rom. 11, 33.] and as He says to Moses: "My face thou canst not see, but My backside shalt thou behold" [2 Mos. 33, 23.].

45. But I do not want to have written such comfort at all, that Mainz, Heinz, and whoever else they are, the desperate assassins, traitors, murderers and evil-doers, should console themselves of that, whom I respect well, and also truly know that before they accept our teaching, the divine word (which they themselves must know, recognize and confess, that it is not our word, but truly God's word), much before they would become Turks against us, or, if they could, they would gladly become devils themselves, let alone that they should not heartily indulge, serve, advise and help the Turk as they only can, according to the saying of Virgili: *Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo*, 3) if God does not help us from heaven, then all the devils will help us in hell; that is Mainzes and Heinzes, together with your thoughts, that I truly know.

46 And this is no small comfort to me, that God will look upon our miserable pleas, cries and sighs, and upon such great treacherous wickedness and devilish plots of the Heinzen and Mainzen, so we

3) Virgil, *li6.* VII, v. 312.

and still have to suffer, and help us above our merit, even regardless of our sin, yet against both, and finally, when we are humbled, give them their deserved reward on their head. For he lets sing of him: Facit judicium injuriam patientibus [Ps. 146, 7.] and: Justus est Dominus [Ps. 145, 17.]. And just as they sing now: Where is now your God? we want to sing once again: Where is now Mainz, Heinz, G[eorg] and their fellows?

(47) Likewise, I will not and cannot have comforted our nephilim, 1) the tyrants, usurers, and rogues among the nobility, who make themselves believe that God has given us the gospel and redeemed us from papal imprisonment, so that they may be stingy, toil, and exercise all courage, press their princes, oppress land and people, and want to be everything in everything, which is not commanded but forbidden to them. They are the ones who help God's wrath to send the Turks to thresh over us, over themselves as well, where they will not repent. For it is impossible that Germany should remain standing, even infallibly and unpleasantly, where such tyranny, usury, miserliness, and the arrogance of the nobility, the bourgeoisie, the peasants, and all classes should remain and increase; in the end, the poor man would keep no crusts of bread in his house, and would rather, or so gladly, sit with the wise among the Turks than among such Christians. If there is too much power and no one better, they mock God's word and plague his servants.

1) i.e. giants, tyrants, Gen. 6:4.

2) Jenaer: like this. - Erlanger: "superiority."

48. But the consolation is that God, the Father of all mercy, a right judge, as well as an angry avenger 3) of all devils, Turks, Mahomet, Pabst, Mainz, Heinz, and all evildoers, has given us His holy, sacred word out of heartfelt grace, to recognize His dear Son; and that such a word is nevertheless accepted, honored and praised among so many blasphemers, persecutors, despisers, desperate devil children, by many good-hearted, chosen people, so glorious that not a few have risked their life and limb, property and honor over it, and still do. Such people's faith and prayers will and should push the bottom out of the barrel and put an end to the game, as Christ says, Luc. 18, 7. 8.: "Do you think that God will not save His elect who cry out to Him day and night? I tell you, he will save them in a moment."

In sum, we Christians should not presume on our wisdom or power (as the Turk, the Pope, Mainz, and the world do); nor should we despair or fear, as Judas did, and the Turk, the Pope, Mainz, and the world must do in the end. Our consolation, defiance, arrogance, presumption, pride, insistence, security, victory, life, joy, glory and honor sit above at the right hand of God the Father Almighty [Rom. 8:34]. Defiance, devil, bend him a hair, he is called and remains *Scheblimini*. All things are commanded unto him, he shall do and do well, as he hath done from the beginning, even unto the ages of ages, amen.

3) Jenaer: "Streffer" - punisher.

56. brother Richard's publishing of the Koran,

Written Anno 1300, Germanized by Luther, with his preface and attached warning. *)

About the end of April 1542.

Martin Luth, D.

(1) This book of Brother Richard of the Order of Preachers, called *Confutatio Alcoran*, I used to read more, but I could not believe that there were sensible people on earth whom the devil should persuade to believe such a shameful thing, and I always thought that it was invented by the French writers, as they have made all their histories suspect with their eternal lies in honor of the pope. However, I would have liked to see the Alcoran myself, and wondered how it happened that the Alcoran had not long since been brought into the Latin language, since Mahmet has now reigned longer than nine hundred years and has done so much harm, but no one has bothered to find out what Mahmet's faith was; they have only been satisfied that Mahmet was an enemy of Christian faith, but where and how, from piece to piece, has not been said; which is necessary to know.

But now, this Shrovetide, I have seen the Alcoran in Latin, but very badly interpreted, that I still wished to see a clarifier. So much, however, noticed from it, that this brother Richard does not invent his book, but tunes it at the same time. And that no false delusion can be here, so brother Richard has been probably two hundred years ago, almost under Emperor Alberto the First, since Dominici and Francisci Order have not been old. For he speaks and knows nothing about Turks, which

first began to reign 200 years ago, and this next hundred years 2) (sint King Matthias' times) have grown so much that they have eaten up the Saracens, who reigned for nine hundred years, by Zelim, this Turk's father, Anno 1517, and are now called the Turkish Empire. I say this because I have to believe this brother Richard, who so long before has moved the Alcoran, so the same neither before nor until now with us no one has seen, and still see indistinctly.

Therefore, I consider it useful and necessary to translate this booklet (because there is no better one), so that we Germans may also recognize how shameful the faith of Mahomet is, so that we may be strengthened in our Christian faith. For since Mahmet receives victory, happiness, power and honor in the world through God's wrath or doom, but we Christians bear the cross of our Lord, and are to be blessed not here on earth, but there in that life, the common man of flesh and blood is easily moved to that place, where there seems to be no cross, but only good and honor in this life, to which Mahmet also directs his Alcoran.

4. suMma, where we cannot convert the Saracens and now the Turks, but that we in turn also remain firm and strong in our faith, and do not allow ourselves to be moved that the Saracens and Turks so much

1) In the old editions: Watschen.

2) "hundred" is missing in the Wittenberger.

3) Walch and the Erlangers: easy.

*On March 26, 1542, Luther wrote to Jakob Probst (De Wette, Vol. V, p. 452) that he was busy with the "translation of the refutation of the Alcoran Mahomet", and Besold wrote on April 11, 1542- about this writing, "that it will be printed soon" (Köstlin, Martin Luther, Vol. II, p. 686 sã p. 603); according to this is our approximate time determination. The writing appeared first in Wittenberg with Hans Luft 1542, and still in the same year in another edition without indication of place and printer. In the collections: in the Wittenberg (1551), vol. II, p. 494d; in the Jena (1562), vol. VIII, p. 11 d; in the Altenburg, vol. VIII, p. 12 and in the Leipzig, vol. XXI, p. 657. Only the preface and the epilogue in the Erlangen, vol. 65, p. 190. We give the text of the writing according to the Jenaer under comparison of the Wittenberger, the preface and epilogue under comparison of the Erlanger, which brings the text according to the original printing.

a hundred years of victory and happiness against the Christians, but we had many misfortunes against them, until they became masters of the world, always prevail with great honor and good, but we are defeated with great shame and harm. This is not because Mahomet's faith is right and ours is wrong, as the blind Turks claim, but because this is God's way of governing His people.

First of all, that he punishes and oppresses them because of their sin, as the 79. 1) Psalm, v. 8. 9. says, and the histories of the children of Israel teach abundantly with many examples; and St. Peter 1 Petr. 4, 17-19. (Proverbs 11, 31.): "It is now such a time that God's punishment or judgment must begin on the house of God. But first of all, what will be the end of those who do not believe in the Gospel of God? And if the righteous is barely (or with difficulty) preserved, where will the wicked and the sinner appear? Therefore, those who suffer according to God's will, let them commit their souls to Him, as to the faithful Creator, in good works." Thus Jerem. 25, 29: "Behold, in the city which is called by my name I began to afflict; and ye shall go unpunished? Ye shall not go unpunished."

(6) Secondly, Christ's blood must be shed from the beginning of the world to the end, so that many martyrs may go to heaven, because not only the blood of his saints (all of which is called his blood), but also his own personal blood must be shed. Woe to those who shed it! He has driven these two pieces through Mahmet and is still driving them. For Mahmet has tormented the Christians more cruelly than any tyrant, and the Christians well deserved such punishment, since they separated themselves with heresy and mobs, many new doctrines, and in addition lived angrily in ingratitude and contempt of the precious blood of Christ, that they might be redeemed and not atone. Thus the Mahmet also makes many martyrs than are ever made, that he strangles so many innocent children and otherwise pious Christians horribly.

7 But the great wrath is upon himself,

that he is so terribly rejected by God, not only to inflict such punishment and bloodshed (which is not yet too high for a Christian heart to suffer and overcome), but also to lead so many people into eternal damnation with him in body and soul through his lies, as the pope also did and still does. These are the right last, terrible, horrible, most annoying plagues, hard for a Christian to bear in his heart, as the 89th Psalm v. 47. 48. almost grumbles against God and says: "Lord, how long will you hide yourself like this, and let your anger burn like fire? Remember how short is my life; wilt thou then have created all men in vain?" So let us leave the Turks and Saracens with their Mahmet, "as the wrath of God has come upon them to the end" (as Saint Paul says of the Jews [1 Thess. 2, 16.]) and think how we may be preserved and remain in God's grace, so that we may not be condemned with the Mahmet, nor let its great power, honor, victory, happiness and good entice and entice us, nor its terrible sword deter us. For this Richard also testifies that the Mahometans are not to be converted, for the reason that they are so hardened that they mock almost all articles of our faith and mockingly laugh at them as if they were fools washing impossible things.

(8) And where shall they be converted, if they reject the whole holy scripture, both New Testament and Old Testament, as now dead and unfit, and confess no discourse nor disputation of the holy scripture to any man, stopping up their ears, eyes, and hearts firmly against the blessed book of the holy scripture, abiding in their alcoran. This means wrath against all wrath, for which our dear Father in heaven protects us through his dear Son Jesus Christ and his Holy Spirit. We would rather, and it is better, suffer His wrath of temporal punishment and bloodshed, than to deny the Holy Scriptures with the devil and his apostle Mahmet and his saints, the Turks, and fall eternally into the eternal wrath of God with their victory, happiness, power, honor and good. "The Lord is my helper (says the beautiful *Confitemini*),

1) Erlanger: the 89th Psalm.

and I will see my pleasure in my enemies. The Lord is with me, therefore I will not fear; what can men do to me?" Amen. [Psalm 118:7, 6.]

Preface Brother Richards.

1) In the time of Emperor Heraclius 1) a man arose, yes, a devil and a firstborn child of Satan, against the truth and against the Christian church, who drowned in carnal immorality and dealt in black arts, named Mahmet. He has 2) from the inspiration and help of him, who is a liar and a father of all lies [Joh. 8, 44.], let a law go out full of lies and injustice, but with the appearance that it was spoken from the mouth of God: the same he has called Alkoran, that is, a summa or assembly, namely of the divine commandments. This Mahmet has persecuted the Christian church, neither harder those who have gone before, nor those who will come after. For he has not attacked the church in one way, but with all three, namely, with tyranny like the tyrants, with false doctrine like the heretics, and with deceit of glittering holiness like the hypocrites or false brethren, so that he has brought the greatest part of the world under himself with his deceit by God's decree, 3) who is wondrous in his doings among the children of men.

(2) Therefore I, Richard, the least of the Order of Preachers, have taken heed, and have directed my walk according to God's commandment. For after I had traveled over many seas and through many deserts, I also came to Babylon, the glorious city of the Saracens, where they have their high schools, which are very large; there I learned the Arabic script and language, and debated without ceasing and most diligently with their doctors and scholars, but found more and more how utterly shameful the said Alkoran law is. I also began to interpret it into Latin, but there were so many tales, lies, blasphemies, and always one useless babble after another that I was overwhelmed with great sadness.

1) Marginal gloss of the Jena edition: "In this year 1540 Heraclius has been dead for 900 years. - Heraclius reigned from 611-641. - In the Wittenberg edition (whose second volume first appeared in 1548), the marginal gloss reads: "In this 1548 Heraclius is just 906 year today." Instead of "1540" in the Jena edition, "1542" was probably intended.

2) Thus taken over by us from the old edition of Walch. Wittenberg and Jena: hats.

3) Wittenberger: verhengnis.

3) But this time I want to point out and indicate 4) the noble main points and lies of this shameful law with the help of the Most High, who is truth itself, so that other brethren may have cause, so that they may all the more easily convert such heretics, seduced by this law, back to God.

Chapter I.

From the main pieces of this alcoran.

4 Thus it is to be noted that all the filth, which the devil spreads from time to time through other heretics, he has fed out in one heap through Mahmet. With Sabellio he holds that God is not three persons, but he sets a branch in the Godhead (which rhymes with nothing in the Godhead); the one he calls God himself or God's being; the other he calls God's soul, and this is to be Christ, of a different and lesser being than God's subject. Therefore he introduces God in the Alkoran, that he speaks in two persons' names, and is divided 5) and says: We have done this, we have commanded this 2c. And this he got from the Arians, who taught that Christ was God's Son, who was a creature or God's creature, but far above all creatures, as through whom God had created everything else. So also Mahmet says that Christ is the most holy man above all others, and is a power far above all. Therefore, he calls him God's Word, God's Spirit, God's Soul; but that he should be a true, natural, essential God is very ridiculous to him, and considers the Christians to be ridiculous gross fools who believe such things.

And here he needs two causes: The first, that Christ never called himself God. The other, that he taught the contradiction. 6) Therefore Mahmet says (mockingly): The Christians say that Christ is God, while he himself says to the Jews: You shall worship my God and your God, my Lord and your Lord. And so Mahomet's foremost opinion is that Christ is neither God nor the Son of God, but a wise holy man and great prophet, born of a virgin without a father. For he says, 7) it is impossible for GOD to have a son, because he has no wife. And where he should have a son, there would be Him-

4) "will" is missing in the Wittenberger.

5) sich ihrzet" - speaks of itself in the majority.

6) Marginal gloss of the Jenaers and Wittenbergers: He got that from the Arians. O cleverness!

7) Marginal gloss there: He got this from the Jews, who are still talking like this today.

mel and earth and all creatures in great danger, for there would ultimately have to be discord among them.

He further says: 1) The Jews did not crucify or kill Christ, but another who resembled him. In this he almost agrees with the Manichaeans.

7 He further says: God has taken Christ to Himself, and He will be revealed again at the end of the world and will kill the end Christ. After that, God will let Christ die.

8) Further he says that also the devils can be saved by the Alkoran; and of the same many, since they heard this, 2) have become Saracenes.

9 He further says: He himself, Mahmet, went up to God, when the angel Gabriel was sent after him by God, God laid his hand on him, and when he was thus touched by God, he was so frozen that [it] also went through the marrow of his back.

10 He further says that the Holy Spirit is a creature, as the Macedonians said.

11 But that he says that the angels became devils, because they would not worship Adam as God had commanded them; in this he has no one to follow.

(12) But because he deludes and deceives about the eternal blessedness to come, that it should be in carnal pleasures, good living, delicious garments, and merry gardens, he has this from Cerintho and some other unbelievers.

13 And he holds that circumcision must be kept; as the Ebionites taught.

(14) He shall permit them to have many wives in wedlock, as well as concubines and maids, and to catch and feed as much as one of them may in war, and to rob and take the wives of others in war.

15 And he commanded that they all be put to death, if they obey not this law, or be liable to interest.

16) And in the chapter Vacca (that is, cow) he looks as if he allows both men and women to commit silent sins, although the descendants adorn them with beautiful glosses.

17 And this is the sum of it: Everything that is hard to believe and hard to do in the Scriptures, he cuts off, and allows what one is inclined to in this temporal life, as, carnal lusts, robbery and murder, to which especially the wild, raw people, the Arabs, have desire; because he is an Arab.

18. but of the right virtues, as, De

He speaks of courage, patience, chastity, peace, and of eternal life nothing worth reading.

19) But so that such of his 3) traits would not be mislaid by the Old and New Testaments, or by the old 4) philosophers' books written about virtues, he commanded that nothing in them should be considered truth that was contrary to his law, and called for all those to be severely punished who spoke against it. 5)

20 But he praises the Psalter and other prophets highly.

21. also says, 6) Christ prophesied much of him in the gospel to the children of Israel, saying, I proclaim to you an apostle of God, who will come after me, whose name is Mahmet. And boast that this name is written from eternity on the throne of God above, at the right hand.

22 But to prove this, that it should be believed, he did no miracle at all, but drew out a sword, and said, He was sent of God, not with powers of miracles, but with powers of the sword, or weapons.

These are the most important parts of the Alkoran, that is, the Saracen Law; otherwise there are countless lies in it, some of which we will deal with in the 9th chapter.

Chapter II.

How to deal with them.

(24) Secondly, it is to be known that they are very nigern und kützeln 7) to hear of our faith, especially of three persons in the Godhead and of the humanity of Christ; not that they desire to know or believe it, but that they mock our faith and make their laughter of it. For what is beyond reason and human understanding they cannot understand. Therefore they do not want to believe it, even though Isaiah says: "If you do not believe, you will not understand", Is. 7, 9. And because it is also contrary to their Alkoran (which they firmly believe to be God's word), they do not let them say anything about it and do not pay attention to it. Therefore, it is not necessary to first discuss with them the high articles of our faith and to cast pearls before swine [Matth. 7, 6.], but to take this way and manner, namely, from their

3) Thus set by us. Jenaer: "such his"; Wittenberger: "such his".

4) "old" is missing in the Jena.

5) talk tbursten - dared to talk.

6) Marginal gloss: O devil! Ivan. 5: Alius betrayed in homilie suo.

7) i.e. curious and ticklish.

1) Marginal gloss: He got that from himself, as the third master.

2) Marginal gloss: That is true, devils, Saracens, Turks are. One thing.

Alcoran, and do diligence to prove such their law false and void. For since faith teaches us such things as are incomprehensible, let us be content that it is confirmed by the gospel (which the Alcoran himself also praises) and by miracles, since they have neither gospel nor miracles to prove 1) their law, but hold what reason can comprehend, like the Gentiles.

35 And though the Alcoran says, Ye shall not call three gods, cause it is One God; this is not against us, and proves nothing. For we ourselves say, as do the pagans, that there is only one God, and that he is united and indivisible, so that nothing could be more united. Nor do we give him a companion, as they do, who is called God's soul, God's spirit, God's word, as if he were his servant; so that one would be justified in asking them why the Alkoran makes God speak more than many, or we, if they insist that he is one, and not many or we. But because the Saracens deny both miracles and the Apostles' Scriptures, where they are against the Alcoran, there is no other way to deal with them, except that the Alcoran is not God's law. Which one can also do through the Alcoran, and thus strike Goliath with his own sword.

Chapter III.

That the Alkoran is not God's law, because neither Old nor New Testament testify nor prophesy of it.

26 There is no testimony of Mahomet, neither in the Old nor in the New Testament, but he himself and only he testifies of himself, without miraculous signs and without writing; therefore he cannot be of God, and denies, since he boasts that he is a prophet to the whole world. But to this he answers thus: it is well prophesied of him, both in the Old and New Testament, but the Jews have falsified the Old Testament, the Christians the New Testament; but he has taken out the best, and nothing true remains in the Old and New Testament, without what he has collected and selected in the Alkoran. Otherwise, 2) Christ would have proclaimed in the Gospel to the children of Israel: "I proclaim to you an apostle who will come after me, whose name is Mahmet.

27. that this is not true, I prove therefore; for he himself [Mahmet] in the chapter of Jonah says thus: Where you doubt that which we have now 1) "to" here inserted by us and "to" before "have" to you.
erased from us.

2) In the old editions: had.

ask those who have read the book (the Bible) before you 2c. But this is what the Jews and Christians find. If then the books of the Bible are falsified, why does he assign his Saracen brothers to false ones? Is he a prophet of truth, and skins himself here in the cheeks?

28 Thus he also speaks in the chapter Elagar, which means stone: We (God) have sent down *monitiones*, admonitions, which we also want to receive. But admonitions are called the gospel and the law of Moses. So God must preserve the Gospel and the Laws of Moses both before and after Mahomet; how then does he reproach them for falsifying God's preservation, the holy prophet? Item, in the chapter Elmaida, that is table, is thus written: When the judge of Empacene said to Mahmet: How shall I tell the Jews, if they seek justice from me? said Mahmet: How do they seek justice from you? they have the Old Testament, where God's justice is written. Now tell me, how do you deny that the Jews have forged the Old Testament? Or do you direct them to the false book, you holy truthful prophet?

(29) It is also foolish to say that the Bible should be forged, since all the heretics in the world have used it against the Christians, and it would be ridiculous for the heretics to use a different Bible than that of the Christians. For then they would have known that their new Biblia would have been worthless against the old Biblia of the Christians, and again, the Christians against their Biblia, because there were two different Biblia. But now it is a matter of one Bible, who has it or not.

30 Further: towards the morning there were many sects before Mahmet was born, especially the Nestorians and Jacobites. The Nestorians, however, agree more with the Saracens than the Jacobites; that is why they gave honor to Mahmet above all others. But how is it credible to reason that the Nestorians and Jacobites became one with each other, who were so hostile to each other that they even strangled each other?

Item, why should the Christians have removed the name Mahmet from the gospel before, which praises Christ and his mother, also the gospel? For thus he says in the Alkoran: In the gospel of Christ is truth and perfection. Much more would they have erased the names Pilati, Herodis, Jude, Caiphä 2c.

32) How can it rhyme that the Christians should have put in the gospel how Christ was crucified and died, so that it would have been much better for the Christians and easier for the world to believe that they have Christ?

(the Mahmet does), especially because it is foolish and impossible for all reason to believe that he who is a true God should die?

33. nor has the whole world accepted this, emperors, kings, scholars, and poor unlearned laymen, as the apostles and their disciples were. So also a Saracen Calphas or Soltan died as a Christian in Babylon, and a cross was found on his neck, that he might bear witness that, though he had been the Saracen Soltan, yet he wished to die as a Christian; wherefore he was also specially buried, not in the place where others are wont to be buried, and I have seen the grave myself.

34 Item, in the chapter Elmaida (Table) it says: There is nothing with the company of the book, where they do not keep the gospel and the law. "Society of the Book" is the name of the Saracens who have accepted the Alkoran. So they must keep the Gospel and the Law of Moses, besides the Alkoran, which is their own law (as they say), or there is nothing with them; how then shall they keep corrupted books according to God's and their Mahomet's commandments? Or do God and their prophet honor truth and lies at the same time?

35 Lastly, they are guilty of showing us where they have found an unadulterated Bible, because they are all said to be false; they must convince the false with a true one, or be liars, and be guilty of keeping with us the Biblia, which is the same in all the world, or condemn its Alkoran by its own judgment as a book of lies.

Chapter IV.

That Alkoran could not be God's law, because he has another way of speaking.

The Alkoran does not have the way of speaking that other holy scriptures have, for it is definitely set in rhyme or poetry, as songs are sung. But to speak in such a way is not only against the holy scriptures, but also against all philosophers, laws and other textbooks, without where the songs are. For it is not fitting, if one should preach, teach or speak in court, that he should come along with rhymes, as if he wanted to sing a song or play a mischievous game. Although the Saracens and Arabs praise this highly, as if it were a sign that their law is revealed by God to the Mahomet and is all the more glorious, if the contradiction is true. For no prophet, lawyer or philosopher has ever spoken poetically or in rhyme where he should have taught and preached to the common people.

Therefore also some reproached Mahomet, as it is written in the chapter Elempii, and said: How is it with thee? Dost thou dream? or wilt thou dance? or art thou foolish? For no reasonable man can suffer anything to be told or reported to him, especially if it is new that someone wants to do it with rhymes. He would have to think that one wanted to mock him or make a joke in serious matters; singing and rhyming otherwise have their time and space, here it is not suitable.

37 Furthermore, the Alkoran is full of his own useless praise. For he may well teach nothing everywhere for a whole chapter, but only speak in God's person that God is great, high, wise, good, just, and that he is all that there is in heaven, on earth, and in the means, and he is to be praised. And he should do this more than a hundred times, and then follow it: there is no God but God, and he believes God and his apostle (means himself by this); and in this he forgets, like a madman, that he himself speaks such things about God. For it is not God's way to speak thus in His own person: Know that God is great 2c., but the prophets and others speak of God thus; but God speaks of Himself thus: I am your GOtt, I have made all things, mine is all things, I am gracious 2c. Not so in Alkoran: God is your God, as if he spoke of another, which he was not.

38 Thirdly, the Alkoran uses impudent, coarse, lewd words when speaking of the work of the flesh, as do the harlots and knaves in the whorehouse, or other coarse impudent people. But the Holy Spirit speaks of it in the Scriptures in a very chaste way; as: Adam knew his wife Eve; item: David went in to Bethsaba; item: Elisabeth became pregnant 2c. Because also the right and philosophi, as public speakers, chastely and shamefully speak of it. But Mahmet was so deeply immersed in fornication that he liked to speak shamefully in public about such wretched need or evil sinful lust, and teaches how to speak, as those do who are like him in the insatiable lust of the flesh.

39 Fourth, it is obvious and certain to all who read it that the Alkoran is full of fables and useless fairy tales, so I will put a little here. In the chapter Emele, which means fly, it is written that Solomon gathered a great army of angels, men and unreasonable animals. As they went along, they found flies like a great stream of water. Then Solomon said to the flies: Arise, ye flies, into your dwelling, that Solomon and his host destroy you not. But the flies smiled. Soon after, all the birds in the army were there without the flies.

were not there. And Solomon said, How is it that I see no fly? I will punish it and cut off its head, or else causes shall tell me why it is not there. Then said the fly: I have learned more than you; I come to you now from Sabea with true new paper. Then I found a woman ruling over them, whom I forced, together with her people, to worship the sun in God's stead. 2c.

. Item, in the chapter Caramar, that is, moon, Luna, thus it is written: The hour came, and the moon was broken. Their scholars interpret this as follows: Mahmet once stood with his company and watched the moon as it almost wanted to become new. Then they said to him: "Dear, let us see a sign. So he beckoned to the moon with two fingers, his thumb and middle finger. When he did so, the moon split into two pieces, and one piece fell on Mount Eleventh, which is near the city of Mecca 1) on one side, and the other piece fell on Mount Rubus, which is on the other side of the city. When the moon was thus divided, it crept into Mahmet's skirt, and he made it whole again.

Item, in the chapter Seni he says, how a worm announced Solomon's death to the devils. They glossed over it thus: Solomon leaned on his staff, then suddenly such a great pain came upon him that his soul went out in a flash. But he did not fall down, by the miracle of God. The devils, however, who had to be subjected to him, seeing that he was standing, thought that he was asleep. Then a worm grew out of the earth and gnawed the staff in two, so Solomon fell down. And the devils ran to 2) and saw that he was dead. So they began to harm the people with all their might.

42) Item, in the chapter of Erzelen 3) he himself, Mahmet, sets the reasons why wine is forbidden, and says: God sent two angels on earth, that they should rule well and judge right, one was called Aroth, the other Maroth. Then a pious woman came and invited them as her guests, and gave them wine to drink, when God had forbidden that they should not drink wine. When they were drunk, they asked to sleep with her; 4) she agreed, but with the condition that the one taught her to go to heaven and the other taught her to go back down. So she went to heaven. But when God saw her and heard her

He made her a morning star, so that she would be as beautiful among the stars in heaven as she had been the most beautiful among women on earth. 5) But to the angels he gave the choice whether they wanted to be punished here or there. And because they chose rather to suffer the punishment here, he let them hang by the feet with an iron chain in the well of Babylon until the last day.

43 These and many other things are written in the Alkoran, from which all reasonable people may conclude that such a law cannot be divine. For even nature teaches, if there were no Bible, that the true God would not speak to men through such fables.

Chapter V.

That the Alkoran does not agree with the Holy Scriptures or other reasonable teachings.

44 It is obvious that the Alkoran of virtues or good works, and of man's blessedness, does not agree with the philosophers either, let alone with the holy Scriptures; for the philosophers speak much of all kinds of virtues, and that man's blessedness is found in contemplation, not in carnal pleasures. But Christ clearly says John 17:3: "This is life eternal, that they may know thee, the one true God, and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ. And Moses, 2 Mos. 33, 13. 18., having seen many wonders of God, and being full of gifts, nevertheless heartily desired to behold God's face.

45) But Mahmet is not about virtues at all, 6) but about wars and robberies, the long way to hell. And will they help nothing to blessedness (as they think) when they speak these words: 7) There is no God but God, and Mahmet is God's apostle. So he also puts man's blessedness in carnal pleasures, in eating, drinking, beautiful clothes, funny gardens, pretty clean women, of which afterwards in the 6th chapter. And no one can say that he speaks these things as parables, which should mean something else, spiritual, as there are also parables in the Gospel, as Christ says that his own shall eat and drink with him at his table, in his Father's kingdom [Luc. 22, 30]. But the Evan-

5) Marginal gloss: Ei, nun strafe dich GOtt, leidiger, blasphemous devil.

6) Marginal gloss: Ut in Rosario.

7) Marginal gloss: Murderer, say a Hail Mary and you will be blessed.

1) In the Wittenberg and the Jena: Mecha.

2) Marginal gloss: These are silly and young devils gewest.

3) Perhaps: "telling", as Walch resolved it.

4) Marginal gloss: Here stands the chaste Mahmet's word.

The Gospel itself interprets such parables, that eating does not mean filling the belly, or that beautiful women should be there, as everyone knows well. But the Alcoran speaks such things without all parables, and interprets it nowhere else, except that it is a blessedness, as a lewd carnal man desires.

46) Even though Mahmet did not think or speak about the right eternal bliss, he nevertheless told his Saracens a special thing beforehand (without doubt because of God's decree), because Mahmet says to the Saracens: 1) After me you will be divided into three and seventy parts, among which only one part will be saved, the others will all be destroyed with fire. This saying is so valid among them that 2) neither the wise nor the unwise hold it in low esteem. There is also another saying in the Alcoran, in the chapter Martil, that is, Maria, which says that all Saracens must go to hell. I consider this saying to be true, even though it is spoken from the mouth of the supreme liar.

47 Secondly, the Alcoran does not agree with Moses in the commandments. For God's commandment forbids murder, robbery and all carnal pleasure, but the Alcoran says all this, or even forbids it: as in the chapter Elmir, that is, Light, he forbids that one should not force wives to leave chastity; but if they consent to it, one may safely sleep with them. And in the chapter Elminim he allows both to sleep with their own wives, and how much one can catch them in war 2c.

Chapter VI.

How the Alcoran is against himself.

Mahmet himself speaks in the chapter Elnasa, that is, women: If the Alcoran were not from GOD, there would be much repugnant in it. And in many places he says: God does not lead anyone astray. Again, in many places he asks that God lead him from darkness to light. Item, he says: he is a lost orphan. Again he says: God has made such a prophet out of him. For when God called him to Himself, he went up to God in the seventh heaven and obtained forgiveness for an angel a thousand times greater than the world, whom he found weeping over his sin.

49. He says: he is the common prophet of all the world. And again he speaks: that God gave the Alcoran only in Arabic language,

1) Marginal gloss: Here the devil raises mice.

2) In the editions: them (jnen).

and he could not speak any other language than Arabic. He says in the chapter Inpakara, that is, a young cow, that both Jews, Christians and Sabaeans will be saved; but afterwards, in the chapter Abraham, he says that no one will be saved except those who live according to the law of the Saracens.

50] Item, he commands them, 3) They are not to act harshly and harshly, but gently with people of another sect, for it is not man's, but God's alone, to bring them to justice. And each one must give account for himself, not for another. Again, in many places he commands to kill and rob those who do not believe, until they believe or pay tribute. But again, in the chapter Comem, he says: 4) Those who accept a god other than God, you shall not take care of them, nor provide for them, for God Himself has reserved this for Him. Is this not a deliberate act against each other, so often commanding to kill the unbelievers; again, so often commanding not to punish sin, but to let God alone punish?

51 Thus in the chapter Elteminim he boasts that he is not one who compels to faith. How is this true? Or where is a greater compulsion than to compel by robbery and death? In the chapter Bovis, that is, Ox, he admits that 5) it is not against nature to mix with boys and women. For he says to the Saracens that they should not defile themselves with the unbelievers before they become believers. And to the 6) women he says: Your wives are your fields, plow them as you wish. Again, in the same chapter, he says that the Sodomites in the time of Lot committed an abominable sin, which the former Gentiles were not accustomed to.

(52) He says of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and their descendants that they were Saracens. Again, he says that it was revealed to him by God that he was the first Saracen in this faith. If he is the first Saracen, how were those Saracens? if the Alcoran was given long after Moses and the Gospel. For Mahomet began at five hundred and eight and ninety years after the birth of Christ, and continued until the seventh hundred year. But if he wants to say that they were Saracens because they knew as prophets what the Alcoran would be, then they were also all kinds of heretics and everything that they knew in the future. If they want to say that they liked the Alcoran, it is impossible,

3) Marginal gloss: *Hoc servat hodie.*

4) "he" is missing in the Jena.*

5) Marginal gloss: O Sow Abbot and Rangen Prior.

6) In the old editions: the.

For they have taught and done much that is in the Alkoran differently and against it.

53, Item, he says: "Prophesying by the flight of birds or by their crying is forbidden. But after that, in the chapter of Elaphar, he says: You shall prophesy; if you cannot do otherwise, do it with your fingers; and whoever does not do it, let him be banished. Item, he says, he was sent to the Arabs because they had no apostle of their own from God. Item, that the Alkoran is given only in the Arabic tongue, and that he cannot speak any other language than Arabic. For when Mapira the Jacobite, Silon the Persian, and Solam the Jew joined the Mahomet, some said: These will teach you everything; then he fell to the ground, and his hands clenched. And his fellows covered him with their garments.

54 And when he was come again to himself, he said, God hath sent me to rebuke you for the word, because ye say, These teach me. And read unto them a saying, which is at the end of the chapter of Elnael, that is, Palms, which saith thus, We 1) know that it shall be said, These teach him, when they speak Persian with him 2c. Therefore he says: How is it possible that these should teach me, if one is a Persa, the other a Hebrew? To this they answer: It is possible that they speak to you in their own language and then interpret it to you, but you put everything into your own language. To this he knew no answer.

(55) But if he could not learn from a Persian and a Hebrew, which are the nearest to his language, how can he teach those who are so far from his language? And yet he wants to be a prophet to all the Gentiles. For in the chapter "Prophets" he says that God said to him: We have sent you to all the Gentiles. But how will he come to all the Gentiles, who are divided into 72 languages, if he cannot reveal his word in any other language than Arabic?

Chapter VII.

That the Alkoran is not confirmed with any miraculous work.

When Moses was sent to Pharaoh, he performed great miracles [2 Mos. 7, 9. ff], and all the prophets, Elijah [1 Kings 17], Elisha [2 Kings 1. ff], and especially those who were to bring forth a new thing. Christ came with great signs [Apost. 2, 22. 10, 38.], as Mahmet himself confesses in the Alkoran; but he 2) has never done any sign; therefore his law cannot be of

1) Marginal gloss: "We" that is, GOD and His soul.
2) "but" is missing in the Wittenberger.

God, and he would not be an apostle of God. And if the Saracens wanted to say that Mahmet had done many and great signs, as when he replenished the moon that had been cut in two and made a spring of water flow from his finger; these are fables, and also contrary to the Alkoran itself. For Mahmet declares that no such thing of his is to be believed without what is written in the Alkoran. Of all the prophets he says, "Many have told many lies; lest anyone think the same of me, let that alone be believed to be true of me, which is proved by the Alkoran.

57 For when he had done no miracles, and wished to prove it, he brought in God, who spoke to him, saying, "The Lord said to me, 'Therefore I will not let you perform miraculous signs, lest you suffer for miraculous signs, as other prophets have done. So it is proved by his own testimony that he did no miraculous sign. And he, Mahmet, often speaks in the Alkoran, as the people said to him: Show a miracle, as Moses came with the signs, and as Christ and other prophets have done. To which he answers: Moses and the prophets were sent by God, especially Christ, who came with great signs; but the world did not believe them, but called them magicians and black artists. Therefore God did not send me a sign, because they would not have believed; but I came by force of arms.

(58) But this is publicly false. Why would they not have believed him if he had performed miraculous signs, if they had believed him without miraculous signs, since he only pretended to kill, rob and rape women, to cut out tooth for tooth, eye for eye? For people are inclined to worldliness, so that they can hardly be kept from it by many judges, executioners and punishers. But that he introduces the sword for miracles, or weapons force, is also a lie, because he is not always superior, as Moses, Joshua, Elijah, whom God's angels always protected, 3) and helped to win. But Mahmet sometimes won, sometimes lost, like other tyrants; for his teeth were knocked out in war, and his face was bruised.

(59) Therefore this is not a miracle, which they take for a miracle, that a great part of the world has fallen to him. For he has given such a law and such commandments, 4) to which people are inclined even without laws; as said above. God has commanded me," he says, "to fight the heathen with the sword, until they have

3) In the editions: protects.
4) Marginal gloss: Yes, against God's law.

that there is no God without God, and that I am God's apostle. Those who have confessed this have received their money and blood with it. Therefore, the Saraceni are called *servati*, the preserved ones. For those who accepted Mahomet's commandment were preserved, both by him and by those who were under him, and did not kill them or take anything from them. And the Saraceni therefore will not be called Saraceni, but Maselamin, that is, the preserved ones, and mock the Christians for calling themselves the preserved ones.

(60) Since many took such preservation from Mahomet for the sake of the same causes, he was told to preach that whoever said these words, "There is no God but God," 1) would go to Paradise, being an adulterer or a highwayman. But there came to him one, whose name was Evordi, and asked him whether this was true? He answered, "Yes," and said, "If he drinks wine or kills, even if he bends the nose of Abdala," 2) but to confirm this he did not give a sign, but drew his sword.

61 It is even clearer in the chapter of the Prophets, for there it reads: "It was said to Mahomet, 'You dream, you invent lies, or perhaps you want to sing; dear one, come to us with some miraculous signs, like those who were sent before. Then he answered, "God says, 'We have turned back cities before the eyes of the unbelievers, and after them those who were before you; yet they will not believe, neither will you believe, except by the sword. But he boasts that Gabriel was sent to him by God, who led him to a beast larger than an ass and smaller than a mule, whose name was Elmaparak. And the same beast could talk and walk in an hour a way that would otherwise take five thousand years to walk, and it did so at night; and other more fables, of which hereafter in the tenth chapter.

(62) But our Christian faith, which demands hard things to believe and to do, is founded on public and useful miraculous signs, which not only Christ, but also the apostles and later the fathers performed, and which still continue to this day, so that devils are cast out, the sick are healed, and the dead are raised. Such miracles are performed by Christians, who believe and confess that Jesus Christ Crucified is the true and only God.

63 And although the Saraceni say they did not believe that les) had happened, I show this great miracle. It is evident that the

The whole world before the birth of Christ worshipped idols, especially the Romans, who were masters of the world at that time. They still accepted the Christian faith, and not only believed that the crucified Christ was the true God, but also rejected all other gods, who answered them so long ago through the idols, and also did not impose anything more difficult; but the Christian faith imposes such unusually difficult things, as despising the world, despising oneself, loving enemies, praying for persecutors, doing good to those who harm us, not stealing other people's goods, giving our own goods 2c. The world has accepted all these things and rejected its former nature.

(64) Whether the world be converted by miracles or without miracles, it is a great wonder that without miracles, through simple-minded unlearned men, such things may have happened. And this is what the Christians did, who did not kill other people, but patiently suffered the death of others. Thus it is evident that the Christian faith is founded on exceedingly great miracles, but the faith of Mahomet is not founded on a single miracle. There is also such a faith that needs no miracles, especially among the Saracens, who are quite carnal and inclined to temporal pleasure, even to rob and murder.

65. although what wise people [are,] and learned people, the people have reason among them, the Mahmet believe nothing.

Chapter VIII.

That the Alkoran of Mahmets is bestial and sour.

(66) It might well have happened that Mahmet's law would have been accepted by the world, even without miraculous signs, since it would have been according to reason. But now it is not according to reason. First, because of the master; second, because of the law in himself; third, because of the work; fourth, because of the end or opinion.

First of all, it is not according to reason that such an evil man, a murderer, robber, adulterer, and subject to other vices, should make a holy (as they call it) law; as is obvious to all who know his life. Here the Saracens answer: David also fell into adultery and murder [2 Sam. 11.]; Moses slew an Egyptian [2 Mos. 2, 12.]. So it may be said of Mahomet that he can still be God's prophet, whether he has been in sin or not;

1) Marginal gloss: *Id est, diabolus est etiam deus.*

2) Marginal gloss: *Infra [§ 160] Audula [In the Aus gave erroneously: Andula.]*

3) In the outputs: everything.

for those two were nevertheless true prophets of God. But they were not. David and Moses have punished their sin by repentance; and this is known. For David confessed his sin, and was sorry for it; therefore when he said, "I have sinned," Nathan said out of God's mouth, "The LORD hath forgiven thee thy sin" [2 Sam. 12:13]. But nowhere does it say of Mahmet that he atoned for or confessed his sin, but rather confirmed it by his blasphemously shameful law.

68 For all the Saracens know very well that Mahmet had fallen in love with a woman called Mary, a Jacobite, whom Macobeus, the king of the Jacobites, had given him. But Mahmet's two wives, one of whom was named Aiese, a daughter of Empiecer, the noblest of all, and the other Aasa, a daughter of Omar, began to jealousy against Mary. And they came to him one day, and found him lying with Mary, and said: Yes, shall a prophet do so? Then he was ashamed, and swore an oath that he would never do it again. And they were satisfied for the sake of the oath. Soon afterward he could not refrain himself, and made a law as if it had been ordained by God and revealed to him, and put the sentence in the Alkoran, in the chapter Elmetheharem, that is, prohibition or ban, saying: O Prophet, why doest thou commit that which God hath permitted thee? Do you want to court your wives? God has hereby decreed that you may not keep your oaths. So he perjured himself and slept with her again, pretending that God had revoked his oath, with Michael and Gabriel as witnesses.

(69) Then one of his wives said, O Mahmet, yes, God will be very pleased with your forwardness. Perhaps that is why he spoke it, so that he would follow you and participate with you in this evil work; do you think that is why God commanded you to testify with your mouth? Do you think God wants to help you and assist you in this? Then he read to both his wives what follows in the chapter Vetationes, and said, as if from the mouth of God: "Let it be a sorrow to you before God that your hearts have sinned so (he means that they had punished him for adultery); and there it follows: If he will divorce you, I will give him better Saracen women in your place, who are devout, rich, penitent, prayerful, and strong, as well as virgins. When they heard this, they said, "We are sorry.

Seventy and seventy, when he took his wife from Zeith, his conductor, he said in the chapter of Elazeb that God had said: Thou dost

you harbor in your heart that God wants to be revealed, and you fear men; it is cheaper to fear God. But when she promoted Zeith again and said: O apostle of God, you must not have her 1) as your wife, Mahmet said: Woe to you, God has given her to me.

(71) Indeed, he himself, Mahomet, says: There is no greater sin than to ascribe lies to God. There is no sin more offensive to a prophet than impure lust and fornication of the flesh. For the Holy Spirit does not stir the heart even of the right holy prophets when they are in the work of the flesh, as St. Jerome says. Aristotle also says that it is impossible to deal with wisdom in such work or lust.

Therefore it is contrary to reason that such a holy law (as they call it) should be the master and prophet of such an unclean, coarse, lewd, carnal man, who also boasts that he has as much strength and supply for such a work as forty other men. Although God has not given him a child, only a daughter. 2) Such a law is a beastly, unreasonable law to keep for the sake of its master, who is such a desperate, evil, beastly, sour man. In addition, he himself is uncertain and doubtful, as he testifies about himself in Alcoran that he does not know how he and the Saracens will fare, and that he is also uncertain whether he and they are with him on the path to salvation or not.

73 Secondly, the alcoran is also in himself a beastly and sour law against reason. For he uses the most impudent words in matters where it is necessary and fair to speak honorably and demurely, and to cover the hereditary shame, but he likes to speak such words, which serve the lust of the flesh. For in many places he uses the word *coire*, 3) that even the poets are not so coarse. Nor does he publicly pretend that there is no man on earth who understands the Alkoran. Why then has God commanded to keep it, if one cannot understand it?

This is also contrary to reason and foolishly spoken, since he says in many places that God commanded the angels to worship Adam. And those who would not do so would have to become devils, but those who would do so would remain angels. How can reason suffer that God should command idolatry and give men the honor that is God's alone?

75 Item, as they say, is the most necessary thing in

1) In the Wittenberg (wrong) instead of "they not": "me".

2) "a" is missing in the Jena.

3) Marginal gloss: Vox diaboli.

their laws that one should speak these words everywhere: There is no God but God, and Mahomet is God's apostle, and that God is great. What kind of a great thing is this, as if there were some doubt or strange new doctrine in it? Who does not know that God is God and that He is great? Who has ever heard that God is not God, or that He is small, be it One God or much? It is just as if one said: There is no donkey but a donkey, there is no cow but a cow, there is no man but a man. It is well known that an ox or a dog is not an ass, nor is man or an angel God; fools and madmen may speak so. But that it should be a special service of God or wisdom, that is nothing. Moreover, as true and certain as it is that God is God, it is uncertain that Mahomet is God's apostle. What is the use of such a great foolish glory in these vain words, that he who speaks such words will be blessed without doubt?

76 Item, Mahmet says in the Law: that all men are of one kind, and of one faith, but God has made them of many kinds, having sent many prophets. Dear, what appearance does this have that it should be true? God wants to have unity at the highest, and not various sects. The devil and evil men (by God's decree) separate men from the unified truth in various errors and sects.

(77) Item, Mahomet says, as from the mouth of God, to kill the unbelievers, that is, those who are not Saracens. And yet say, they can think no good thing unless they are guided by God. If they are not guided, it is foolish, even murderous, they kill for that which they are not able to do. But if they are able, it is foolish to force them. For GOtte does not like forced services. And elsewhere he himself considers it a foolish, unskillful thing to kill those who do not believe, or to force them to believe. For so he says in the chapter of Jonah: "If God would, all who are on earth would believe; and you want to force people to believe? No one can believe unless God gives it to him. More about this in the following chapter.

78 Thirdly, his law is contrary to reason and animalistic, because of the things it teaches. He makes a separate chapter of ants, of the spider, of smoke. But why does God give such things about ants and smoke 2c.? Item, he says: God can never forgive him who turns his back on his enemies. Rather, what fool would consider it a sin for one to flee,

If he saw the danger? without wanting to make his own foolhardy and belligerent.

79 Item, when he teaches 1) about washing, that is indeed foolish and ridiculous. He says that if they want to pray, they should wash the hands and face, and below (with leave) the hindmost and foremost, as he calls it roughly enough, also the soles of the feet and the arm up to the elbow. But where they could not have water, they shall thrust the hand into dust, and rub the hands with dust, and so rub the face also therewith 2c. If one teaches to wash the heart, as Jeremiah says [Jer. 4, 4], that would be more reasonable. What is the sense of rubbing dust on the face?

80 But this is exceedingly great, gross unreasonableness, which he teaches about divorce. For a Saracen may repudiate his wife and take her again, as often as she loved him, 2) but so far that he, who repudiated for the third time, must not take her again. Unless the other husband has not slept with her properly or perfectly 3). Therefore, if they would like to have their wives again, they give money to the one who has taken the rejected woman (who is sometimes a blind man or some other lowly person), so that he may be heard publicly to say that he wants to divorce her; when this has happened, the first one can take her again. 4) But it also happens that the same other man likes the woman so much that he says afterwards that he cannot divorce her; so he has lost both money, bride and hope. But such laws should not be imposed on humans, but on unreasonable animals 5).

Fourth, Mahomet's law is also against God and all reason, that he sets man's highest and last good (eternal bliss) in carnal pleasure. For throughout the whole of the Alkoran he promises his Saracens this blessedness, that they will possess watery gardens, wives and concubines, young, clean, sedate, in purple robes, golden and silver cups over the tables, and all kinds of delicious food; all this he tells especially in the chapter Elrahman,

1) Marginal gloss: O holy water, where are you?

2) Side note: This is dog and sow wedding, not marriage.

3) Marginal gloss: "Perfect", what that is, the devil or Mahmet's impudent hemlock himself interprets in my place. Fie on you, you shameful devil and cursed Mahmet.

4) Here should probably be read: "that the same other man's wife" etc.

5) Randglosse der Jenaer Ausgabe: Nämlich den Säuen und Hundm.

that is, merciful. And in the Book of the Doctrine of a child in the womb, which is nourished and produces Mahomet, which is highly respected among them, he sets nothing. But what such an example does, everyone the order of the food and says: "The first dish shall be in the liver of the fish Alimpeput, a very sweet food. Then fruits of the trees, one after the other. And now comes further on in the same chapter, where some ask him, whether they also will do carnal pleasure? He answered, "If there were not some pleasure, it would not be a blessed life, and the rest would be nothing and in vain, if this pleasure of the flesh did not follow.

And the final opinion of the Alkoran and the Saracen sect is to put the blessedness in carnal and belly pleasures. And do not do that, that they interpret it spiritually to another, wre the holy scripture speaks of the table and meal in the kingdom of heaven [Luc. 22, 30.]. For Mahmet does not say a word about the true blessedness of beholding God and being perfect in all virtues, for he does not desire it, nor does he understand it, but only that which he desires he promises them.

In this he shows himself to be the one who teaches not only against Christ and the prophets, but also against the philosophers and all rational men, who all agree that man's salvation is in knowledge, as Christ says: "This is eternal life, that they may know you" [John 17:3]. And Aristotle says: "Life in the mind is the best. So life according to the belly and carnality must be the worst, which hinders all good understanding.

But because the Saracens do not ask anything, neither according to the holy scriptures nor according to the reason of the philosophers, one must reproach them, as the coarse sows, their sour life, how it may be in that life. For why should eating and drinking, if there is an eternal life, no sickness, hunger, thirst, death or lack? As Mahmet himself confesses and says in his textbook: God will strangle death, after which they will rise immortal and completely healthy. So, what is the use of the work of carnal pleasure, if there are no children or fruits of the body there, since it was ordained by God? Or if there is to be eating and drinking, then there must also be the sweeping out of the body; how does this rhyme with eternal blessed life?

Here Mahmet answers in his textbook: There will be no sweeping out of the filth without sweat 1). And he leads the example

of a child in the womb, which is nourished and produces nothing. But what such an example does, everyone understands well; for the child neither eats nor drinks in the womb, nor does it have carnal pleasure in eating and drinking, which the mammoth alone seeks, but nourishes itself through the umbilical cord. Also, what kind of bliss is that, since one must sweat, sweat and stink every hour without ceasing, as in a bath or parlor?

But where children are to be born of the work of the flesh, 3) many more will be born after the resurrection than were ever born before the resurrection; and these same children cannot be perfect, like the fathers and mothers, but must be unequal, weaker, more foolish, more meager; how then are they blessed? Also, where there is lust of the flesh, there will also be pain in childbirth for the women of the flesh. Item, the children will also have to die, if they are to be resurrected otherwise.

(87) If those who are born after the resurrection cannot be blessed, but take many wives, they must remain blessed and wait until many wives are born. And thus many more women than men would have to be born. Thus, in a short time, the reign of women would become.

If, after the resurrection of men, their multiplication by fleshly works is to continue forever, this must be followed by the fact that they must either die again and decay or be born eternally without number; this is impossible. Or if the same deceased shall not also rise again, the soul must remain eternally separated from the body, and thus the resurrection will not be of all men.

89. But if children are not to be born, to what end is the lust of the work of the flesh? Perhaps to an eternal fie on you. How much more sensibly the philosophers and pagans speak of this, that such work is not ordered to or for the sake of lust or heat, but again the lust is ordered to and for the sake of the work, so that thereby the animals are stimulated to increase and maintain nature, which otherwise would perish without such work.

90 And why do we not consider the unreasonable animals blessed, as the stags and boars in heat, and dogs and foxes when they baptize or ram, as having already the pleasure in this, so Mahmet seeks there in that eternal life?

2) "not" is missing in the Wittenberger.

3) Marginal gloss Such art shall teach whoever rejects the Bible.

1) Marginal gloss: O a strong sweat it must be.

Or what is needed here on earth, or what is lacking, that we are not blessed with equal women in this life, if we can eat and drink to the utmost (as we Germans do), or take many wives (as the Turks do)?

91. Also, if such beautiful pleasure is eternal life, why do they themselves praise all those who abstain from such pleasure with them (the Saracens)? For they also have some monks and clergymen who live chastely, of whom they think much.

92 But what shall I talk sharply with sour unreasonable people? I will continue to talk roughly with them. If there is eternal joy in such carnal lust, what do the souls of the saints who have died do? For they do not eat or drink, nor do they indulge in carnal pleasures, because the body lies rotten.

(93) And whereof are the angels blessed and merry, which neither eat nor drink, neither have they wives?

(94) Further, if eternal blessedness is that a man may have many wives, and without number concubines, where shall the wives be blessed and happy, if they also shall not have many husbands according to the free pleasure of the flesh? Again, how can a man be happy if his wife is to have many husbands? From this it must follow that either the man will be unhappy if his wife wants to have many men beside him; or the woman will be unhappy if she alone wants to have one man, but the man wants to have many women beside her; and yet both should be happy, according to the lust of the flesh, as Mahmet teaches.

95 This is enough to say how unreasonable, shameful and sinful the law of Mahomet is in this play. Although it contains many more foolish and unreasonable things than that God swears by the faithful city, by the garden of figs and the garden of oil, as he clearly says in the chapter Eltim (that is, fig). So all reason teaches that all who swear swear by that which they hold higher than themselves, rather than by a higher witness to confirm their word, of which [the Epistle to the] Hebrews also says that since GOD had nothing greater by which to swear, He swore by Himself [Heb. 6:13].

Item, that he forbids wine for the sake of drunkenness, as he says in many places, since wine is a good creature of God, and the abuse of the good creature is to be condemned. But perhaps he suspected his Saracens that they could not drink wine moderately, so he had to forbid it.

Chapter IX.

From public gross lies of the Alkoran.

He himself, 1) Mahmet, in the chapter of Jonah says: Who teaches the truth? He answers: God teaches the truth, and is the truth, one should follow. And again: It is not proper to speak anything in the divine law without God. Now it is well known that lies and falsehood must be spoken without God. For St. Augustine says: "If a lie were found in the Gospel, the whole Gospel would be suspect and nothing. For God cannot lie.

Now it is true that in the Alkoran there is much that is written in the Gospel, Moses and the prophets, but Mahomet adds so many public lies from his own head that his book is suspect and false and must be attributed to him who is a liar and the father of lies [John 8:44].

I will summarize his lies in the Alkoran in ten parts. First, he lies shamefully about himself, then about the Christians, the Jews, the apostles, the patriarchs, the devils, the angels, the Virgin Mary, Christ, and God.

(100) Of himself he thus teaches that he is the end, seal and silence (or cessation) of all prophets, and that he gives the order to kill all those who claim to be prophets after him. Against this not only the Jews and Christians say (as God's hand is not shortened by Mahomet) that many of them are prophets after Mahmet, or have had the spirit of prophecy, but also they themselves accepted a prophet in Babylon called Solem (that is, leader), whom the Tatars slew, and with him not a small number of the Saracens. Further, he leaches from himself, and exalts himself as from the mouth of God: If all spirits or angels and all men would do together, they would not be able to make such an Alkoran as he is. This he may understand as he pleases, that it is not possible without God's doom or without God's help, it is a blasphemous lie.

(101) He denies that Christians give God a companion; this is a blatant lie, for Christians throughout the world say that God is one and indivisible, indeed that nothing is more united than the Godhead or divine essence.

102 Further, in the chapter Telteumpe (that is, repentance), he denies that Christians consider their bishops, pastors and monks to be God; this is a public lie; although Mahmet speaks such things.

1) Marginal gloss: Pro se dicit, ut sibi credatur.

out of ignorance of languages. For the Christians in Persia and all the 1) Oriental countries call their bishops, pastors, monks or clergymen Rampan (that is, master or overlord), but in Arabic Rampa is God's name and means Lord, so that it means God alone; just as with us God is called HErre, and when one speaks of God, it is God's name alone; otherwise men are also called Herre; therefore in this Mahmet, as an enemy, obliges himself with lies to us Christians.

He further denies that the Christians make Mariam a goddess: for in the chapter Elmaide (that is, table) he introduces Christ as apologizing before God for not having taught the world that his mother was a goddess. The Christians do not say that Mary is God or Goddess, but the most pure feminine image. For the Gospel does not call her a goddess, but a feminine image. Whoever says otherwise about the Christians is lying as a Mahmet and a devil.

In the same chapter he speaks of Christians and Jews: they cannot be God's children or dear friends, for they must suffer much, like sinners. This is also wrong, for the Scripture often says: God's saints must suffer much, even death. And where are the holy friends of God, the Saracens, who have had to suffer many a distemper from the Tatters?

(105) From the Jews he teaches, for in the chapter Telteumpe (Repentance) Mahmet says that the Jews make Eleazar a god and teach him: He is the son of God. This is a public lie, for the Jews do not make a man God, nor call him God's son. Further, in the chapter Elnasa (Women), he teaches that the Jews should say: they have killed Jesus Christ, the son of Mary, the apostle of God. So the Jews say Ficht, because they do not consider JEsu as Christ nor as God's apostle, but as an evil man, whom they have killed for blasphemy.

In the chapter Abraham (whom they call Moses' father) he denies that the apostles said to Christ that they were Saracens and successors of the apostle Mahmet. This is a public lie. For the apostles and Christ were over six hundred years before Mahmet, and Mahmet came forth in the time of Heraclius, who began to reign in the year Domini six hundred and twelve, and is now seven hundred years that Mahmet has been. Now it is more than a thousand and two hundred years since Christ was born. How then can the apostles be Saracens? for he himself says in the chapter Elcamnar that it was commanded him by God that he should be the

be the first Saracen. If he is the first Saracen, he denies that the apostles were Saracens; if they were Saracens, he denies that he is the first Saracen.

Of the patriarchs he teaches the same, that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and their children were Saracens, as he puts it in many places in the Alkoran. He also says of Noah that he was a Saracen. Yes, he says that the flood came upon the earth because he preached to the people that they should become Saracens, and they did not want to. The lie is as obvious as the previous one. How can Noah be a Saracen who has been over two thousand and six hundred years before Mahmet, when Mahmet wants to be the first Saracen?

(108) The Saracens also lie, saying that God promised Mahmet that no one would enter Paradise before him. Then God took him and brought him to Paradise, where he saw many men and women and said, "Lord, what is this? And God said unto him, Marvel not; these are all thy followers. Now it is not possible to be Mahmet's successor John through the Alkoran; but he is not revealed before Mahmet, as it is written in many places inside, and especially in the front. But such a gross lie must not cause much embarrassment to him who has a little sense.

He lies about the devils, for he writes a special chapter about them in the Alkoran, and there he freely says that a great number of devils were glad when they heard about the Alkoran, and they confessed that they might be saved by it, and they also called themselves Saracenes, and so they were saved. How gross this lie is, must not be proved.

(110) Of the angels, he denies that they all worshipped Adam, except the devil. Item, he denies when he says that when he came to God with the angel, he saw an angel a thousand times greater than the world, who wept for his sin, and Mahmet obtained mercy for him through his prayer. And many other great 2) lies he tells, of which we will hereafter say in his false face.

Item, he holds that the angels have a tangible body; for in chapter Sad he says: The angels are made of fire, men of earth. In other places he says that they are of great space, as will follow.

In the chapter Abraham he publicly says that she is Abraham's daughter.

1) "all" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) Thus the Wittenbergers. Jenaer: larger.

Aram 1) was the father of Moses and Aaron. And in the chapter Mar Jem, that is, Mary, 2) it says that Mary, the mother of Christ, was Aaron's sister. It is true that Moses and Aaron had a sister called Mary, and all three were children of one father, Aram, as 2 Mos. 2, 4. 7. says. But between that Mary and this Mary, the mother of Jesus Christ, are more than a thousand five hundred years, and that Mary died in the wilderness when Moses brought the children of Israel out of Egypt.

Of Christ, he therefore denied that Christ had never said of himself that he was God and the Son of God, but apologized to God that he had not taught this to the world. This is a public lie, because John 14:1 says: "If you believe in God, you also believe in me"; and John 5:18, when he called himself the Son of God, the Jews wanted to stone him and said: "He makes himself like God"; and there are many sayings in John when he calls himself like God. If then Mahomet would have believed his own words, when he said that one should take the gospel as a witness to his alchemist (as said above), then he would have to punish his own lying mouth, that he says that Christ did not call himself the Son of God, or that he praised himself like God; or he would have to lie in that he takes the gospel as a witness to his alchemist.

He further says that Christ was not crucified nor did he die, but God would let him die at the end of the world 2c. If Mahmet thinks the gospel is right (as he boasts), why does he deny the gospel? If he thinks it is wrong, why does he praise it? For it is proved above that Mahomet lies, saying that the gospel is counterfeit in all the world. And much more shameful lies he tells about Christ against the gospel, which he praises so highly.

From God, therefore, he surely denies the gospel, vowed by him as the truth, that it is impossible for God to have a son, for he has no wife; and this he always proclaims, as if it were a solid, delicious reason. But such wisdom is just as if I said, "God cannot live, for He neither eats nor drinks, neither poops nor pees, nor snorts nor coughs. Christians know well how God can have a son, and there is no need for Mahmet to teach us how God must first be a man who is a woman.

A man who has a cow to beget a son, or a farmer who has a cow to beget a calf. How is the Mahmet drowned in the flesh of the woman, in all his thoughts, words, and deeds; he can neither speak nor do anything before such a heat; it must all be flesh, flesh, flesh.

And why does Mahmet call Christ the Son of Mary, the Word of God, the Spirit of God? If he is an oral word of God, as the word of all prophets is called the word of God, then he has not so highly praised Christ, whom he exalts above all men; for then he would also have to be the word of Mahmet, as of the apostle of God. And for the sake of such a verbal word, God should not speak as two (as is spoken through and through in the Alkoran): We, we; for it is not that a speaker would call himself and his word: we. But if he considers Christ to be an eternal Word, who has always been with God, why does he deny that he is God or the Son of God, born without a woman? because Word or Spirit cannot be born of women.

In the chapter Elminim he thus teaches: 3) If God had a son, the world would be in great danger of becoming divided. For he thinks that God is nothing higher than a man, whom the son may disobey. Although it is a miracle that he does not also indicate here the women's danger, that they might become disunited for the sake of a whore (like bad boys), as he was disunited with Zeith, his steward, for the sake of his wife, *ut supra*.

118) Mahmet teaches in the chapter Elezar that God and the angels pray for Mahmet and for the Saracen 2c. I will not say anything about the angels now. Dear, when and where, or how does God pray for them? Or whom does he ask for them? Does he ask the angels, or the people, or himself, or the devils? And if everything else would be possible, then he could not ask himself, because Mahmet penetrates, it is nothing, but a single God.

He also tells many other lies and impossible things. As in the chapter Elasiar, where he speaks as if from the mouth of God, 4) if we were to send this Alkoran to a mountain, you should see how he would be destroyed by great fear and trembling before God. Thus we have heard above how he lied 5) about the moon being divided, and many more lies that lead to

1) Should be "Amram" according to Num. 26, 59.

2) Above in § 46 the chapter "Maria" is called "Martil"

3) Marginal gloss: Poeticum est, ut de Jove et Saturno, de Sole, et Phaethonte.

4) Marginal gloss: Vult suos terreri.

5) Marginal gloss: Ei. Pfui dich, Teufel.

much are to tell, that no reasonable man can believe, his Alkoran is from GOD.

120 There are still many more unrhymed Narrentheiding, which are taken for certain truth in the Saracen, than glosses or commentary on the Alcoran, and are clearly written in the Commentary Nähmet, of which we (who are very many) want to tell a little.

One thing is: that the sky is made of smoke, the smoke of the mist of the sea, the sea of a mountain,' which is called Caph, which surrounds the whole world and carries the sky. Says: The sun and the moon were equal in size, and there was no difference between day and night; but when Gabriel flew once, he touched the moon with his wing, therefore it became darker,

122, Item, he says: the wild sow was born from the elephant's mud, and the mouse from a pig's mud, the cat from the lion's forehead. They interpret this as follows: 1) When Noah was in the ark with his children and animals, when they went into the secret chamber, the ark would sink, especially when the elephant was there. Then Noah was afraid, and asked God; who answered, "Go therefore and worship before his backside, even to the hole where the mud goes out. When he did so, the muck came out with a very large pig, which now rooted in the muck, as is its kind. A mouse grew out of it and began to gnaw at the boards of the ark, and they were terrified. And Noah asked God, who told him to strike the lion on the forehead; then a weasel (or cat) came out of his nose and ate the mouse. And this shall be the cause why they must not eat swine's flesh.

In the same chapter he says that at the end of the world God will kill all creatures, including angels and archangels. Angels and archangels, and will leave nothing alive without God alone, and death, which is an angel, called Adriel. Then God will command Daniel to kill himself. When this is done, God will call out with a loud voice and say, "Where are the rulers and lords of the world? And then everything will be resurrected.

Item, Mahmet wrote a book of twelve thousand wonderful words. 2) When some wondered and asked if they were all true, he answered: 3) Only three thousand were true, but the others were all lies. And if now in this

1) Marginal gloss: O Satan, O Satan, you shall pay. 2) Marginal gloss: Vsl things.

3) Marginal gloss: Vide securitatem Satanae et fiduciam mentiendi.

The Saracens say that they find something false in the book: Oh, Mahmet 4) himself said that not everything is true; and this piece is one of them, but the other remains true. Methinks they do the same with the Alkoran. For although 5) many lies are found in it, but because there are also some true sayings in it, they consider it to be God's word.

But we Christians know that God neither lies nor can lie. And as St. Augustine says: "Where a few lies are found in the Gospel, it would be fair to reject it as useless gibberish and not a Gospel, *Quia commune dictum est: Fidei non potest Msuro sudesse*, Lying cannot make blessed, but condemns. Therefore, faith cannot stand on any lie.

And I consider it certain that the reasonable and learned among the Saracens believe nothing of the Alcoran, but must despise such fictitious teachings among themselves. And that this is so is indicated by the fact that they do not want to debate publicly with other scholars, as I have experienced myself, and do not allow the Alcoran to be brought out publicly. And they are disgusted beyond all measure when it is read by others, and they do not want it to be interpreted into another language.

127. We Christians, however, who know and take comfort in the truth that abides forever and shuns no light, gladly talk with others about the Gospel, and are glad that others also read it, do not throw it under a bushel, but put it on the lampstand, that [it] may shine freely to all the world, and wish that it may be interpreted into all languages, and are not ashamed to publicly confess and praise the suffering of Christ (which the Mahomet mocks and ridicules with the Saracens and pagans) with writings and words.

The X. Chapter.

That Mahmet's law is murderous, tyrannical, and furious.

This proves that the Alkoran cannot be God's law. For it is, to speak briefly, a law of death and rage. For it not only leads to eternal death, but also forces people to believe what Mahmet says through bodily death. Although in the chapter Em-.

4) Marginal gloss: cuckoo his name.

5) Marginal gloss: Alkoran lies, and yet is supposed to be God's word, so God must be Mahmet's liar.

6) "mit andern" is missing in the Wittenberg.

pacara 1) (that is, cow) speaks: Compulsion is not in God's law. Because it is already separated right and wrong. But where can be greater compulsion than through murder? Therefore, the law cannot be from God that compels people.

The Saracens call it with a special high name Elesalem, a wholesome law of God. Yes, rather, as said, a murderous and furious law. But such was the way of such a law and master, that the people had to consent to eternal death through love of life and fear of the sword. The Christians, however, in turn, despise bodily death and life and attain eternal life.

For when Mahomet, or rather his master the devil, saw that his law was contrary to God's law in the New Testament, and also contrary to himself, and had no reason nor miraculous sign, and was full of tangible lies, he could well think that many would persuade and contradict him. Therefore he gave him his own right instrument, the sword, to kill. And therefore he set a commandment in his Alkoran, that all those should be put to death who oppose this law and do not believe. Therefore he does not speak in one chapter, but throughout the whole book as a common commandment: Kill, kill.

But Christ teaches us Christians to love our enemies, to pray for those who persecute us, and to do good to those who offend us [Matt. 5:44]. St. Augustine says: "A man may be forced to confess with his mouth that he believes, but that his heart should be forced to believe is not possible.

132 So we read that Mahmet brought his cousin, his father's brother, who said, "How, my dear cousin, my brother's son, will I kill you if I do not? Mahmet answered, O cousin, I will kill thee. And he said, Can it be no other way? Not otherwise, said Mahmet. Then said his cousin, Well, I will follow thee with the tongue only, and not with the heart, for fear of the sword. And Omar, the son of Catempadi, forced, said: Lord, you know that I will become a Saracen only for fear of death. So the son of Empiasca also became a Saracen out of fear of the sword, sending letters to Mecca (which a woman brought hidden in her hair), warning them in the city of the future of Mahmet, that they should beware of the violence of Mahmet's teaching.

133 And here it is to be noted that there are four kinds who hold Mahmet's error. The first ones, who come in through the fear of the sword (such as

The others, deceived by the devil, believe that such lies are the truth. The others, deceived by the devil, believe that such lies are the truth. The third, who do not want to leave the faith of their ancestors, and say that they believe as their ancestors believed. And these are the ones who, having been idolatrous before, respect Mahomet's cult better than the previous idolatry.

(134) The fourth, who for the sake of the free life, and that they may have many wives, and other indulgences, prefer this temporal impurity to the eternal joy of that life. Those who are called wise and learned among them do not believe that their law is right and good, but the free pleasure of this life suppresses reason, just as among us Christians many learned and wise people do not keep the gospel, even though they believe it is right and good; nor do they prefer to lead an Alkoran life, regardless of the fact that they believe there is no truth in it.

And this is the sign in both, that some Saracens become Christians, and some Christians become Saracens. Although a Christian would not become a Saracen in his end, but in his life. But a Saracen would rather become a Christian in his end than in his life. And so both would rather die Christians than Saracens, if they were not forced otherwise by force.

Now there are three signs that this law is a murderous and furious law, about which it is said that he often says, "Kill, kill. The first that Mahmet said: his law would remain as long as they would remain strong with weapons and violence. But as Chrysostom says: the truth is of the kind, the harder it is stormed, the stronger it becomes. Again, the lie, if it is assisted by equally great power, yet it falls from itself. Thus, the Gospel of the Christians, persecuted for about three hundred years, has grown the most, both in the number of believers and in miraculous clarity.

The other sign is, that when they come together, that their preacher should teach them the law of the Saracens, and deliver the word, he putteth forth a sword, and holdeth it bare in his hand while he preacheth, or putteth it in a high visible place for a terror. On the other hand, when Christians preach, they do not lift up the sword, but the cross, and do not show a murderous sign, but a friendly one, as men sent by Christ in the midst of wolves, like sheep.

2) Marginal gloss: Sicut apud nos.

1) In the Jenaer probably wrong: "Emparaca"; in § 49 it was called: "Inpakara".

The third sign that it is a murderous law is that among the Saracens are raised Assessinii, 1) future murderers. To these they promise eternal life for murdering, God grant that they murder or are murdered over it, and send them out into the whole world to cunningly strangle the worldly lords. These Assassinii have castles and houses on Mount Liltum, and are under the Sultan of Babylon, who is the head of the Saracens. And although these Assessinii are true Saracens and live according to the laws and customs of the Saracens, they are not called Saracens, but Ishmaelites, as the tribe and root of the Saracens, and the most distinguished defenders and upholders of the Mahmetic Law. For they are specially nourished and educated to murder. Of which vice not only the Christians, but also the Tatters are afraid, who say that they have no law without the natural right. 2) The Saracens are the most noble defenders of the Mahmetic Law. Thus it is certain that the Saracen is a murderous and furious law, not of God, but of the devil.

Chapter XI.

That the Alkoran is not God's law, because it is disorderly.

What is from God is well ordered, Romans 13:2, which can be seen in both nature and holy scripture. And it is certain among Christians and Saracens that Moses' Law, Prophets and Gospel are from God. Moses keeps a very fine order, starts from the creation of the world, and goes through the whole books orderly according to time and history. The prophets do the same and write in order, under which king, and also say a given thing in order. So also the gospel goes in the finest order, it begins with Christ, how he was conceived and born under Augustus, Herod, and who ruled at that time. Then how he lived, preached, did miracles, then suffered, died, and rose again 2c.

But in the Alkoran there is no order at all, there is no account of the time or years, no person of the kings or rulers of the same time, also no orderly speech of the things. For the first chapter, which is the title of the book, begins with prayer and praise to God. And after such a short prayer he starts the book, and the same is the other chapter of the red heifer, of which is written in the fourth book of Moses Cap. 19, 2. The third ca-

1) Randglosse: How? if that were the Zigeunex or Tattern.
2) Walch had resolved this with "Thättern".

The first chapter is about the house of Abraham, whom he calls the father of Moses. And he says much about Christ, saying that the Virgin Mary was the sister of Moses and Aaron. After this the fourth chapter is about women. From then on, in the other chapters, he chops it up so messily that no one can say why this is in front, that is behind, or this is in the middle.

Thus he also speaks of no matter properly, but falls from one to the other, unk mixes one into the other as a madman or who would always be elsewhere, much less remains ev on the way, if he is to prove or conclude something in turn, but sets a saying, on which he introduces, that nothing rhymes with it. As, since he always therefore washes, God is high and good, and Alkoran is a law of salvation, and God is God, and that there is no God except God, and Mahmet is a true prophet. Dear one, how does it hang together that Mahmet is a prophet, God's servant, and God is God?

In the chapter Elmaida (that is, table) he says: God has given us the house of Elaram (that is, calling), which is the house of the table, and the fast moon of the Saracens. And this is so that you may know that GOD knows all things that are in heaven and on earth, and knows all things that come to pass. But who is so great as to doubt that God knows all things? And if anyone doubted it, how does it rhyme that the Saracen's table and paschal moon make anyone know how God knows all things?

And he always speaks as if he were in a dream, and especially at the end of the book, when he still lacks words. As in the chapter Elkaphetim (that is, heretics) he says: "O cursed ones, I do not worship what you worship, and you do not worship what I worship. 3) To you be your law, to me be my law. 4) What heretic or idolater could not speak thus? What is the use of investigating the truth?

I have not found a single disputation in the whole book that would be proper, but the words and rhymes are fine. For the whole book is made in rhyme or poetry, of which the Saracens boast very much. And this is to prove that Mahmet is a true prophet. For an unlearned layman could not speak so rhyming 5). But above we have proved that God does not use poetry or rhyme to speak with men or through prophets.

3) In both the Wittenberg and Jena editions, the phrase is duplicated: "I pray - anbete".

4) Marginal gloss: What is that said?

5) i.e. chivalrous.

The XII. Chapter.

That the Alkoran is not God's law, for it is unjust and evil.

That the Alkoran is an evil and unjust law is evident from it. For in the chapter Elcaph, and in the chapter Elgem, that is, the devils, it is thus written that it pleases the devils and the devils have pleasure in it. The devils, however, are evil, perverse spirits, to whom nothing can please unless it is evil and perverse. The alcoran is also the cause of all evil, such as murder, robbery, perjury and the like. For he not only indulges in such things, but also commits them, especially murder, as was said above.

(146) And it does not help if someone says that he commanded to kill the unbelievers and not the believers. For thus he says: The believer shall not kill a believer. Yet he says to kill the unbelievers if they do not pay tribute. So I hear that not giving tribute is cause enough to kill. Why is it not rather the cause that they do not believe?

147] In many places he says that there is no greater sin than to ascribe lies to God. Now the Alcoran does the same, and ascribes many more lies to God than those told in the 9th chapter above. But we could indicate many other such lies, as in the chapter Elemphaal (that means profit or benefit) he says: There are several profits of God and the apostle, and one should give the fifth part of the profit to God.

Tell me, has God become so mischievous that he permits robbery, that he may take the fifth part? or is he so poor that he cannot feed his poor and widows, orphans and strangers (of which he speaks there), so that he permits robbery? If he makes such a profit, indeed, Mahomet makes God his companion to do evil, who cannot have a companion to do good.

(149) And though the Alkoran at times forbids robbery, perjury, and other evil, yet such a prohibition is more like an allowance. For he says: You shall not do evil, for it is not pleasing to God; but if you do it, he is merciful and gracious, and will gladly forgive you. But from robbery in particular he gives nothing everywhere, that one should give back. Nor is it their way, but it is enough for a Saracen to say at its end: There is 1) no God but God, and Mahmet is God's apostle; as is said above.

150 He speaks freely of perjury in the chapter Elmin: God will not reckon perjury to you, but rather that you do not call upon him; as if he should say: Perjury does not deserve guilt, but only punishment. For afterwards he says: For such a transgression it is enough to feed ten poor people, or to clothe so many, or to release a prisoner; whoever is able to do this truly shall fast three times.

From this all evil must follow, for they are not afraid to rob, cheat, swear falsely and break faith, even though Christians are commanded to believe even enemies and unbelievers.

But they, the Saracens, have an oath that they do not easily break, which we will see hereafter. Mahmet speaks of himself in the chapter Elmetare that God had dispensed with him or allowed him not to keep what he had sworn legally and honestly. For example, he no longer wanted to lie with the Jacobite woman, whose name was Mary, and was perjured about it, and Michael and Gabriel had to be witnesses to this permission, as he denied. Should such a law of God be, since so much evil, indeed all evil, comes from here, and ascribes such great poisonous lies to God?

153. Above these lies he gives God more, not only lies, but also foolish lies; for he says: God has excused Himself that He did not send an angel, but the man Mahmet. And could have sent an angel, but they could not have walked safely through the world. 2) How? Could Mahmet have walked through the world more safely than the angels? Or could God not protect them? Or, if he wanted to understand pious peaceful people through angels, it is certain that pious peaceful people walk through the world more safely than the wicked.

154] Item, he is always pointing out how God says that He did not make the world as a joke. 3) But who is so foolish as to think that God has made the world his joke?

Item, the Mahmet, a man and Saracen in daily fornication, introduces in Cap. Elinir Elazapi, 4) as God says thus: You shall not enter anyone's house uninvited or uncalled. Then God says: When you have gone in and eaten, come out, and do not stand and preach to the doorkeepers, for it is displeasing.

2) Marginal gloss: Forte quia non haberent gladium, sicut Mahmet.

3) Marginal gloss: Ut nostri: He did not make the sky for the geese.

4) Wittenberger: Elazapir.

1) Wittenberger: be.

lich and ashamed to preach there. 1) But God is not ashamed to preach the truth.

In sum, what he wanted to do or had done, he put it to God, 2) as if He had commanded him to do it. From this came all evil, as if God had commanded it in his law, murder, rob, commit adultery, swear falsely, commit incest with the wife of the time, break the oath for the sake of Mary, the Jacobite, and keep faith with no one. So it is no wonder that the devils are pleased with this law,

Chapter XIII.

Who is the master of this law, and how uncertain the alcoran is.

157 The wisest among them had certainly for it, and is also convinced with a strong reason, that the first master of the 3) Alkoran was not a man, but the devil, who out of old envy, by God's doom for the sake of man's sin, publicly and violently started such an abomination of the end-Christ. For when he saw that he could no longer defend the multitude of idolatry, nor resist the gospel and holy scriptures that were spread throughout the world, he thought to deceive the world with a fictitious faith, which would be like a middle way between Moses and the gospel,

For this he needed a man, yes, a devil, named Mahmet, who was an idolatrous man and poor, yet arrogant, and famous in the black arts; he would much rather have taken a better name than a man, if he had been allowed to, just as he would much rather have taken another animal than the serpent to deceive man, under which his wickedness would have been more beautifully hidden. But the divine wisdom did not want to allow it otherwise, than that he would take such an animal, and now also attack the world through such a man, so that the world could easily understand what the law would be, which would be given through such a master.

159 When Heraclius the Persian had defeated King Cosroe, and had brought the holy cross to Jerusalem with great triumph, Anno six hundred and twenty after the birth of Christ, and Anno fifteen Heraclii 2c.

1) Marginal gloss: Hic nescio, quid dicat translator.

2) Marginal gloss: Sic facile est, esse prophetam etiam porcis.

3) Wittenberg and Jena: the.

4) of a better name man" - the figure of a man of a better kind.

He was an Arab who had become rich through a widow he had married. After that, he became a captain among the highwaymen, and came into such high office that he intended to become king in Arabia. 5) But because he was of low estate and reputation, they did not accept him. Then he pretended to be a prophet, and after he had the falling sickness or the falling plague, and always fell down, so that no one would believe that he had such a plague, he said, An angel had spoken to him. And after that he said some sayings, which he heard (as he said) like a bell ringing in his ears.

160 But when he was an unlearned layman, the devil gave him right companions, some apostate Jews, and some lost Christians, the heretics. For a Jacobite named Baira attached himself to him, who stayed with Mahmet all his life, and it is said that after his death Mahmet did nothing. But of the Jews Phinees and Audia named Salon, then Audala 6) and Selem, they became Saracens, and some Nestorians, who agree very much with the Saracens and say that God was not born of Mary, but the man Jesus Christ.

And at that time Mahmet made something as a law by his fellows, took something from the Old Testament, something from the New Testament. But the people did not have the Alkoran at that time. For one reads in their histories thus that Mahmet spoke: The Alkoran came down to me above with seven men; what now is enough, that is enough. These men were Naphe, Eon, Omar, Omra, Eleesar, Asir, the son of Cethir and the son of Amer. Then we said to them, Let it be read before Mahomet. And they all said, Nay; but before the seven elders, and afterward before Mahmet.

It is certain that the seven elders did not agree with those, the previous elders, according to the words of the book, which they now keep. This is clear from the fact that the words of the first part are repugnant to the words of the second part. For after the death of Mahmet no one understood Alkoran except Audala the son of Mesetud, and Zeith the son of Tampeth, and Ocanan the son of Ophin, and the son of Oenpe, and the son of Tap. But of Alete the son of Abitale, some said he understood one part, but some said no.

But each of them made his own Alcoran, quite unlike the other Alcorans. And they were also at odds all their lives, and

5) Marginal gloss: Münster.

6) Probably: Abdallah. Cf. § 60.

None of them worshiped the other's Alkoran. After her death, the people went astray and were divided in the Alkoran until the time of Mermpan son of Elecen, who gave them the Alkoran they have now and burned all the other Alkorans. Also the seven reeves of the cities contradicted him that he had not used proper and clear language after their kind.

164 In their histories it is also said that the chapter on divorce was longer than the chapter on Bovis, which at first had two hundred and thirty sayings, and now has no more than twelve. The others say that the chapter "Ox" had a thousand sayings, but now has eighty-seven. They also say of a mighty one, named Elgas, that he had eighty-five sayings from the Alkoran, and had added so many others of a different meaning.

How is it true, then, that they say of the Alkoran that God should have said: We have sent down the admonition (Alkoran) and also want to receive it?

Some also say that Mahmet died of poisoning, and at that time the people had no Alkoran. But when Empeumpecer took the reign, he ordered that everyone should read together what he could. And so he provided the alcoran that they now have, and burned the others.

But in the chapter Elaram it says of the Alkoran that no one understands its interpretation except God alone, and he who has a high understanding; we believe him, for it is all from God. And of course it is true that in this book there is so much disorder and incorrectness (as told above) that it teaches nothing, but is overwhelmed with folly and lies. So they finally agreed that this is the Alkoran they have now, and say that God revealed it to Mahmet, who wrote it from the mouth of God.

168 Elphacae, that is, the great teachers and interpreters, have never been united in their interpretation, nor will they ever be. So not only are those who live in the morning at odds with those who live in the evening, but also those who live in the morning are divided among themselves, and those who live in the evening are divided among themselves; even in the same school there are disgusting sects, so that one condemns the other; some follow Mahmet, and he is the most, some follow Hali, who is the least and the best, and say: Mahmet has taken by sacrilegious force what Hali has done.

169. some scholars stood up in the philosophia against both sects, began to read Aristotle and Plato, and left all of them.

Sects of the Saracens together with the Alkoran. When Caliphas of Babylon noticed this, he built schools, Academiam and Stantzeriam, which are very delicious, and changed their lessons into the Alkoran, and decreed that all who came from the countries to Babylon to learn the Alkoran should have free lodging and food, and commanded that those Saracens who studied in the Alkoran should not study in the Philosophia. Therefore, they consider that those who study in the Philosophia are not good Saracens, because they despise the Alkoran, for reasons indicated above in the eighth and ninth chapters.

Chapter XIV.

Of a peculiar shameful big lie and image.

The Mahomet sets a fictitious face, which is supposed to be an interpretation of a part of the Woran. He speaks in the chapter "of the children of Israel": Praise be to him, who let his servant travel in one night from the house of prayer Elaram, that is, from the house of Mekka to the most femal house of prayer, which is the holy house of Jerusalem, which we bless 2c. The interpretation of this saying is this: one day Mahmet said his morning prayer in the Psalms, and when he had finished it, he said to the people: O people, notice that yesterday, as I was leaving you, Gabriel came to me after the vesper prayer and said: O Mahmet! God has told you to visit him. I said: Where shall I visit him? Gabriel said, "In the place where he is. And he brought me a beast greater than an ass, and less than a dun horse, whose name was Elmparac,

And he said unto me, Get thee up, and ride unto the holy house. And when I would have sat up, the beast fled. And he said, Stand still, for it is Mahmet that shall sit out of thee. And the beast said, Am I sent for him? Gabriel answered, "Yes. The beast said: I will not let him sit out, but he shall first ask God for me. And I asked my God for the beast, and sat on it, and it went very softly under me, and it set its foot as far as it could see, to the end of heaven, and so I came to the holy house, nearer than in a moment.

And Gabriel was with me, and brought me to the rock of the house of the holy Jerusalem, and said unto me, Descend, for from this rock thou must go up to heaven. So I got down. And Gabriel bound the beast Elmparac to the rock with a girdle and carried me on his shoulders up to the rock.

the sky. When we came to heaven, Gabriel knocked at the door. Then he said: Who are you? He answered: I am Gabriel. And again he said, Who is with thee? He answered, Mahmet. And the porter said, Art thou sent for his sake? Gabriel said, Yes. Then he opened the door for us. Then I saw a great multitude of angels, and I bowed my knees twice, and prayed for them.

Then Gabriel took me and led me to the other heaven. But the two heavens were as far apart as a road that could be traveled in five hundred years. And when he knocked, the answer was the same as before. And so on to the seventh heaven. In the same heaven (as he writes) he saw a great multitude of angels; the size of every angel was many thousand times greater than the world is. Each one had seven hundred thousand heads. Every head had seven hundred thousand mouths. Every mouth had seven hundred thousand tongues. And every tongue praised GOD with seven hundred thousand tongues. 1) And he saw one of the angels weeping, and asked why he wept? And he answered, that he had sinned: and he prayed for him. Then he said, Gabriel commanded me to another angel, and the same to another, and so on, until I came and stood before God and His judgment seat. Then God touched me with His hand between my shoulders so hard that the coldness of His hand went through the marrow of my backbone. And God said to me, "I have put prayer on you and your people.

When I came down again to the fourth heaven, Moses advised me to go up again and relieve the people, 2) because they could not bear so much praying. And in the first coming again I attained from ten to the fourth part. And in the fourth coming I attained to the seventh part. And at last the number of the prayers was so few that almost little remained. But when Moses said that they could not yet bear so much, I was ashamed that I had gone up so often. And would go up no more, but came again to Elmparac, and rode down again and again unto the house of Mecca. And all this happened closer than in the tenth part of the night.

(This face we have left much more outside, because we have told).

When Mahmet told all the people, a thousand people fell away from his law.

And when they said, Dear, go up to heaven by day, that we may watch and see how the angels meet thee, he would not acknowledge his lies, but said, Praise be to God, I am nothing but a man, and yet an apostle.

In the chapter "Prophets," he says of those who sought miraculous signs from him and spoke to Mahomet in this way: Thou speakest many dreams and heapest up blasphemies, or speakest poetically, bring us at least one miraculous sign, as the former have done. He answered: "We (says God) have turned back cities before the unbelievers, do you think that they would believe? Why do they wait for miraculous signs? Then he answered, "Those who were before you did not believe in miracles, so you would not believe in miraculous signs without the sword.

177 Now listen, you Saracens who believe the Alkoran to be true, he himself, Mahmet, testifies that he has done no miraculous sign. And he is much more whom the sword has devoured than those who willingly followed him, as said above. And this shameful lie and false poem alone should be enough to embarrass all that Mahmet has said and done. For, as has often been said, the Holy Spirit made him lie so grossly that anyone could easily recognize his false poem. Now he says of himself unheard-of miracles; now he says that he has done no miracle; now he says that he is a man and a messenger; now he says that he is more than an angel and above the angels. And why did he need an ass or a beast to go from Mecca to Jerusalem, if he could go to the uttermost heaven without an ass? And how could he suffer such great splendor of the angels in heaven, saying [that] when an angel appeared to him, he fell to the earth every way, and lay, and foamed, and his hands and feet were bent? To this he does not say that he was raptured in such a vision, but went up with body and soul. And he says to the signs: God touched him between the shoulders with his hand, and [he] felt the cold through the marrow of his back.

Chapter XV.

Of six common questions in the Alkoran, against the Saracens. 3)

Let us hold six questions before the Saracens, to which, if they cannot answer them, they should recognize themselves and convert to the truth.

3) In the old editions: "is", which we, like Walch, have omitted.

1) Marginal gloss: Calculate how many languages an angel has.

2) Marginal gloss: He has grown weary of praying, so he wants to file away with lies.

179) The first: What does the Alkoran want with it, that he introduces God so often speaking as in many persons? For so he speaks in the chapter Elmpaceram, in God's person: We commanded the angels that they should worship Adam; and so henceforth he lets God speak through the whole book to the end, now as many persons, now as One Person, when it is certain among the Saracens, as well as among the Christians, that God is one, and has no companion nor equal. For they cannot say here that God speaks thus in his person and in the person of the angels. For he speaks this to the angels, or from the angels, when he says, "We have commanded the angels," and this speech of God is not from the angels, but from the angels, as the chapter Sad also testifies, that all the angels worshiped Adam, without the devil.

In many places in the Alkoran, he performs such a speech of God as spoken in many persons, in addition in such works in which the angels cannot have a part or fellowship with God, as in the creation of the world and the justification of the ungodly 2c. For in many places it is thus written: We have created heaven and earth, and all that is between them, 1) and we have not judged man in vain. And we sent the Son of Mary, and we gave him the Holy Ghost, and the gospel, and miraculous works, and such like. In which works the angels may not have part nor fellowship with God. For they themselves are created by God, and do not create heaven and earth with God. 2c.

Neither can the Saracens say that such speech is of God and of another being, which would be called wisdom and understanding, over the created understanding, through which God creates everything. For it is evident that what is apart from God is a creature, or being created by God. For the creature is not at the same time a being created by GOD, and with GOD a creator. Nor can it be said that God speaks in this way because of many of his attributes or names, except that he is called the eternal power, wisdom, justice, goodness, 2c., which the Arabs call Saphat. For all these are not peculiar and other beings apart from God, but the one divine Being Himself; indeed, no angel nor man may speak of himself as many, for the sake of such attributes, since they are not the Being Himself, but may be with and from.

182. it is true, it is found in one place in Moses, that God speaks in such a way, Gen. 1, 26: "Let us make man in our image", which the Jews interpret as meaning that God is

talk with the angels. But this is against the holy scripture, which does not say that man was made in the image of angels, but in the image of God. As Moses himself interprets it soon after v. 27: "God created man in His image, in the image of God He created him." Therefore, this is a speech of the Father to the Son, or of the whole Trinity to itself; for God is one in essence, and triune in persons.

Thus Mahmet might well have said, from his own words, since God calls Himself We or Us, that there is One God and three Persons; but he makes a false sense under right words, as if three Persons must be three Gods. Therefore he says in the chapter Elnesan: "O company of the Book, be not lax in your law, and say nothing of God but the truth, that Christ is the Son of Mary, an apostle of God, and the Word of God, which He has put into them by the Holy Spirit. See, there he names the three, God, Word, Holy Spirit; but that he does not confess three gods for the sake of the three, he quickly adds: You shall not say that there are three Gods, for God is one God. Thus the Holy Spirit admonished him and drove him, so that he had to pronounce the highest article with words of our faith, and yet led the wrong mind into it. For we also say that God is one, and yet God's Word and Holy Spirit are with God, and not three gods.

The other question: The Alkoran always remembers the Holy Spirit and the Word of God. Does the Holy Spirit work, and who is the Word of God? For in the chapter Elpalceram God says: "We have given Jesus, the Son of Mary, to perform public miracles and signs, and have made him perfect through the Holy Spirit. And this is what he always proclaims throughout the whole chapter. And in the chapter Elmaide: Mary, we have poured into her the Holy Spirit; and in many places he speaks thus.

Here the Saracens cannot say that he is a creature, like an angel, or good spirit. For he (that is, God) speaks of One Holy Spirit. But the angels are many, all holy, and all God's spirits. Why then does he speak as of one special one and say: the holy and our spirit? Nor would it be a special praise that God should not have given Christ, whom the Alcoran praises very highly, more than an angel, or holy spirit, as a guardian. For that is what he does to all men, as the

2) "be" put by us instead of "is" after § 187, where the same citation recurs.

1) "is" is missing in the Wittenberger.

Alkoran says in the chapter Elntaide: 1) God makes His spirits angels and us apostles.

Furthermore, the angels cannot (yet no creature) sanctify a man, but it must be God who does both by and without means, and he alone can forgive sin, as the Alcoran says. Thus, such a spirit that does such works must be true God, just as he who speaks of such a spirit: We have given the Holy Spirit, and have poured in the Holy Spirit 2c. So then, if there must be one inseparable God, it follows that whoever gives the Spirit, and the Spirit so given, must be essentially One God, personally distinct. Thus Mahmet, though ignorant, must testify with words against himself to our faith's highest article, and does not understand what he says.

The third question: In the same way, we may also ask about the word of God; for in the chapter Abraham, the angels say to the holy Mary: O Mary! God has exalted you above all women. And soon after: O Mary! God proclaims to you, or His word proclaims to you. And in the chapter Elnesan he says: "Say nothing about God except the truth that Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, is an apostle of God, and is the Word of God, which He has placed in her through the Holy Spirit. So he confesses that Christ is the Word of God.

The question now arises: What is such a Word of God, whether it is a human, transient word, or an essential word? One cannot say that (it) is a human word, because it is supposed to be God's word; so also the human word was not put into Mary by the Holy Spirit, much less born from her.

The Gospel and the Alkoran also speak of a single word of God, which is not the voice of man. For the word of man, which is also called and is the word of God, is many, and by it was not heaven and earth created, nor was it born of Mary. And what special praise of Christ would that be, that he should be the Word of God, that he should preach the Word of God: when all the prophets preach the Word of God, and yet none is called the Word of God; Christ alone is called the Word of God in the Gospel and the Alkoran. But Mahmet wants to exalt Christ far above all prophets, because he is the Word of God.

190) But because 2) he speaks of the essential imperishable Word, it is evident that it must be

1) In the old editions "Elmaice", which is probably a misprint. Compare the note to § 209.

2) Thus the Wittenberg edition. The Jena one offers instead of: "Weil - redet" the words: "Will - reden".

be an eternal word and true God. For just as the word spoken from the mouth of corruptible men must be corruptible, so the word that proceeds from the eternal mouth of God, through which (as the Alcoran confesses) heaven and earth were created, must be eternal and incorruptible, and thus a true God. But since there cannot be only one God, it follows from this that God and His Word must be essentially One God, and yet personally distinct. And this is the word by which God spoke and made all things, John 1:1, 2, 3, as is also written in the Alkoran. So that the Mahmet here once again confesses with words, yes, with our words (however unwittingly) the high article of the holy Trinity in God.

When Mahmet hears that the Christians preach that God has a son, he could not think more highly than that without a wife there could be no son. Therefore, the coarse companion does not bring up any other reason than that God does not have a wife. And did not think that David in the Psalter, which he praises so highly, gives God many sons, you say Ps. 82, 6: "You are gods, and children of the Most High," and yet God has neither one nor many wives.

Even if it is impossible to have sons without a woman, it must be just as impossible for women to have sons without men. Why then does he believe that Mary would have a son without a husband? But he is too coarse to understand how God has a son. And yet he speaks the words, as he learned from the Arians, that Christ is God's word; however, like a jackdaw 3) learns the language of men, which it does not understand.

193 Notice that when he said that Christ is the Word of God, he adds that Christ is with God like Adam, to whom he said when he made him from the earth: *Esto*, be a man. How does this rhyme with the one where he says that God poured his Word and his Holy Spirit into Mary? and thus the Word was born from Mary.

194 But if he should be called the Word of God, because he was created like Adam, and it is said of him: *Esto*, be Christ the Son of Mary; then all creatures 4) must be called the Word of God, because it is said to all: *Esto*, be, or become. Thus Christ would not be the word by which all things were made, as he is confessed above; but he himself must also have been made by another word, like all creatures.

3) In the old editions: "Dale".

4) Thus taken over by us from the old edition of Walch instead of: "dem alle Creatur nach" rr.

The fourth question: Why does Mahomet praise so highly Moses, Job, David, and say: The Psalter is a noble book? But above all books he praises the gospel, because he confesses that truth and salvation are in it. It 1) asks (I say) why the Saracens do not read, nor have, nor teach such books, which the Mahmet praises and points to? For the Christians, when they heard such books praised by Christ, took them from the Jews, and interpreted them into all kinds of languages, and still hold them high, reading and preaching them in their churches.

For the Saracenes pretend out of their mahmet that the Jews have falsified the Old Testament, the Christians the New, and that nothing true has remained in the world, for as much as is in the Alkoran, this is proved above to be a lie. For this is against Alkoran himself, who directs his Saracenes to such books, saying: there is truth and salvation in the Gospel, and if they doubt in Alkoran, let them ask the Gospel; and is not that such great prophet should direct to false books.

But this is the reason why the Saracens do not read such books. For their scholars know that where the Saracens read such holy truthful books, they would easily find the lies of the Alkoran. That is why the Alcoran, out of the devil's malice, has protected himself so that his lies would not be revealed, and has built many defenses against it. The first, that he commanded them to kill all who speak against the Alcoran, as above in Cap. The other is that they shall not debate with people of other sects. The third, he forbids to believe all who are not of his sect, as in the chapter Abraham: You shall believe no one except those who follow our law. The fourth, that he separates himself from all and says: "My law to me, your law to you. If the Saracens wanted to follow Alkoran, because he praises Moses, David, Solomon and the Gospel so highly that truth and salvation are in it, they would do well. But now they remain condemned, even by their own Alkoran, who directs them to the right books, and yet they despise them.

The fifth question: Why does the Mahmet always indicate these words? Believe God and the apostle; obey God and the apostle; follow God and the apostle 2c.? For therefore it seems as if Mahmet wanted to make himself God's

1) So the old issues. The meaning is: you ask cheap 2c.

2) Wittenberger: is.

He always claims that there is one God and that he has no equal or companion. For that Christ says: If you believe in God, then believe also in him, he does this justly; for he is natural God, and equal to God from eternity. Otherwise, the prophets do not speak in such a way, 3) that they join or resemble God, and say: Listen to God and me, follow God and me.

The sixth question: Since the Alkoran says many and glorious things about Christ, but little and low things about Mahmet, why do the Saracens not prefer to follow Christ rather than Mahmet, and the Gospel rather than the Alkoran? And that both may seem the clearer, let us set black and white against each other and hear what the Alcoran says of both.

Of Christ, the Alcoran says that he was announced to his mother by an angel, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, and conceived by the power of God the Most High, not by natural power, and born of the most holy virgin Mary, who is the purest of all women. But of the Mahmet he says none, but that he is an orphan and wretched, and hired by God.

Further, the Alcoran says of Christ that he is God's word, therefore nothing was unconscious or uncertain to him. But Mahmet is an uncertain prophet. For he himself confesses that he does not know how he and his people will fare. For he speaks to his Saracens: I do not know whether I or you are right. 4) Therefore it is also said that he said of his father and mother, "I would like to know how they have lived, or how they are doing.

It is also said that he was bewitched by the Jews, namely, that the women stuck his waxen image in the face full of needles and threw them into a well. And it is commonly said that he was killed with poison, which he got because a Jewess let his vein run.

Item 203: Christ comes from Abraham and Isaac, to whom the promise of the blessing of the inheritance is given; but Mahomet comes from Ishmael, to whom the promise does not concern, but

3) Marginal gloss: Hoc est frigidulum. Nam 2 Paralip. 20, 20. dicit Josaphat: Credite Domino et prophetis ejus. Et Paulus: Imitatores mei estote, sicut ego Christi: [This reason is somewhat dull; for 2 Chron. 20:20. saith Jehoshaphat, "Believe the LORD and his prophets." And Paul (1 Cor. 4, 16. according to the Vulg.): "Be ye followers of me, as I of Christ."]

4) Marginal gloss: Papale: Nescit homo, utrum amore an odio dignus sit.

It is written of him: "He will be a wild man, his hand against all, and all hands against him" 2c. Gen. 16, 12.

Item 204: Christ never committed any sin, for God's Word and Spirit cannot sin; Mahmet was an idolater, a murderer, an abuser of women, a robber, and full of all vices. Although they say that God has forgiven him.

Item: Christ performed many great healing miracles, but he did not perform one, as the Alcoran testifies. For that which is said of him is either a lie, or impossible, or foolish, or of no avail. For example, that he has cut the moon in two, or that a camel has spoken, or even that he has done them in secret, for he himself confesses that he has done many things by night and in secret, which he could not prove when asked during the day. Therefore also some said unto him, Thou sayest how thou goest up to heaven by night; go up by day, that we may see and believe.

206. But Christ did great and glorious miracles in the daytime, publicly, before many observers, and his works are manifest. Item: Christ has been a surpassing Master, as the Alcoran says; and in the chapter Elmaide God says: O Christ, notice how I have given you the Holy Spirit to speak. Item: In the cradle I taught you the Book, Wisdom, Mosaic Law and Gospel. But Mahmet was an unlearned master, a layman, who knew no other language than his mother tongue, nor understood the interpretation of his own law. For he says that God understands the Alcoran.

Item: Christ, according to the Gospel, was crucified, died, rose again, and sits at the right hand of God. Although the Alcoran says that he did not die, but that God took him to himself. Now he says what he wants, so far he agrees with the Gospel that Christ is alive, but Mahmet is dead. Now it is better to have a living helper than a dead one. Why then do the Saracens not rather follow Christ than Mahmet, and rather the Gospel than the Alcoran? And it is reasonable to believe that the best law is given by the best master.

Chapter XVI.

How the gospel surpasses the alcoran.

From all that has been said above, it is easy to see how the gospel is far above the Alcoran. For we have thus proved that the Alcoran cannot be God's law, because neither the Old Testament nor the New Testament testify to it.

[It does not agree with others in speech or teaching, it is repugnant to itself, it is not confirmed by any miraculous sign, it is contrary to reason, it contains public lies, it is murderous, it is disorderly, it is harmful, it is uncertain; all this is proved from the Alcoran itself. And he who reads the Alcoran himself will find it better that we may boldly say, If you will not believe us, read the Alcoran. But in the Gospel all this is contradicted.

And he himself, Mahomet, before all the prophets that are now, or that may come, highly commendeth Christ, and exalteth the gospel above all the books of the holy scriptures. But we know that no testimony of doctrine or life is so strong and powerful as the praise of those who reproach us. For in the chapter Elmaide 1) God says: "We have made the way of men through Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary, the most true prophet, and have given him the gospel, which is law and light and public truth. So the Alcoran praises the gospel in many more places. And it is revealed to the world in the highest way, in all places, in all languages, so that I may boldly say to the Saracens: If you want to believe your Mahmet or not, read the Gospel yourself.

210. Further, the Alcoran says in the chapter Elemphal: Since God wanted the truth to be certain by His word, and the heretics to be reigned in, and the truth to be right, and the lie to be destroyed, God has thus provided and ordered, so that the world would not be corrupted by ignorance, that this law, which is common and necessary to all, namely the law of the Gospel, should not be written in one place, but in all countries, not in one language, but in all languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and then faithfully interpreted.

211 Therefore, at the end of the Gospel, Matth. 28, 19, Marc. 16, 15, Christ commanded His disciples to preach the Gospel confidently to the whole world. And so that they would be able to do this, He gave them the gifts of speaking with all tongues and the power to perform miracles. But the Alcoran says that he was given to them 2) alone, and only in Arabic.

1) In the old editions: "Elmeide", while in 2 103 and 2184 it is "Elmaide" and 2 28 and 2 34 Elmaida". Also "Elmaice" (2 185) is probably a printing error. Aehnlichen errors we meet also with other Arabic chapter names, e.g. "Inpacara" (2 49) and "Empacara" (2 128), "Elmpaceram" (2 179) and "Elpalceram" (2184); "Elemphal" (2 210) and "Elemphaal" (2 147).

2) Jenaer: him.

Language given by God, as the Saracens firmly insist that no one can understand him who does not know Arabic. Now it is obvious that not all the world can learn Arabic, nor can all of them, and yet they boast (as has been said) that no one can be saved except those who live by the law of the Saracens. Therefore, it is reasonable to ask them why God wants only the Saracens, or those who know Arabic, to be saved, 1) since the Christian Law is written in all languages, teaching that God wants all people to be saved.

As the Saracens, who alone call themselves the blessed or preserved by name (as said above), and all others truly want to be saved, they must learn to recognize Christ, the only Savior, and read the gospel in whatever language they want; then they will find all that is proved above about the Alkoran, the contradiction.

They will find how Moses and the prophets testified to the same thing, and that it is not against itself, nor rhymed or poetically put, but simple and bad speech, for the benefit of the simple, that they may understand it well. It is also not full of its own praise, nor does it need shameful, lewd, but mean, honest words. There is no fairy tale or twaddle in it beforehand. And even though there are parables in it, they interpret themselves afterwards. So it is also perfect, not only the outward work, but also the inward evil desires.

Item 214: It does not permit murder, robbery, violence, or injustice; indeed, it teaches that one should suffer such things for God's sake, and pray for enemies, persecutors, and blasphemers. Thus it is also, as said above, orderly, and certain, by certain masters; not so disorderly, incorrect, and by uncertain masters, as the Alkoran. It also does not reject people who do not believe soon; it does not say to them, like Mahmet, "My faith is mine, your faith is yours," as if he alone asked where he would be blessed, not where the others remain. But it teaches to be ready to answer all who desire causes of their faith and hope, wanting all men to be blessed, and not themselves alone.

215 And this is also due to a wise man of understanding, that he should show the reason and cause of what he does and teaches; otherwise every fool would give the law, and make what he would, and then say to those who asked him the reason and cause, To me be my law, to you be your law, to me let no man believe contrary or otherwise.

1) Marginal gloss: Vsl, an vslit onmss ^radioarn llnAuam älsosrs.

Chapter XVII.

What the Saracens answer to all this.

216) To this some quarrelsome and spiritual Saracens want to answer, thus: We do not say that the Gospel is not from God, if the Alkoran publicly testifies to it. Nor do we say that it has a defect or is imperfect because it is from God, but it proclaims such high and perfect things that the world is not able to keep it. 2) For who can love God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself? 3) Who can pray for his persecutors and blasphemers? Who can do good from the heart to those who do evil to him? And many other high things are given in the gospel.

Because it was such a law that could not be kept, God advised the world with the law of blessedness, and made the commandments easier, and gave the world the Alkoran, which is not so difficult, and people can easily be saved by it. 4) Therefore they say that the Alkoran is better for the common man, and for the world very much enough for salvation; and for this reason they call the Alkoran with a special name the law of salvation. Thus they conclude that the Alkoran has come in the place of the Gospel, 5) and what was good in the Gospel is in the Alkoran, so that henceforth one may have nothing of the Gospel.

218 But this is a public lie; for it cannot be said with truth that the gospel was given for a time, that is, until the Alkoran, and the Alkoran should have come in its place; because the Alkoran himself testifies that truth and blessedness are in the gospel. For how can truth and blessedness depart? Or from whom should they depart?

219] Furthermore, it is not good to say that after God gave the gospel, He only afterwards realized that the world could not keep it, and therefore changed His word and eased the commandments; just as if God did not know what we were or what we were able to do until He learned it afterwards: for a man knows beforehand what his cattle can or cannot bear. Rather, God knew beforehand whether the gospel was too heavy, and what men could bear 6).

The Alkoran himself also says that the Saracens are nothing if they do not fulfill the Gospel and Mosiah's Law, as stated above.

2) Marginal gloss: There it lies.

Loo est.

3) Marginal gloss: Isn't the Mosis commandment.

4) Marginal gloss: O salutary law!

5) Marginal gloss: O devil!

6) Wittenberger: endure.

321 Further, if the Alkoran is lighter than the gospel, it is all the more dangerous if they do not keep it. Now the Saracens do not keep it, that is obvious; for they drink wine and get drunk, and eat forbidden food with them, do not keep the fasts, nor the prayers, and do not give alms according to their ability, and many other things more, which well know who has lived among them and experienced such things.

It is true that Mahmet would have liked to give an easy law, but he is not forbidden to rule his pen in such a way that he does not write many difficult things under it. First of all, it is difficult that no one understands the Alkoran without God alone, as he says in the Alkoran, although this is foolishly said; *ut supra Cap. 8*. Item, he confesses that Mary, a virgin, gave birth to Jesus, and that God has a Word and Holy Spirit; which is difficult to believe, and with us confirmed by miracles, as necessary articles for salvation.

223 He is also hard on works, such as circumcising oneself, not drinking wine, and guarding against all drunkenness through strong drink, fasting and praying, and giving alms according to each one's ability, and many other things that very few Saracens keep.

224 If it were necessary for men that the commandments of the Gospel should be lightened, and the Alkoran given as a lighter law, then one might pretend that it would be necessary to give another lighter law, which men could keep, and thus both the Gospel, the Alkoran, Moses, and finally all laws would be done away with, until we would do what everyone desires. Therefore let it remain as Solomon says, Ecclesiastes 12:13: "Fear God and keep His commandments, which is the duty of all people."

Martinus Luther.

This is a shameful law, which itself confesses that not everything is true that is written in it, but, as we heard in the ninth chapter, Mahmet himself confesses that of his twelve thousand words, only three thousand are true, and the other nine thousand are all lies. This is a free devil, who, without all the larva of angels, publicly boasts in his own form that where he teaches something, the fourth part is true, and three parts are lies; so it is certainly all lies, even the fourth part, if it were true in itself.

2. for no one (no one, not even a sensible person) will ever

eternally that a man (if he is otherwise a man who is 1) in his right mind) should be able to believe with seriousness a book or scripture, of which he would be certain that one part (let alone three parts) would be a lie, not having to know which would be true or not true in different ways, and thus having to buy in sackcloth, or eat or drink three pints of poison mixed with one pound of sugar.

No one (I say again) will persuade me that a reasonable man can seriously accept and believe such a book. For it is impossible that a human heart, even the devil himself, can believe a lie. I say, believe seriously; for the devil himself knows well that his lies are lies, and cannot himself believe them to be truth, as little as all his children, who lie secretly or publicly, can believe in themselves that their lie is truth, yes, they know and want it to be lies.

4 If the Turks or Saracens believe this book of Mahomet, the Alkoran, with earnestness, they are not worthy to be called men, as they, deprived of common human reason, have become mere brutes, stone and block. But if they are men and of sound mind, and believe the same Alkoran knowingly and willingly, then no one is guilty of their damnation but they themselves. For their master, Mahmet, and the devil, too, have kept themselves safe, and are honestly excused from their damnation before God and all the world, because they publicly confess that they want to teach lies.

(5) If my pastor preached to me: Do you hear, I will now preach a sermon in which three parts will be lies and the fourth part will be true; and if I do not distinguish between the three parts and the fourth part, but I nevertheless believe everything in the 2) field: Dear, tell me, with what pretense would I accuse such a pastor at the last judgment of having deceived me? He would answer me (the devil himself also): I have not deceived you, but you yourself, I warned you that I wanted to lie to you, and you wanted to have the lies.

1) "a man is who" is missing in the Wittenberg.

2) Wittenberger: ins.

(6) If this were so, the Turks or Mahometists would have to be such people who unite themselves with the devil, committing and prescribing that he should assist them, help them and advise them on what they would like, as they have always been and still are, even great princes and lords. For they must not blame anyone for their damnation except themselves. The devil is innocent in this, they want it that way. And it is nevertheless to be seen from this booklet Richardi that the Mahmet together with his companions had also been such a leveler 1). As with the Arabs, his compatriots, such black arts have always existed, and still are today.

(7) And where the Turks were of the people, the Christians (especially with armor and weapons) would have a hard time against them. For to fight the devil with iron is nothing and a lost cause; one must first, by right faith and with an earnest Lord's Prayer, put the devil, their god, out of the field, and bring God to us with His angels.

Now, I want to put this time (but that without giving) that the Turks are partly also men, and do not believe the Alcoran, as Richardus also testifies that there are many among them who do not believe the Alcoran. For also our Medici and Astronomi have many of the Saracen books, as Avicennam, Mesue, Hali, Albumasar, Alfraganum 2c., who admittedly were men, and believed nothing of the Alkoran, but followed reason, as Plato, Cicero, and such philosophers. Such people, I think, have been misled by the sects, and have wanted to be neither Jews, nor Christians, nor Saracens, and have kept to reason and philosophy.

(9) After that, the other group, who believe neither this nor that, are slammed (as they still do) for the sake of great happiness, victory, good, honor, worldly carnal glory and pleasure, who do not ask anything about what is right or wrong, about God or the devil, but because there is happiness, quickly conclude that God must be there, whose gift is all this, and if he were not their gracious God, he would not give it. So it must be right,

what they believe; and though they know that they believe many lies, God will let it all be good, who nevertheless gives them so much, so helps them, so blesses them, so lifts them up, that they have become drunk with great happiness and, drowned inside, do not consider where they are at home.

(10) Take an example from ours, who want to be Christians and holy churches; they know and freely confess that it is God's commandment, word and truth that they hear, and that what they believe is wrong and unjust. But their hearts are elsewhere than in mammon, temporal power, honor and pleasure, that they knowingly and wantonly despise and persecute the recognized and known truth, to defend their public and recognized idolatry, lies and injustice. And the mob, who daily hears God's commandment that adultery, robbery, theft, avarice, usury, cursing, despising God 2c. is great sin, laughs and mocks both the preachers and God in his commandments. And the sum is, where the great God Mammon is powerful, everyone believes and does what he wants, and what he thus wants to believe and do must be right, regardless of the fact that his conscience tells and admonishes him otherwise. And, what is still worse, there are many who associate with the devil, and know that it is the devil, and trust him. For they know that he is a murderer and a liar. All these will not be able to say at the last day that they have been deceived by the devil.

11. Since both of these things are common among us and among us Christians, and the greatest number, disobeying God's commandment, knowingly serve mammon, yes, the devil: What is there to wonder if the Turks, who do not have God's commandment and word, drowned in mammon and such great fortune, believe public lies, or at least consider them harmless lies, because God is so close to them, and so highly honors them with victory and wealth, fortune and whatever they want. They do not think how God gives such great goods, dominion and honor to the worst of boys, nor does he give the whole world to the devil, so that he is called the prince of the world.

12) Now, when such two armies of Turks come against

1) Thus the Jenaer and the Erlanger. Wittenbergers: "Ebentherer".

Dear, give our Lord God good counsel (where he otherwise would not know), which Turks 1) he should help and give happiness? I, for one of the least counselors, 2) want to advise him to give the Mahometan Turks luck against the Christian Turks, as he has done so far, without our counsel, even against our complaint and request. The reason is that the Mahometan Turks do not have God's word, nor do they have preachers of it; they are coarse, insolent sows, and do not know what they believe or believe; but if they had preachers of the divine word, they might, yes, some of them, turn sows into men. But our Christian Turks have God's word and preachers, yet they do not want to hear it, and they become vain sows out of men, desecrating the name of Christ, so that they boast of being Christians and Christian, and yet they are worse Turks than those who boast of being Christians and not Christian.

Item 13: This is also a very fine thing (if this is to be called fine, which the devil himself cannot make uglier) about the Saracens or Turks, that they not only believe such lies, or at least are not afraid of them, but also do not know whether these are the same lies, 3) or who the masters of such lies are. For, as Richard says in the 13th chapter above, they have had so many different Alkorans, some burned, some patched up, and some destroyed and mangled, that they themselves do not know which is the right Alkoran or the right book of lies. That it looks as if the Mahmet has perhaps put something, after which so many masters have come over it, since one has carpentered this, the other that on it, removed and added, according to each conceit, that the name Mahmet alone has remained on it and the present Alkoran (to speak so) must be called the right Alkoran out of arbitrariness and by force.

14. and it is not much better with us

1) "Turks" is missing in the Wittenberger.

2) Wittenberger: one.

3) Erlanger: lie. It will have to be the noun here, because the context reveals that the Turks do not know whether it is just the same lies which the Koran contains, which Mahomet has presented, or other lies. Immediately following, Luther says: "The right book of lies".

Christians also went. For there are so many lies in our Alcorans, Decretals, Lying Sums and innumerable books, since no one knows where they come from, when they began, who the masters are. For it is not known today who the masters of the abomination are, that the one figure of the holy sacrament has been taken out of the church. Item, who of the 4) lying saints, St. Christopher, St. George, St. Barbara, St. Catherine, St. Ursula, and those without number, with their miracles, who first devised the Sacrifice of the Mass, Purgatory, Indulgences, and such idolatry without measure first began. Still, as they come into custom and are written in books, they must be called articles of the holy church, and all those who doubt or believe against them must be heretics.

15 And the pope defends everything with force, since his high scholars, also cardinals, rebuke and boast with the saying in their rights: Non potest omnium ratio reddi [one cannot give an account of all things, regardless of the fact that God, the Holy Spirit, through His holy apostle St. Peter, tells us to be ready to give everyone the answer, the reason and the cause of our faith [1 Petr. 3, 15]. And St. Paul teaches his disciple Timothy to know from whom he learned [2 Tim. 3, 14]. If a Christian does not know from whom he learned it, nor why he believes this way, what may one believe about God or His Holy Scriptures?

But God has let his final wrath go so that the devil has poured out all his power and wickedness until he could do nothing more evil, namely, that he has created all kinds of lies knowingly and understandable to reason by Mahmet's regiment there in the morning and by Pabst's regiment here in the evening, and that he has not considered us worthy to know or denounce the masters of such lies for the purpose of mockery and exaltation. This is how God should punish our ungrateful, cursed being, for the blood that His dear Son shed to reconcile and redeem us. Oh, Lord God, pray, sigh, cry out, whoever can pray, sigh, cry out,

4) Erlanger: "sanctify".

that the wrath may one day, as Daniel says, come to an end, amen [Dan. 11:36].

(17) But what I am writing here I am doing in order that this booklet may come to the attention of those who are fighting against the Turk, or who are already under the Turk, or who are yet to come, by means of printing or preaching, so that they may resist the faith of Mahomet, since they cannot resist his sword, especially those who would like to be saved even after this life. For I have completely despaired of those who want to wage war against the Turk, and yet with blasphemy, fornication and all kinds of willfulness, neither the Turks themselves are worse than I know that God will not nor can give happiness where such people should wage war for us.

It will be up to those who repent and amend, honor God's Word and His sacraments, humble themselves before God, and pray heartily so that God may be moved and keep His angels with us in the field. Otherwise, it is lost and the punishment must come upon us, be it this or another. For God can no longer suffer it, as is now often preached, and reason must confess.

(19) This should also move a devout Christian, yes, even a respectable heathen man, that there is no discipline or marital status at all among the Mahometans, but only a free life of whoredom. For whoever, according to Mahmet's law, takes as many wives as he wants, rejects them again, and takes them again as often as he wants, or sells them 2c., is not a husband, but a true whoremonger or wild whore-hunter. For this is not how God created women, nor how he ordered them to be kept, as Moses and the Gospel teach us by reason. Therefore, such mahmetists are vain whoremongers and fornicators, just as dogs and sows have marriage, since no marriage nor semblance of marriage can be. And it is no wonder that the wild, savage people take pleasure in such a free sow's life and like to become Turks.

(20) That they keep much stricter order besides, as obedience in war, severe punishments in regiment, and much praying,

and the like, that is vain pretense and helps nothing. Behold the murderers' and murderers' guilds, and other desperate societies of traitors and malefactors, how they are so faithful among themselves to keep their oaths and vows, so secretive, so obedient, so diligent, so valiant, so cunning, so careful, how they suffer so much and dare to do harm, that no prince nor lord finds the same among his subjects (except among very few). And it would be a blessed regiment if the subjects were all so faithful, so diligent, so brave, so obedient, to do good, as the murderers, traitors, murderers, devil's flocks are among each other, to do evil. For the sinful flesh is willing and inclined to do evil and to serve the devil, it likes to keep faith and obedience, but to do good it does not want to continue anywhere. Just as a wife is much more faithful and obedient, and does and suffers much more for the sake of the adulterer than for the sake of her husband and children. Again, the adulterer also, according to the saying: The devil's martyrs suffer more than Christ's martyrs, and hell must be earned more sourly than heaven.

21) They also pray a lot, like the married woman, Proverbs 7, 14, does, 2) give and sacrifice a lot. Our highwaymen sing 3) thus: First we will praise Mary, the pure maid, and St. George must be Rottmeister. And what may it much say? Where is more prayer and worship ever heard than among the idolatrous heathen, among the false prophets in the nation of Israel, and among the clergy in the papacy? And yet all their prayers in a heap are not worthy of a letter nor a bag in the Lord's Prayer; indeed, as the 109th Psalm, v. 7, says, they are vain sins, and, Matth. 23, 14, condemned as a great abuse of the divine name, because "what does not come from faith is sin. Rom. 14, 23.

From all this we Christians may see what a cruel, terrible, immeasurable wrath of God has fallen upon the ungrateful world that has despised the Gospel of God. There, towards morning, he has decreed that the beast, the shameful Mahmet, has

2) Wittenberger: "Ehehurn" and "thun"; "much" is missing. 3) Walch and the Erlangers: ostrich robbers.

1) "the" is missing in the Wittenberger.

1) Here, towards evening, he has let the false prophet, the troublesome Pabst, arise, who has deceived and crushed the world much more subtly, so that those who did not want to hear the Son of God there had to hear the son of the devil, the Mahmet, and those who did not want to obey the Holy Spirit here had to obey the evil spirit in the Pabst. 2)

(23) But his causeless mercy, to preserve his dear church, has so tempered such abominable wrath that the shameful Mahmet has not been able to deceive anyone, nor has he himself wanted to be deliberately deceived. For he had to expose his lies so crudely and tangibly, and to arrange his nature so sourly and beastly (as heard above), that no reasonable person (let alone a Christian) could believe him, nor approve of his behavior.

(24) Here, in our country, He has mightily and graciously preserved the Holy Scriptures, the text of the Gospel, and the sacraments in public usage and in the churches, so that the deceived elect may finally, in their distress or at their end, come to terms and take hold of the Lord and Savior in His Word and Sacrament, as happened to St. Bernard and many like him.

(25) And I do not take Mahmet for the end-Christian; he makes it too rough, and has a knowable black devil, who can deceive neither faith nor reason, and is like a heathen who persecutes Christianity from without, as the Romans and other heathens have done. For how can he deceive a Christian who rejects the Holy Scriptures, both New and Old Testaments, baptism, sacrament, keys, or forgiveness of sins, Lord's Prayer, faith, ten commandments, even the marriage state, and teaches vain murder and fornication?

26. but the pope with us is the real end-Christ, he has the high, subtle, beautiful, glittering devil, who sits inside Christianity, leaves the holy scripture, baptism, sacrament, key, catechism, marriage, and the other things in the hands of the devil.

1) Wittenberger: plagued.

2) Jenaer: would have to.

3) Wittenberger: the.

stand. As St. Paul says: he sits (that is, reigns) in the temple of God [2 Thess. 2, 4], that is, in the church or Christianity, namely in such a people that has been baptized, the sacrament, the keys, the holy scripture and God's word. And yet he rules so masterfully that he elevates his Drecketal, his Alkoran, his human doctrine so above God's word that the Christians' baptism, sacrament, keys, prayer, gospel, and Christ himself are no longer of any use, but must believe to be saved by their own work. All monasteries, convents and all his regiment are directed to this.

This devil does not affect those who want to be deliberately deceived, as under the Mahomet, but those who do not want to be deceived, yes, the elect of God, Matth. 24, 24. For he uses all these names, God, Christ, Son of God, Holy Spirit, church, baptism, sacrament and everything that Christians believe and teach, and which the Mahmet rejects. And yet, under such names and appearances, pushes the truth to the ground by his alcoran, as St. Paul says: *Speciem pietatis habentes, virtutem ejus abnegantes* [2 Tim. 3, 5.].

(28) Mahmet also boasts that he does not perform any signs, but Christ and Paul prophesy that the Pope should sit in the temple of God, pretend to be God, and perform many false signs and wonders [Matth. 24/) 15. 24. 2 Thess. 2,4. If you want to know what these miracles are, read about the saints, the monks, the pilgrimages, the masses, and similar legends, and you will see what false signs are, and what miracles the poltergeists and pilgrimage devils, saints' service or invocations have done in all corners of Christendom. Although some of them are fictitious, and in addition to such signs, Christ also proved His true signs to His own through the prayers of true Christians.

29 And behold, how the gross devil there and the subtle devil here have played the game of matrimony. The coarse, impolite Mahmet takes all wives, and yet has none. The chaste pope takes no wife, and yet has all wives. Are these not strange

4) Here the Erlangen edition reprinted from Walch: "Matth. 34, 15."

Things? He who has no wife has all wives; he who has all wives has none. How does it work? This is how it goes: the impudent, insolent Mahmet leads no pretense of chastity, takes wives (like a whoremonger) as much as he wants; therefore he has none in marriage, nor can he have one in marriage, and is therefore without a wife, or in no marital state.

30. The lily-white, chaste, shamefaced, chastening, holy father, the pope, the tender Juugfrauschaft, leads the appearance of chastity and also does not want to have a wife with God and honor; but how many wives he otherwise takes, not only whores, but also wives and virgins: Look at his cardinalates, bishoprics, monasteries, convents, priests, preachers, chaplains, schoolmasters, and his whole body, without which there are still countless vices that must not be named.

I do not want to count other things than murder and avarice, or else the pope would far surpass the Mahmet in this. For he has instigated so much war, murder and bloodshed among the kings, robbed so much property, land and people, stolen, plundered and maltreated them without rest, and has also practiced such arrogance over all the kings, and all of this under Christ's name in the most blasphemous way, that Mahomet would be almost holy before the world against him.

32. shall we now have luck against the

1) Erlanger: marital.

Mahmet, the outward enemy of Christianity, we must first renounce the inward enemy, the 2) end-Christ with his devil, through righteous repentance, and turn to our Lord and Savior JESUS CHRIST with right earnestness and a simple heart, so that we can pray rightly and with truth, and thus be sure of being heard. Otherwise, we will be as fortunate as our forefathers, who fought against the Mahomet until he came out of the brittle murderous corner of Arabia, and having gained land four hundred German miles away, now knocks at our door and defies us. 3)

(33) Well, God give us His mercy and punish both the Pope and the Mahomet along with their devils. I have done my part as a faithful prophet and preacher. Whoever does not want to listen, let it be. I am excused now, from that day and forever. But those who believe will thank me here and there. For it is they (where God will give happiness) who will earn it for God with faith, prayer and forbearance, and will do the best. 4) May God, the merciful Father, help them through His dear Son Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, blessed forever. Amen.

2) In the editions: den.

3) Taken by us from the old edition of Walch. In the editions: "on our misting."

4) Walch and the Erlangeners: Das.

57: Luther's admonition to the pastors in the superintendency of Wittenberg to exhort the people to repentance and prayer against the Turk. *)

February 1543.

To all pastors, our dear lords and brothers in Christ, grace and peace in the Lord. D. Martin Luther and D. John Pomer.

1. our most gracious lord duke John Frederick, elector, etc., has given his consent.

Both you and we are commanded and admonished that we should always diligently exhort the people to repentance and prayer against God's ruthlessness, the Turk. Which we also, without this, in addition to our gracious Lord's command to you, provide that you from

*) This admonition is found in the collective editions: in the Wittenberg (1559), vol. XII, p. 227; in the Jena (1562), vol. VIII, p. 1706; in the Altenburg, vol. VIII, p. 341; in the Leipziger, vol. XXII, p. 424; in the Erlanger, vol. 56, p. 54; and in De Wette, vol. V, p. 544. We give the text according to the Jena edition, comparing the Wittenberg. The determination of the time is according to De Wette.

(1) I have sufficiently admonished you, and I have no doubt that you have done so and are still doing so.

2 Because this move, which happened last summer, did not turn out too well, unfortunately! but the heavy tax was badly laid, great goods were lost, in addition many fine people were lost, and, which is probably the worst, the name of Christ was highly despised by the Turks, but the Mahmet was highly praised, moreover that some princes and lords (as it is said) kept the tax and sent no help, which was frightening for us to hear, and have had to think that they must either be in league with the Turk and traitors to Christendom, or else worse enemies of Christendom, neither being the Turk himself, because they so shamefully kept the money, which was put up for the last need of Christendom, and killed it, of which much evil talk arose in the empire; And if this were the case, they should be thrown out of the empire and deprived of all honor of the empire.

3. Such and such things have truly moved us, that we would have thought our prayers (I Doctor Martinus in particular) to be nothing, but that God would not hear, because not only has no repentance followed, but usury, stealing, transgressing, all kinds of wantonness in all classes, but also such enemies of Christianity are found among us, who have deprived the fighting Christians of their wages in such distress and, as much as there is in them, have starved the Christians to serve the Turk. Such things, I say, truly move us as well, along with many other pious people, that it seems as if God's wrath and punishment will not be asked for, but will give room to the Turk and his traitors.

4 But because we are commanded by God's word, we are also commanded to pray. Therefore, let us do what we can and how we can. Whoever

not repent nor become righteous in God's name, let him (if he will) become worse in the devil's name. We must pray, just as we must preach, without ceasing 'and without hindrance, because we are with the world and in the world, so that our conscience may be free on that day, when we have faithfully shown our Christian ministry and love against the false, ungrateful, evil world, and have not grieved it to the end. If God wants to punish her through the Turk, as she deserves, and is still struggling for it with all impenitence and wickedness, our prayers will be directed to us again, as Christ says in Matth. 10, 13, and will be a testimony to us before God that we heartily resisted His wrath and the Turk, our fortune, and would have gladly saved poor Germany from sins, God's wrath and destruction.

(5) You shall also stop the tolling of the bell at noon, and help to pray earnestly in church after the sermon, when the people are together, and let the children pray in the houses. For it is not so important to us old people who go there, but it is to serve our descendants so that they may remain safe from the devil of Mahmet in the faith of Christ and eternal bliss.

6) Do not forget the Imperial Diet at Nuremberg, either, that God, the Father of all graces, wanted to enlighten and incline the hearts of the princes, now that this summer the faith has rudely come into their hands, that they once seriously want to leave their disagreement, to unite cordially with all their might, and to do things differently than before, before they become confused and degenerate, since they would like to in vain, because now they do not want to, since they can. There are enough examples with Hungary and many other countries. Whoever will not listen, God will not hear him again. But we, who preach and pray, are excused. Hiemit GOtt befehlt. Amen.

1) This refers to the "Exhortation to Prayer Against the Pitfalls," No. 55 in this volume.

2) Wittenberger: in this.

Appendix of some writings,

which still belong to the present part.

1. Carlstadt's writing full of the recipients, signs and promises of the holy sacrament of the flesh and blood of Christ.

June 24, 1521.

To the venerable and respectable Mr. Nicolao Demuth, provost and archidiacon of the New Work at Hall, my beloved master and patron, I, Andreas Carolstat D. wish health and prosperity through Christ! Amen.

Venerable, magnanimous Lord!

1. Since some apostates from the faith do not refrain from hindering the comforting and evangelical doctrine, and make those of little faith fear Christ, who has come to their benefit, salvation and help, especially that the sick shun and flee their physician and medicine, for this reason I have recently given notice herewith, that no one should abstain from receiving the flesh and blood of Christ because of his sin, and by the holy Scriptures I want to indicate that those who are sinners, because of their sin, should cheerfully, like Zacchaeus, take the Lord into their arms and house, and that the saying Centurionis 1) which the church uses, namely: Lord, I am not worthy that you should enter my house (Matth. 8, 8, Luc. 7, 6.), to which Christ answers, "I have found no greater faith in Israel." For by such words Christ did not praise Centurionem for considering himself unworthy of his presence, but only for believing that Christ would help him absent. Thus Centurion embraced and received Christ spiritually, as Zacchaeus received him spiritually and bodily, to whom Christ said (Luke 19:9): "Today blessedness is made to this house,

for he is a son of Abraham", that is, a believer. Centurion placed the greatest on the word (Luke 7:7). Zacchaeus embraced the sign in the word; what word? "Today I must stay in your house" (Luc. 19, 5.). So Christ also stayed with Centurione, because he made his servant well. Recently, they both received Christ in that word, and it is a wonder why one does not say to those who go to the sacrament: "Say: I will receive the Lord with joy, as Zacchaeus did. For the word Centurionis, Non sum dignus etc., Christ has not yet praised, as he praised Zacchaeus. I know not what moved the teachers more to this word Centurionis, "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst go under my roof." For Zacchaeus confessed his sin, infirmities and ineptitude no less than Centurion, who also accepted the Lord in spirit.

After this I wanted to report that signs in the sacraments are less, and because of the promise, 2) that also no one, but a sinner, receives the sacrament of bread; item, that everyone can know whether he takes such sacrament worthily. This I have attributed to Your Reverence (to indicate my service with it), highly requesting Your favor of official diligence, E. E. hereby wish, until long the other booklet 3)

2) What Carlstadt means by this can be seen from § 34.

3) This may refer to the exegetical writing that Carlstadt dedicated to Provost Nicolaus Demuth on the Monday after Jacobi (July 29) 1521: "Berichtung dieser Red: Das Reich GÖttes leidet Gewalt 2c. Matth. 9." (Jäger, Carlstadt, p. 216.)

1) d. i. of the captain [at Capernaum].

will be printed, have patience. Then to serve E. E. and all your beloved ones, and especially Mr. Andreas Zeitlaß von Carolstat, your chamberlain, I am always willingly ready. Date Wittenberg, [on the day of birth] Johannis Baptistä, in the 15] 21st year.

In order to make this speech easier and more understandable, I will ask two questions. First, whether sinners should abstain from the reverend sacrament and withdraw, because of the iniquity and sin they have committed. For the other part I ask: Since there are two things in this sacrament that make it full, namely the sign and the divine promise, which is the highest and to which man should most of all adhere: Whether the flesh and blood of Christ more fei, or divine promise attached to the sign?

[Examination of the first question.]

(4) For the first part, some decide that a person should refrain from receiving the holy sacrament because of sin, and they base it on an illusion of the Scriptures. Namely, they read: "Our sins divide us from God" [Is. 59, 2]. If sins divide us from God, one must abstain from the Sacrament because of his guilt, for he should avoid that from which he is divided.

Item 5: "God says to the sinner, Why do you take my testament into your mouth? Ps. 49. [or 50, 16.] If a sinner may not take commandment and testament of GOD into his mouth, how should he be permitted to take the flesh of Christ into his mouth? If it displeases God that a sinner should put the divine word into his mouth, much less does he permit a sinner to eat his flesh.

(Isaiah 1:15) By whom God speaks thus: "If ye lift up your hands unto me, I will turn away mine eyes: and if ye worship me, I will not hear. Much less will he have his mercy on the sinner, if he needs the reverend Sacrament, than he has on those who call upon him with hands and words.

(7) To this they refer to the saying of Paul, 1 Cor. 11:27: "Whosoever eateth the bread, and drinketh of the drink unworthily, shall be guilty of the death of Christ." Now Paul says before of sinners who were chaste, 1) and had no distinction and judgment of the body of Christ, if they [ate] the flesh of Christ unworthily,

1) quarrelsome == unruly. 1 Cor. 11, 16: "who takes pleasure in quarreling."

that they became as guilty of the blood and death of Christ as the Gentiles and Jews who strangled Christ.

(8) With these writings they discourage sinners from the use of the sacrament and the communion of saints. Yes, they secretly say how Christ may come in to sinners, and make of our Savior a corrupter, of Christ (who is born to all sinners for joy) a frightening man. Therefore I will make this resolution:

(9) Sins committed by a man shall not deprive him of the reception of the reverend Sacrament, but shall rather impel and kindle him to run quickly and swiftly to the reverend Sacrament.

10. reason: Christ says (Matth. 9, 13.): "I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners. Hereby we hear clearly that Christ came on behalf of sinners to take away their sin and unrighteousness. Why would he say, "I have not come to call the righteous," when he was born to the pious? And if Christ wanted us to flee sin halfway, why does he say, "I have come to call sinners"? If he calls us, we are to come. Now you hear that he calls sinners, and for this reason he came, that he might call the erring and lost sheep to him" (Matth. 15, 24.). If this is so, the sheep should not flee from the Shepherd because of their loss and wandering.

(11) If you were to fear and shrink from the holy sacrament because of your sin, what would Christ have said when he said, "The shepherd feeds ninety-nine righteous sheep and seeks out one sheep that has gone astray" (Luc. 15:4, 7)? What does the story of the lost penny (Luc. 15:8, 9) serve us? I say unto thee, Fleuch Christum nicht Sünde halben, der darum kommen [ist] und dich sucht, dass erben dich von Sünden und erlösung will. His name is called Jesus because He was born to make His people holy from their sins (Matth. 1, 21.).

12. remember every one the words of Christ, which he said to the holy eaters 3) (Matth. 9, 12. Luc. 5, 31.) saying: "The healthy have no need of a physician, but the sick and weak." These words Christ answered when the Pharisees and scribes (who walked in great, praiseworthy and seeming works, as monks and clergy and other churchmen now walk) asked, "Why do you effet and drink with the

2) i.e. holy. In the Vulgate: *salvum*.

3) i.e. Pharisees. Several times later.

sinners?" To this Christ answered, "The healthy have no need of a physician," and set forth clear causes why he came, saying, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners only to repentance." With these words Christ compares sinners to the sick; for what sickness does in the body, sin does in the spirit. Therefore David says, "O Lord, make my soul whole, for I have sinned against thee." Ps. 40 or 41:5.

(13) Now everyone knows that the healthy do not desire a physician, nor do they seek one to make them well. But the sick, when they perceive their addiction and disease, desire a physician, and do not shrink from the physician for their infirmities. Yes, the harder they feel their sickness, the faster and more eagerly they flee to the physician, and consider nothing but the physician's help and their own sickness. It is the same with sinners: they should not be afraid of Christ, because Christ came to call sinners, to draw them to himself, to make them well. The more and the more grievous a sinner's sin, the more swiftly and fiercely he should run and hasten to Christ. If thou hast sinned, and needest nothing more on earth, but to know thy sickness and sin, and to find thyself in need of thy Lord Jesus, and to believe that he is able and willing to forgive thy sin, thou art more worthy 1) of Christ's help, than those who begin to run with good works, who hear that the healthy have no need of a physician. Item: "I have not come to claim the righteous" 2c.

Let this be your eternal comfort, that Christ said: The sick need a physician. Confess your sickness, and you will have Christ standing before you as a physician to help you.

15 Therefore I say that no one should abstain from 2) the reverend Sacrament if he has sinned openly or secretly, if he has committed a great or small sin, vice or disgrace.

16 For though the deed be fresh, great, and abominable, yet fear not Christ, when thou knowest thine affliction. For Christ saith, Harlots and manifest sinners shall go before you unto the kingdom of God. (Matth. 21, 31.)

17. stand firm that Christ has come to make well those who are sick of sins; let nothing hinder you, believe this, and feel your sin, and come cheerfully, fresh and without doubt.

18) I say even more: even if a person realizes that he is not almost sorry for his sin, and would like to leave it 3) and repent, he should come to this sacrament with comfort. So you hear that many sins should greatly inflame you to receive this sacrament, and should drive you toward it, not keep you away. For this reason Christ said of Mary Magdalene: "Many sins are forgiven her, because she loved the physician much" (Luc. 7, 47.), and said: "To whom little is given before, he loves little. This is what Paul says: Since sin abounded, grace often abounded. (Rom. 5, 20.)

(19) I do not say that one should sin against the goodness of God, as the crafty gleamers try to argue when they preach the grace of God. Nay, I say, if thou hast sinned, thou shalt find thine affliction, and flee to Christ in good comfort without fear, and shalt not at all doubt that thy sins be forgiven thee. This is what Paul taught you, saying, "This is my faithful saying, which we should accept in all ways, that Christ came into this world to make sinners holy. (1 Tim. 1, 15.) If this is faithful speech, it must also be certain and true and not deceive anyone; so you should also meet Christ as a sinner and not flee him because he is going to meet you because of your sins. Keep his words, and bring your sin with you cheerfully to the Lord. Therefore it is written (in the Song of Songs Cap. 2, 14.): My dove is in the caves or holes of the rock. The rock is Christ, the holes or caves are his deep wounds, which he received because of our sin; to the same caves the sinners flee, as the Psalm says (Ps. 103. or 104, 18.): refugium herinaceis. The rock, that is, Christ, is to the bristling hedgehogs, 4) that is, to the sinners, a refuge to which all sinners should flee. Why should I flee sin halfway to him who is set up as a help, security and refuge to save me from my sins?

(20) Finally, Christ instituted the reverend sacrament of his own flesh and blood in order to help sinners and the sick, not the righteous and the healthy. For before his last departure, the Lord took the bread and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, "Take and eat; this is my body, which is given for you" (Luc. 22:19), or as Paul said, "which is broken for you.

1) In the old edition: worthy.

2) So put by us instead of "before", because in Luther's time "abstain" is construed either with the genitive or with "from".

3) In the old edition: serene.

4) In the old edition: "dürftigen ügeln."

5) In the old edition: faithful.

(1 Cor. 11:24) If we had not sinned, how would the body of Christ have been given for us in suffering and death? But if his body was given for us, he died because of our sin. Now, as he was given, suffered, and died for us, in such a manner and opinion he instituted his sacrament. But he died for sinners, so he also ordained his sacrament for the benefit of sinners. Therefore Paul says (1 Cor. 11:26.): that we should proclaim the death of the Lord as often as we take the sacrament.

21 To proclaim and confess the death of Christ is to say why Christ died, how with his death he put to death and buried our sin. And if I eat his flesh, I shall know that Christ forgives me my sin; if I do this in strong faith, I receive worthily. Why then should I flee Christ for sin, because he comes to me for sin and dies for me?

Yes, some say, one should abstain from sin in honor of the Sacrament. My dear! What do you teach 1)? Is this the honor of Christ, to avoid him because of sin? Or do I honor him, if he seeks me, and I will not let him find me? Well, should I honor the doctor if I did not trust him with my addiction? Recently, the next and first worthy feeling is in finding out your sins and believing that Christ will surely heal you without merit. This is the closest and most worthy reason to the doctor, when the sick person recognizes his illness and wants to get well, and does not doubt that the doctor can and will make him well.

The priests have deprived many people of their souls with their reverence for the holy sacrament, because they have frightened the afflicted consciences before their physician and medicine. Do as you will, and you will never receive Christ worthily, for you feel your infirmity. But if they are too high for you, say with Job (13:23), "Show me my vices and iniquities;" and with Paul (1 Cor. 4:4), "I am not righteous because I know nothing.

(24) If you do well, you sin, as it is written, There is not a righteous man on earth who does well and does not sin. (Eccl. 7, 21.) Therefore we pray in the Lord's Prayer: Forgive us our trespasses (Matth. 6, 12.). Therefore there is no one who is without sin and not in need of the reverend sacrament.

Answer to the contrast in the beginning.

(25) The above-mentioned writings may not take away or break off this reason and decision.

(26) The sin that a man willingly has, which a man does not want to feel, and who fears God and flees as if their sins could not be forgiven, these have sins that separate them from God and put them far away.

(27) With one word I say to all that sinners are separated from God, and shall not take His law into their mouths, and that God does not regard their prayers and works that go on the head, that is, those who seek God with works, and earnestly purge their sins with devotion, fasting, prayer, mourning, mortification, 3) and other works; these God will not hear, but will turn His eyes from them. For you must purify your heart with faith, and be completely satisfied; knowing nothing else but [that] you are a sinner, and that Christ is your Savior. Your trust and faith purifies you, for it binds you to God, and makes you one spirit with God, and washes away your sin.

(28) Neither shall the scriptures (2) (of sins and works) deter thee. Cause: All suffering that the Scriptures bring, and all despising and throwing away, and all divine disfavor of God, are therefore brought against us, so that we may become wise and understanding. Of this we have an amusing text in the third 4) Book of Moses, Cap. 26, 41: I will walk against them (says God) and will surround them with enmity until their uncircumcised heart will be ashamed, then they will plead for their wickedness. Listen! God will wander against you until you recognize yourself and plead for your sin. God wants you to be aware of yourself for a short time and to pray for your sin. All punishments, disgrace, and wrath of God point to and lead to the realization or feeling and confession of your sins. Therefore, if you want to approach God and take His words into your mouth, or if you want to fast, pray and celebrate properly, you must remember, that is, find out your sin, you must feel woe and sickness, you must have a desire for God.

(29) What a physician would remember if you were sick with broken feet and came to him as a healthy person, God would also remember if you were a sinner and yet wanted to run to God with works. For as one cannot walk well

2) i. Scripture passages.

3) In the old edition: Köstigen.

4) In the original: fourth.

1) In the old edition: Iernest.

with sick feet, so a sinner cannot well or without harm come to God with works before he has attained health. This is the cause of the saying Isaiah 1, 15: I will not hear your prayer 2c. that the same sinners 1) (like our monks and priests and other holy gluttons) begin to go to God with works. For this reason Paul wrote (Rom. 4, 5.): To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that worketh unrighteousness, faith is made righteousness. If thou wilt be far from God, come with thy works and godliness; if thou wilt come near to God and be justified, come with confession of thy sins.

30 This is what Job says (13:15, 16): "I know that if I punish my ways before his face, he will be my deliverer; I know that no glorifier, no holy devourer, will come before his face.

(31) Hear this, whoever comes to or from God and returns, and realize that you need nothing else on earth if you want to receive the sacrament worthily, but that you confess your guilt and sins, that you feel your wounds. Christ [Matth. 11, 28.] says: Come to me all who are burdened. Thus saith Job [13:15, 16], I know that if I punish my ways, that is, if I feel my burdens, he shall be my deliverer.

32 But to the holy glutton, who would make himself worthy of the sacrament with good works, Christ says: I have not come to the righteous; and Job: No glorifier shall come before him. All and every one who comes with works and piety are glorifiers, for they may not be godly persons.

From this life you can know whether you received the sacrament worthily or unworthily and to your detriment. For, as Job (9:15) boldly says, "I know that I will be justified when I am judged. 2) So you may comfortingly say: I know that I will take the sacrament worthily and to my advantage, because I feel my sin and my unwillingness. But if you do not realize this in yourself, say: "Oh, that I would be angry with and against my will and sin! Item: I know that God will surely forgive my sin through the reverend Sacrament.

[Examination of the other question.]

(34) Now I shall answer the other article, thus asked: Since in the reverend sacrament of the flesh and blood of Christ there are two things, the flesh and the Word, or the bread and the promise, which is the highest, the one most concerned with it?

(35) Before I answer, let it be known that I speak with the Scriptures, and take this for one thing, which I say, the sacrament of bread, of flesh, and of blood. For Christ calls it at times bread, at times flesh, at times body.

(36) For the other thing shall be heard as one thing, which I speak, the word, promise, covenant, or promise. Neither will I forbid you that the promise or word is called a testament in some parts of the Scriptures. For this cause ye shall not hinder yourselves, though I speak a thing by many words.

37. to the third, listen how Christ instituted the sacrament Luke 22, 19.: When the Lord and his disciples were eating, Jesus took the bread, gave thanks to God, broke the bread, and gave it to the disciples, saying: Take and eat; Matth. 26, 26.: This is my body, which is given for you among yourselves. Here you have bread and promise. Bread, he took the bread, saying: This is my body. The word or promise is this comfort: Who is given for you, that is, is sacrificed, persecuted, killed. So Paul says 1 Cor. 11, 23. 24.: Our Lord Jesus, in the night, when he was delivered to the enemies, took bread, broke it, and gave it to the disciples, saying, Take and eat; this is my body, which is broken for you, and is to die, or is to perish and die.

38) For the fourth, that we may speak lately of the sacrament, note that bread, flesh, and blood are called a sign; Christ himself saith John 3:14: As Moses hath lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, and be exalted. Now the Scripture clearly says, in the fourth book of Moses, chapter 21, that Moses made a bronze serpent and set it up as a sign, so that anyone who was wounded and looked at the serpent might be healed. Since Christ himself said that he should be set up as Moses set up the bronze serpent, it follows that Christ: flesh, blood, body, or bread is a sign. To this Isaiah, on the 55th cap. [v. 13.], saying: that the Lord is called a sign, which would be eternal, and not pass away or be taken away. The other signs interpret and end in these signs of the flesh and blood, and are much removed from it, as from the

1) In the old edition, here and elsewhere: Gleichßner.

2) This passage in Job (also in the Vulgate) says the opposite of what is stated here.

old and new law; but the sign, which is the Lord Himself, will stand forever.

(39) There are some who make a distinction between the flesh or bread in one part, and the sign of this sacrament in the other part, and have the word of Christ for a reason, when Christ says, Take and eat; the bread is my body. From this they draw that the eating of Christ's flesh is a sign of the worthy sacrament, and say that bread or the body or flesh of Christ without eating or using the food is not the sign. And following they say: If thou eatest not the flesh of Christ, and drinkest not his blood, that thou mayest not have the sign of the promise, or of the word, which thou heardest of the said sacrament.

(40) I do not dispute this subtlety, but I know that food is food, even though it is not pestilent, inasmuch as the things called food are prepared and used for the mouth and stomach.

41 Now Christ says John 6:55: "My flesh truly is meat, and my blood is drink. However, food never reaches its final essence until it is eaten; therefore Christ says next [v. 56]: "Whoever eats me remains in me, as if he were to speak: You must eat me if you want to be partaker of me. From this we conclude that Christ is not a sign of the sacrament of salvation, but is eaten. But if one wanted to be subtle, he would say that Christ is a sign of this sacrament, even though you do not eat or drink him, and he would turn to the text John 3:14, where Christ says: "Just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, so that everyone who believes in the Son may not perish but have eternal life. (The Scripture calls faith a sign 1). From the words now spoken it follows that, because the sign and word of God or promise are to make a sacrament, that Christ, exalted and looked upon, is a sign, and these words "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" is the comforting promise, and that such two things make one sacrament. But I do not want to pursue subtlety begun.

(43) It is certain that some signs of the sacraments are used by touch, some by sight, and some by other senses. Circumcision you grasp, because it is done on the body, with the sense that is called grasping, as in the first book of Moses at the 17th Cap. [the] circumcision was done with hands, and made pain, and was a sign of faith; as Paul Rom. 4:11 [testifies]. The sign belonged to this promise of God, that Abraham should be multiplied and become great and many in his seed, like the stars in the sky. In the first book of Moses 15, 5. and 17, 6.

43 We also have more signs that are used with the sense called grasping. As the sacrament used for the confession and forgiveness of sins. For if a prince of the people, through error and ignorance, had acted contrary to a divine commandment and realized that he had unwittingly acted contrary to God's prohibition, he had to sacrifice a goat and lay his hand on the head of the sacrifice. After that the priest killed the sacrifice 2c. and prayed for the prince, and his act or sins were forgiven him, Deut. 4, 22-26. See, you hear that the sign, which is given for confession and forgiveness of sins, had to be touched and used with hands.

44. so the serpent (which Moses set up in the wilderness) was looked at with the eyes, used and touched, 4 Mos. 21, 8. 9.

Thus God promised the rainbow in the clouds, Genesis 9:13-16. The same rainbow could not be touched and used in any other way than with the eyes. The signs are used in various ways in the Scriptures, and one cannot know why circumcision should be a sacrament, and the signs and promises mentioned above do not make a sacrament.

46 Finally, I do not much dispute that the flesh of Christ is not a sign, if it is not partaken of and touched and understood with the mouth: but I will include this, if one sees Christ with the eyes of faith, that he has no less a sign than John 3:14, 15 is clear and evident. From this long association we have partaken of the sign of this peaceable sacrament, namely bread and drink, which is the flesh and blood of Christ.

Now follows from the promise.

47. the promise and assurance is in these words: the body given for you; the blood poured out for you, Luc. 22:19, 20.

1) In the old edition: "time look at", to which Walch has put a longer note, which does not satisfy us however quite. We believe that "time" is an error, which must be improved after 4 Mos. 21, 8. by "signs", which only fits into the context. Jäger ("Carlstadt") passes over this and other difficulties of the text.

Or, as Paul says 1 Cor. II, 24: This is my body broken for you. The word "broken for you" is the promise. For Christ certainly tells us with such words that the body (which he calls us to take and eat) has been emptied and killed for us for salvation and good. This is a gospel word that brings us a joyful and comforting message. What is more comforting and joyful for us to hear than that the body (which we are to take and eat) is to be given to us for our prosperity and redemption into death and crime? Let my will, life and mind cling to these words and not doubt that the body of Christ, which is my food, died for me.

(48) Therefore Paul says that we should proclaim the death of the Lord as often as we eat his flesh. What is proclaiming death? Saying how Christ died? No, the Jews and the gallows knights could do that. The spirit must feel and know the cause of Christ's death. He must find that Christ's death came for our redemption, that he might put our sin with him to the gallows, and die [i.e., make us die] our old wicked Adam, pay all our debt, and justify our wicked life, and at last make no evil hurt us, and his righteousness become our righteousness.

This and much more, which we read in the Holy Bible, and especially in Paul, we are to consider most heartily when we partake of the Sacrament. He who will eat this worthily must do nothing more than feel the wounds of his sins and wickedness, and firmly believe the words that the body of Christ, which he will eat, died for his sin and sickness, and that his wickedness and sin fall away and die with the death of Christ. He that hath not this faith eateth unworthily; he that hath not this remembrance, when he receiveth the bread of Christ, eateth the flesh of Christ, as the Corinthians did, who took it for the fleshly hunger and pleasure.

You must have respect for the promise; the word of God is a word of faith, and teaches you the spirit of the sacrament. Whoever does not pay attention to the promise, the sacrament is of as little use to him as the flesh of Christ, as he says John 6:63: "The flesh is not useful, but the Spirit who makes alive.

51. divine promise is a word of faith, and proclaims the fruitful spirit, which invades eager ears with comforting and evangelical message, and makes the spirit of man alive, new, righteous and spiritual, if you believe the word.

For the promise of God does not lead to salvation if one does not believe, Hebr. 4, 2. So no one can come to peace and rest his heart without faith, unless he believes, as Ps. 94 [or 95, 11] is written: Quibus juravi in ira mea, that is. I have sworn to the unbelievers that they will not enter into my rest.

(52) After these sayings I say that a sign is less than the word, and that the sign is presented because of the promise. Recently: the flesh of Christ is because of the word of God, which we have often called a promise. Cause: that Christ Himself speaks that He had to die because of the Scriptures, and thus enter into the glory of His Father, Luke at the last [Cap. 24, 26]. Thus Christ is also a Commander of His Fatherly Word, Joh. 12, 49, and God has spoken through Christ, as He has spoken through the prophets in all times, Hebr. 11, 1. 2. Therefore it follows that Christ is a sign after flesh and blood, set up because of the promise, and we are to keep and bind ourselves beforehand and more to his word than to his flesh; although this is strange and odd, yet we learn this from Scripture, especially in the Gospel of John, which cannot speak or teach untruthfully.

(53) The 9th chapter of the first book of Moses informs us that the sign is set up because of the promise, and that we are to remember it through knowledge of the signs. There [v. 9. 11.] God speaks to Noah thus: The covenant, or promise and promise, I will make and bind with you: that I will not destroy the earth with rivers of sin and water. Hear, this is the promise; see also of the sign. I will [says [v. 13.] God] set my bow in the vaults for a sign of union or promise. Behold! that the bow is a sign of the comforting promise that God will never again desolate the earth with the flow of sin, and that the bow is only a sign of divine promise.

54. Now notice what you are to learn from the sign: If I [says [v. 14. 15.] God] have covered the air with clouds, then the bow will appear in the clouds, and I will remember my promise. Follows also [v. 16.]: I will look at the bow, and remember the covenant which I have put and promised between GOD and every living soul. From these words of Genesis 9, we are to learn that we are to take nothing but certain comfort from the signs and cast out all doubt. For we are to know that God is willing to keep His promise.

and has not forgotten his word at all. That is, we are to become firm and strong in the word of God from the signs, so that God will fulfill His word without doubt and give promised comfort and help.

55. Therefore, when you drink and eat the bread, flesh and blood of Christ, you should come to the certainty that Christ will keep his words without fail, and should not doubt his salvation, but firmly believe and have no assurance, except that the flesh and blood of Christ, when you take it, will kill your sin and be a medicine for you, and for righteousness and newness of your spirit. God, who is true and mighty, considers it a great injustice and wrong if you doubt him and his word. Therefore he has set signs to the promises, that you may be the more sure, the more at peace, and the more tranquil, and that you may stand in a living Sabbath. But if any man waver in the word and in the signs, he shall be severely punished for his unbelief, and so much the more severely, that he shall believe neither signs nor words.

Thus it is said and proved that signs serve the promises and covenants of God, and the word is more than its sign. Example: fleshly circumcision is less than faith and promise.

(57) Hereafter learn how to keep the best part, that is, how to firmly believe the word of God and keep it in the heart.

58 I will teach this shortly by a history of the scriptures, which is written in the 1st book of Moses at the 32nd. Since Jacob feared his brother Esau beyond measure, he held on with full faith to the divine promise forever, if this matzo was promised to him, namely in the first book of Moses at the 28th chapter [v. 13. 14.] God said to Jacob: "The ground in which you sleep, I will give to you and your seed; your seed shall become like the dust of the ground; that is, your seed shall become as many as the grains of dust in the ground. Follow [v. 14. 15.]: And in thy seed shall all generations be given; and I will be thy keeper, and will bring thee again into the ground, and will not leave thee, having accomplished all things that I have spoken.

59) This promise and glorification of God was well known to Jacob, when he was troubled, sad and fearful with him [i.e. with himself] because of his brother Esau, and said in anguish thus [Cap. 32, 9]: "O Lord, you told me that you would do me good. [V. 12. Thou hast said that I should spread forth my seed and my seed, as the

Sand of the sea that cannot be counted. [V. 10.:] I am inferior to all thy mercies, and to all thy veracity. [Deliver me from the power of my brother Esau, for I fear him greatly, lest he slay mothers and children. Jacob clung to the divine word as a ship clings to an anchor in the sea.

(60) Thus a Christian should firmly adhere to the words and promise of Christ when his brother Esau, the old Adam, and the devil and sin afflict or persecute him and make his conscience unpeaceful. When he realizes that his sins are beginning to frighten him, he should seek the sacrament that gives peace and tranquility to the spirit, and keep the word of Christ in the same way that Jacob kept the promise God made to him in his heart and mouth.

(61) The word that the body is given for you in death, and the drink is poured out for you, shall be in his heart and mouth:

022 O LORD my God, a God of all the faithful, Abraham, Isaac, 2c., thou hast said, Take and eat this bread, which is my body given for you. O Lord, in the word which thou hast spoken, that I should eat thy flesh, for it is given for me and for us all in trouble, and in fear, and in death, I trust in thee, and I charge thee with thy promise, and doubt not that thou wilt give me the fruit of thy bitter death, if I eat thy flesh; for thou hast promised this. Thou art almighty, gracious and true; thou lackest nothing, so thou afflictest no one; so thy word is yea, yea (2 Cor. 1:19, 20), not yea today, no tomorrow.

I stand and stand on your words. You have told me with such words: you want to do me good, forgive sin, provide peace, make me safe, new and spiritual. I cling to your words and cling to the promise, as Abraham clung to your promise, who did not doubt that you would give him what you had said. (Rom. 4, 20. 21.) So I rely on your promise; I do not doubt that you can and will give me salvation from sins, even though my Adam will not admit it; I advance your word to you, as Jacob advanced his divine promise to God. Thou hast said, O Lord, thou hast spoken: I am not come unto the righteous, nor unto the sound, but unto the sick, and unto sinners. And, O Lord, thou hast said, I shall eat thy flesh gladly, and drink thy blood, that thou hast given thy body to be dead for me, for my sin and wickedness, all to me. Then come I unrighteous basket, 1) I wounded sinner and unpeaceful

1) If not "koth" should be read, then this expression "basket" is to be understood according to Amos 8, 1.

afflicted man, and advance your words in prayer and faith.

(64) Thou art not like the promises of men, as kings, princes, lords, and others, who promise much, and suffer not that their promise should be pressed upon them, or that they should be reminded of the promise which they have made, and that they should demand that which they have promised. No, you are another Lord, and you want your words to be in our hearts and mouths, Jos. 1, 8, that we also set our hearts and minds, will and spirit, and everything on your promise, Deut. 3, 13-17, Ps. 110 [111:7-9], and say comfortingly: Lord, you have said, you have spoken, that we should take your flesh and eat it, because you have given yourself in death for our salvation. Upon thy word my faith, comfort, and hope stand; I will not let sin or my wickedness hinder me, for thou hast said that thou wast born and died to forgive our sicknesses and sins, and to make us whole.

65. Abraham stood firm on your promise; he did not doubt that you would give him what you spoke to him, even though he knew it was impossible by nature, yet he did not pay attention to his old and dead body, and you fulfilled 1) your words; what else should I remember but your promise? What should sin and wickedness subtract from me, because Abraham's age did not subtract from your word?

(66) Jacob advanced his promise to God that He had said He would do good to Jacob and spread his seed; Jacob knew this, so he firmly believed that his wife and child would not be slain, and he reminded God of His promise, and became strong in the divine word and in his faith, so that he was allowed to argue and wrestle with God, and held God so firmly in faith that he would not let God go until it was good for him. In such faith and constant adherence to the divine promise, Jacob was transformed in nature and name, for the Scriptures say (Gen. 32:28): "You must be called Israel, for you were strong against God, and how much more did you become strong against men.

(67) Is it not comforting that a firm attachment and faith in the divine Word can hold and overcome God? We should be more comforted by this than by heaven and earth; it should be our foundation. It is impossible for anyone to perish who firmly believes in the divine promise. As little as God can lie, so little can He let you perish if you hang firm, strong and manly in His promise. It is impossible that God

1) In the original: fulfill.

I do not want to leave a person who persists in such trust. Everything must be good for him, and better than man understands. In the firm and earnest adherence to the word of God stands all blessedness. Again, in unbelief stands all loss and harm, and all unworthy reception of the Sacrament, which Christ himself says in John 3:18: "He who believes is not condemned; he who does not believe is already lost. God cannot leave you any less than he left Jacob, if you, like Jacob, cling strongly and steadfastly to divine promise.

(68) So also one comes into true peace, and all bitterness is made sweet to him, and adversity is made kind, and evil is turned into good, as happened to Jacob, Gen 33:3: Jacob prayed seven times, and so long until his Esau, that is, his enemy and persecutor, drew near. What happened? When Jacob clung to the divine promise with faith and prayer, his persecutor and enemy Esau turned into a benefactor and friend; for Esau fell around Jacob's neck, pressed him kindly, and kissed him, and wept, and wanted to give Jacob his possessions and goods. So all evil turned to good, all mischief 2) and strife to goodness, peace and quiet. This happens to all those who steadfastly and firmly stand on the divine promise.

In such faith Moses says (in the other book, chapter 14, v. 13, 14): "Stand and see the great miracles of God and do not be afraid, for you will no longer see the Egyptians whom you see now: GOD who will contend for you, and ye shall be silent. Stand firm on the promise of God, do not be afraid, do not doubt His promise; for before His words should remain unfulfilled, heaven and earth must be broken. So the sea also became obedient, and was divided, and gave place and way to the faithful, and destroyed the Egyptians, which are our sin.

(70) It is the same with the reception of the joyful sacrament. He who wants to receive it worthily should not be afraid, that is, he should not doubt that Christ will fulfill his promise. And let not the Egyptians deter him from the divine word, that is, his evil deeds and sin, which fight against God. For God is the one who contends, the one who strangles sins; we stand still and silent, and find in the forgiveness of sins even worklessness. Cause: When God wants to work His great and wonderful works, we must do nothing more than to

2) i.e. quarrel, strife.

We turn our eyes to God and stand in good confidence when Jehoshaphat (in the 2nd book of Chronicles, chapter 20, v. 20) says: "Stand alone in comfort and strong confidence in God, and you will see divine help upon you; believe God, and you will be safe.

(71) This is what Moses says: Be silent; God is the one who contends. We must not be concerned whether we have prayed much, fasted, swept and searched churches, burned lights, and done such works, if we want to receive the holy sacrament; for we must be silent with our ears and feet, as it is written: "When you enter God's house, keep your feet and listen. (Eccl. 4, 17.) That is, we must not appear with any work, for if works should befall us and make us worthy recipients, God would not be the one who alone warred for us and killed the Egyptians. If I want to take the sacrament, I should do nothing else but believe the divine word that Christ gave and shed his flesh and blood for us in death, and that he gave us his flesh as food and his blood as drink for a sure sign: if I believe this, I will be sure, if I otherwise stand in divine promise with all confidence, that I will see the Egyptians no more; that is, my sins will no longer challenge me and make me miserable.

Thus I find his help and beneficence. In my person I need feel nothing more than manly, brave and firm faith.

and trust in God, that He will not forsake me, for one; for the other, I shall feel no strength, no health, no ability, no good work, and no piety, which I shall carry to the holy sacrament, but I shall see my nothingness, powerlessness, wickedness, and sin for that same banquet 1). As Jehoshaphat said [2 Chron. 20, 12.]; there is no strength in us to overcome the enemies that are our sins. So we see our weakness and Egypt, and flee to this sacrament, which strikes them all down and makes them drink, and makes us alive, gives strength and work, and makes us Esau, who gives us his possessions and goods, Gen. 33, 15. as the Gentiles gave tribute to the Jews. Jos. 16, 10. book of Judges 1, 28. 30. 33. 35. cap. 3, 3.

(73) Thus we have concluded that a worthy recipient has no need of anything other than to feel the wounds of his sins, to look upon his Esau, the Egyptians, or other offenders, and to stand alone chivalrous and manly, [placing his confidence] in divine promise, then God can by no means abandon him. He keeps GOD, and turns his enemies into servants, as said above. We have also heard that in the sacraments the word is more than the sign, and that the signs remind us that God wants to remember His promise and keep faith, not to let us perish in any way or temptation. May God help us through our Lord Jesus Christ! Amen.

1) In the old edition: times.

2. Carlstadt's writing against the old and new papist masses.

About September 1524.

Dear Brother N.! Since you have asked me to write you something about the German masses, especially about the new findings and additions 2c., I am willing to serve you, not only in this, but also in other matters. Accordingly, I will answer your article recently, and thus say to the first:

2 It is necessary, not only right, that in the churches of our German lands they read and preach in the German tongue, and make known other things taught by Christ. For all those who are converted should be corrected from this and know whether God's word is preached to them or not; this you have 1 Cor. 14. Paul has this reason

from Moses, who said how some should read the benediction on God's servants, and some the cursing of God against the devil's limbs, and all the people should say Amen to it; as you can hear from the fifth book of Moses on the 27th and from other oertens of Moses.

3 The people could not say amen to the words of the magistrate if they did not hear the speaker speak in a familiar tongue. Therefore it is necessary that all things in the church be presented to the people in their own language. So everyone should put his prayers and all things in the church and

2) In the old edition: aside.

The only thing they hear is what they pretend to hear, and they hear the speaker or preacher as if he were judging or judging them. For this reason Paul says: "One or two speak, the others recognize" 2c. 1 Cor. 14, 29.

4 For the other, we see that some confirm the old error with the German tongue, 1) and fortify the poor unintelligent people in their error. For they soon speak: Now I have heard the mass correctly when German lessons have been read to them. This is what those do who call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice with words, or works and deeds.

5 Our poor surrounding priests mend their ways in this way. They read the epistle and gospel to the ignorant people in German, which in itself is blameless, but at the same time they say that Christ is a sacrifice in the holy mass. As a Christian, you can judge what an abominable sin this is. I have discovered it for my part in a booklet about the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, and I also hope that you will not allow your pastor to execute our Savior Jesus Christ as an executioner would an evildoer, for his iniquity would also affect you as a grantor, Rom. 1.

(6) Some say and write and preach that Christ is not a sacrifice, and no less use the word mass, and may call the Lord's Supper a mass; which is the same as if I said publicly: The N. is a pious man, he steals from no one what is his; and yet call him 2) a thief or robber. Reason: this word mass is not German nor Latin, but Hebrew, and means in good German a free willing sacrifice.

(7) How well then it behooves Christians to call Christ in the sacrament, or the sacrament in which Christ is to be, a mass, I give you to know, because so much is said: Christ has not suffered enough at once; Christ is still mortal; Christ must be martyred in the mass for our sin. Item, Christ's sacrifice was so small that a poor, stinking, unclean, evil priest could offer it; which sacrifice no one could offer but he himself, Christ, the most high and pure priest. See in the epistle to the Hebrews the fourth, fifth, eighth, ninth and tenth chapters, and read them diligently and meditatively, and you will well understand what an abominable sacrilege it is for a sinful man to sacrifice Christ.

8. it is much worse to say that Christ is a sacrifice when a priest performs mass, than to say that Christ's suffering was insufficient. Because from such a saying or speech it follows that Christ's sacrifice has been and still is impure, guilty, sinful, defiled, insufficient, unintelligent, self-willed, disobedient, as the lukewarm priest and wicked of God, who submits to sacrifice Christ's body and blood. If the above chapters are not considered, all kinds of such abominations follow, and it becomes clear that the name of Messiah, against Christ's suffering, sacrifice and glory, is now attributed to Christ. In this, D. Martinus errs exceedingly, and the poor bishop of Zwickau, 3) who in this case has a papal sanctity, that he calls the Lord's Supper a Mass.

9) These also confirm their name 4) with their deed and manner, and confess that Christ is a sacrifice in the mass, although they grind their pen differently; that is, they lift up the hosts, likewise the chalice, and indicate by such lifting up that the one whom they lift up is still a sacrifice, that also their bread and wine is a sacrifice; for this manner is founded in the old law, and also has its origin and discovery there.

(10) In the Old Law, God commanded that the Jews bring sheaves and other things to their priests, which the priests lifted up and brought down, and by such lifting up and bringing down offered to God such things as you read in the third book of Mosiah on the eighth, ninth, tenth, fourteenth, twenty-third [chapters, and] in the fourth book of Mosiah on the sixteenth.

This annulment or sacrifice is called Thruma in Hebrew. Thus the priests abolish the sacrament and put it down in the mass, and set themselves without appointment as convenient priests of the angelic sacrifice, which Christ alone could offer, and therefore take the place of the avengers, executioners and murderers of Christ.

12) There was also another lifting of the sacrificed things, which is called Thnupha in Hebrew, when the sacrifices were woven or lifted to the right and left, in front of and behind them, as they now move the sacrament in the days of Corporis Christi and thus again indicate that Christ is a sacrifice, and speak that the stinking faithless priests could sacrifice to God, and that thus the newly sacrificed Christ forgives sin. But this still goes

1) Old edition: bestäten.

2) In the original: bannest.

3) This refers to Nicolaus Hausmann, whom Luther often calls *Episcopus Cygnensis*. De Wette, Vol. II, 572. He had to deal with the Zwickau prophets.

4) Abname perhaps as much as mocking name. Should this be correct, Carlstadt means: The name "new papists" they confirm with their That 2c.

now somewhat less and more than the mass. But both are against God's honor and a confession of their unbelief, that they also esteem Christ less than the unbelieving Turks esteem him.

(13) In the first statement, the whole of Wittenberg is in error, but they say that they do not mean it that way, and boast that they are so highly exempt from the law that they may also pervert God's word and interpret it differently than God has interpreted his word and way; but how Christian this is, you must judge. You know that Christ did none of these things, that he did not break the law, but fulfilled it; that we may also judge the Wittenbergers according to the law of God and call them wrong, if they pervert the work of the law or do it unjustly, because, where they allowed themselves to be circumcised, we did not rightly call them circumcised Jews? even if they snorted and roared about it. So, I say, they may abolish the sacrament, so we may speak or write of them that they offer Christ, because God has assigned and measured the abolition to the sacrifices.

14 Since they protested that they did not call Christ a sacrifice, and yet sacrificed him by lifting him up or by wrapping him around themselves, you know what a protestation is that is made *against substantiam actus*. God almost blinded them because of this will of courage and let them fall into many horrible errors.

15. do you as a chivalrous Christian, and also burden the driving, which has a color end-Christian way; fear God, and not men. The time of our life is short, and eternity is approaching. You must remain eternally either in God's wrath and punishment, or grace and joy.

(16) Now some find a new way, who turn to the people, and read the words which Christ spake 2c.; in the other hand they have the sacrament, and say: Take, eat 2c., and take it up: which is ever so devilish and evil as the old custom. Cause: Their abrogation is like the old abrogation, and is as abominable as the old, and has all the vices that the old had, and is more mocking, in that they say to the people, Take, eat, and refuse them the bread; and when they have said, Take away the bread, they say, Take away the bread: And when they have said, Take the bread, and offer it to them, they soon turn back, fearing that one will take that which they have offered, and lay aside the bread. So much so that they promise and do not keep their promises.

(17) If we had kept Christ's order strictly, and considered Christ wise and prudent enough to have instituted and ordained his supper in the very best way, we would not have fallen into so many errors. So also of the

The bread of the Lord is food, and his cup is drink, so that we may use everything in remembrance of him, just as the apostles and their brethren did.

018 To whom did Christ command that he should lift up his supper on high, and show it to the people? But if Christ has not commanded it, how are they so bold as to take hold of such a great prince and lord in his order? Could they tolerate such sacrilege to their statutes? when they have neither redeemed us nor reconciled us to God. I must not teach you how the gospels speak of the custom of the Lord's bread and cup; for the text is in itself light, clear and bright enough. Matthew Cap. 26, Marcus Cap. 14, Lucas Cap. 22, Paul 1 Cor. 11, the other apostles in the stories of the apostles Cap. 2, 46. 20, 11. 27, 35.

19 A communion is called a meal, but a meal is put into the mouth. If it is food or drink, which one eats or drinks in remembrance of another, then you must keep it in remembrance. Now Christ has given us his bread and cup to eat, that we should remember him as one who gave his soul for us, putting himself into the hands of the executioners and devils who bound us and led us to death, as you have heard and know well.

20 In this way and in no other must we take and enjoy the bread and cup of the Lord Christ. He that would do better, what doth he but teach and instruct Christ, and despise the wisdom of Christ? You can take this up with you: Behold, if ye had made an order, and there came a poor peasant to mend your order, could ye suffer it without vexation? Or would you not take it for granted that the peasant wanted to be much wiser than you?

21 But is it not true that Paul says Rom. 8, 6. 7.: "The wisdom of the flesh is an enmity against God, and the death of man"? Truly, truly, all our reason, understanding and wisdom in divine matters is our death, for it is against God and cannot be subject to God. Because our wisdom promises God's wisdom and makes God a fool in all the things that our wisdom finds when it wants to serve God better than God has appointed, as you have heard from the above examples. How well the wise man said: "You shall not follow or trust in your wisdom", Proverbs [3, 7]. Item, Paul: "You should not be wise among yourselves", Rom. 12, 17.

22 You know what Peter heard from Christ, when he wanted to do better than Christ told him, Matthew 16:23. Did not Christ say, "You Satan!" only because he was wise according to his flesh and blood? Now no reason could have punished Peter.

How constant and true is this speech of Isaiah 55:8: "My thoughts are not like yours, and my ways are not like your ways. For God's ways stand, but our ways are as slipperiness in the darkness, Jer. 23, 12. He who stands on his thoughts and ways stands, as he who walks in the darkness on a glue-covered, wet and slippery mountain. That is why God has cast down everything that we or others find. Nothing is good before Him but His own alone. All other things must be rooted out, since Christ says: "Every plant that my heavenly Father has not planted must be rooted out," Matth. 15, 13. and speaks the same against human fables or teachings, saying: "Behold, the people want to honor me with the teachings of men, but their heart is far from me. Truly far from me, for it despises divine wisdom, even though the splendor seems good and divine.

24. God must have recognized our recklessness long ago and broken it by forbidding it when He said to the Jews, "If you are in the Gentiles, you are in the Jews.

When ye come into the land, and behold good and hard service, which they do unto their gods, ye shall by no means do so as they do," Deut. 12:29 ff. This is what is said: You shall not let the splendor, nor the hardness of divine service, nor anything move you to serve me differently than I commanded you.

The Gentiles had a harder service of God than the Jews, and burned their children in praise of their gods; but the Jews were not allowed to do this, Deut. 18:10. Therefore neither holiness nor hardness nor anything else must be regarded as God's order.

Therefore it is truly diabolical when you write and say that men are so defiant and foolhardy that they want to destroy the order of our Lord Jesus Christ and order his service better than Christ has ordered it for them. All of them are also fragile 1) in Christ.

(27) If you do not take the Lord's supper at all, I advise you to do so; but if you want to have the Lord's supper, keep it in the order of Christ, which is light and bright and does not need my interpretation.

028 If ye be not satisfied, write unto me your infirmities. For I am willing to serve you?

1) brittle - one who breaks his word, hence: unfaithful.

3. Carlstadt's Dialogus oder Gesprächbüchlein von dem greulichen abgöttischen Missbrauch des hochwürdigen Sacraments JEsu Christi.

Perhaps in August*) 1524.

I wish all believers in Christ God's grace and knowledge.

1) Let no one think, dear brothers, that I am writing of the anti-Christian custom of the most reverend Sacrament in an unheard-of way out of spite and impudence: although I know for certain that the greatest part will respect that I have sought nothing but innovation and strangeness, because this work of mine is set against so many thousands of Christian scholars. Especially since the princes of the high scholars and the scribes have rejected the old papist abuse.

2) Yellowness - yellow-beakedness. Cf. De Wette, Vol. II, p. 381.

The common man runs after them and dances up and down to their whistles, and considers everything they hear from the scribes to be a reason for righteousness, and that they do right everywhere when they follow the same highly learned preachers, or jump after them, or echo them and say yes and amen to all their advice.

(2) But if the bound consciences would cast off some cords, and let the persons and worldly men trot by, and hold to the truth, and think that it is unseemly and unrighteous to direct the truth according to the larvae of men, or to judge the Scriptures according to the likeness of men, they would no longer rely on the arm of man for it.

*) This approximate timing is given by us because this booklet is already mentioned in the sixth paragraph of the paper No. 3 in this volume, which is probably to be set in September.

but on the unconfessed grounds of truth, and obtain an everlasting peace, and drink a drink of the water which Christ giveth, which satisfieth them wholly, and bringeth them unto everlasting life. 1) This I desire, that the truth may be earnestly regarded. I am also without any doubt that many would remember better and receive the named sacrament more worthily than it is therefore received.

3. If you, brothers, could also take to heart 2) how divine love, together with faith, hope and trust in God, cut itself off and, through the misuse of all outward well-meant signs, perish and become nothing, everyone would say: that I was neither invited and brought to this work by folly, nor innovation, nor self-glory, nor anything else, but only this, that through the false custom of the Sacrament, the love of God has gone out, faith has been prevented, and the consciences have been caught with horrible insanity, which they wanted to fortify in God's love and faith through the old custom and make them free of all fears.

God understands all things better than we do, how skillful one is or can become. That is why He often abolished and completely forbade the custom of external things, which He Himself had instituted; because He saw how the simple were offended by them out of ignorance. So God promised sacrifice, fire, smoke, the Temple, the serpent and the ark 3) and said: "Why do I ask for your sacrifice, for your incense? what is it that you say: the Temple of God, the Temple of God, the Temple of God? You shall call the ark no more. Ezekiel took away the erected serpent and broke it because of the abuse, which was also disregarded, that God Himself had erected it and that it was a special sign of the body of Christ, which was to be given into the hands of the wicked to the cross.

5 What do you think, brothers, that we should do? We, who see so many abominable abuses of the reverend Sacrament? We, who understand how the wretched and blind Christians act and behave with the Sacrament in such a way that they fall into the error of believing that Christ suffered for our sin in the Host, or,

1) So put by us instead of: jumpet.

2) In the old edition: "können", "the faith", "well-meant". This last word will probably mean: m good opinion applied. It would be possible, however, that "wohlgenenneten" i.e. "blessed" should be read, because Carlstadt translates, as we see later in this dialogue, benedicere by: wohlsagen.

3) arca - the Ark of the Covenant.

That Christ washes away and forgives our sins in the Host, or that Christ remains with us forever in the Sacrament? We, who see that some make more boast of the Sacrament than of Christ's suffered death?

6. my matter will seem new to you. But I will present the truth to you as if I were to present it before the eyes of God and the strict judgment seat. Therefore I admonish you in your duty of oath that you look neither to me nor to anyone else, but to the reasons of my booklet, and that you measure the truth in itself seriously and wittily.

(7) You must not think that I am scandalizing you or making fun of you, because I have made a booklet of discussions. I am very concerned about your blessedness, and I have been very serious about this matter, and I have called the people who discuss it together brevity for half of this sacramental act, because the arguments can be made shorter in a discussion than in a single speech. Therefore, you should know that I have sought brevity and your benefit, and first of all God's glory and honor, and not mockery or pleasure.

8. it behooves you to put diligence on each one's foundation and to ask God to protect and keep us from all kinds of his dishonor, which is mostly in the wrong mind and will against God, by his known truth. 4. Amen.

Sub-speakers: Gemser, 5) Victus, and Peter, a layman.

Gemser. Dear Brother Victe, why are you so sad?

Victus. What is the use of my complaining to you? You cannot help me.

Gemser. Do you not know that it is written: Ad aliquem sanctorum convertere, you should call upon a saint in times of need?

Victus. This was said by one who was a companion like you, who also wanted to make the afflicted Job flee from God to the creatures. I also think you are more cunning than he, for your counsel is as if I should flee to you as to a saint.

Gemser. What's the harm?

4) So put by us instead of: transfigured.

5) "Gemser", a papist; the name probably refers to Emser. Carlstadt introduces himself under "Victus". But soon the layman "Peter" takes his place and overcomes Gemser. But, as we see from Luther's writing "Against the Heavenly Prophets", especially from § 62 of the second part, Luther's teaching is also condemned by Carlstadt in the person of "Gemser".

Victus. Much; for you are drowned in the sacramental doctrines and consider that a health, which to me is a disease and horrible ulcer.

Gemser. I smell that you doubt the sacraments.

Victus. You have seen my ulcer.

Gemser. We have seven sacraments; which one are you distressed about?

Victus. I do not know about one, nor about seven sacraments.

Gemser. Oho!

Victus. I do not know what kind of word the word sacrament is, much less what it means; therefore it is possible that I am mistaken and straying when Aristotle says: *Ignorantes virtutes vocabulorum, defacile 1)* etc..

Gemser. Sacrament is a Latin word, not Greek; but the Jews say it is a Hebrew word and in German means a false, lying image. Seker in their language means false, untruthful and useless. Ment is supposed to be an image far away.

Victus. I thought you were a patron of the sacraments, so you are a scoffer.

Gemser. I have told you what the Jews think of the word sacrament and wanted to tell you what it means in Latin, so you fall into my speech as a peasant and want to shame me.

Victus. Your speech and gestures of your face seem as if your mind is of one mind with the Jews.

Gemser. Protect and keep me God!

Victus. But what does the word sacrament mean?

Gemser. Sacramentum is a Latin word and means in good German a sign of a holy thing, as the master of high senses teaches and speaks: *Sacramentum est sacrae rei signum*. For when the Latin speak: *Hoc est sacramentum militare, hoc est castrense; nihil ad propositum*.

Victus. You are a master of high senses, who disregard God's word, to whom God also does not reveal many things; whom God also hates and corrupts their senses and wisdom. I want to have a right, clear biblical word.

Gemser. *Hoc sacramentum magnum est*. [Eph. 5, 32.]

Victus. Rhyme yourself, wolfsbane, to ^den(s) foot! You know that our old translation has a lot of fictitious words, which are similar to the Greek and the

Hebrew are inappropriate, that also the sentence of our Latin Bible is at times unruly with the original tongue, therefore you would not reject me with bad words, you must lead me in the tongues, as Jerome teaches.

Gemser. The Christian church uses the word.

Victus. Therefore, I want to know where the word Sacrament has a reason in the Word in which the Church lives, and therefore I want to have a divine and true reason.

Gemser. We have seven sacraments, among which one is the highest and most excellent, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Victus. God has a pleasure in His words, as the prophet Nehemiah says; therefore tell me: whether God, or a prophet, or apostles have used the word sacrament in the things you call sacraments? God gives His creatures their own names.

Gemser. God brought all animals to Adam and let them be called by Adam.

Victus. Therefore, will you give the church this power, that it may call history and practice, as Adam did the animals?

Gemser. Well and truly.

Victus. Uneven and wrong, because too slow.

Gemser. How so, slowly?

Victus. Christ and the apostles gave names to baptism and communion much earlier than the church of high senses came to earth. You have missed out and were born too late.

Gemser. We have the power that Adam had.

Victus. So I hear that you have power to call that which is white black, that which is evil good, and to punish Christ and his apostles, as you did some hundred years ago, when Adam neither received nor ever used such power.

Gemser. *Propter bonum sensum*.

Victus. Thus the apostles and Christ would have had an evil mind and spirit; nor would the apostles and Christ have been wise enough to give proper names to the things which you call sacraments.

Gemser. I realize that the names annoy you.

Victus. Not for my sake, but for the sake of the sick and the weak, if you lead them onto the slippery ice with such words and prevent them from continuing and coming to God. One thing must follow the other: Either that Christ has not been wise enough, or that he has not been good enough, since he has not been

1) *defacile*. This is how it reads in the autotype [original print].

Whether it should'd be called *difficile* or *de facili*, or still differently, one cannot decide from it. (Walch.)

The Lord's Supper was instituted and not left behind, so that his bread and cup should be called a sacrament or a sign of holy things. Although in good sense it would be permissible to call baptism, bread and wine signs of things, as the apostles figured them in times past, Rom. 6. 1 Cor. 10. If you papists would leave such an interpretation, it would be without danger.

Gemser. You have discovered your disease.

Victus. Let's hear it!

Gemser. You are distressed because of the Most High Sacrament.

Victus. If you hit me, I will scream.

Gemser. Are you concerned whether Christ is in the sacrament after mankind?

Victus. You have guessed it. For to ask whether Christ is there or thereabouts according to the Godhead is to ask whether Christ is in all creatures according to his Godhead, which is foolish, for God is in hell as in heaven, and fills all creatures.

Gemser. That is why I spoke of the humanity of Christ.

Victus. I truly doubt whether the body of Christ is in the bread, and his blood in the cup.

Gemser. Why?

Victus. Therefore, they say that his natural body, which was conceived in the womb and then crucified, should be as large, wide, thick and long in the sacrament as he hung on the cross.

Gemser. Oportet credere, one must believe.

Victus. Maledictus, qui credit verbis mendacii, cursed is he who believes lies.

Gemser. This is the truth that Christ is as great in the Sacrament as He was when He hung on the Cross.

Victus. I know nothing of the truth, and cannot believe it, you show me God's truthful speeches, which indicate this freely and brightly.

Gemser. You have not been a priest. For the priests have some words (which they call *verba consecrationis*) which are so powerful that they bring the body and blood of Christ down from high heaven to earth in a little host; if you understood such speech, you would speak more wittily.

Victus. You pretend many things to me, since I should ask you about them. One is this: You say that the priests or monks bring down the body and blood of Christ from heaven, which is contrary to your previous speech and stands when you said: Christ is as great in the sacrament as he hung on the cross. Therefore, 1) you should have brought Christ from

He was brought to the cross in the sacrament when he died and shed blood. In heaven Christ was not formed, nor extended, when he was on the cross; therefore one must be false. For the other, you report some words which you call *verba consecrationis* 2c., I have not read about them. I also think that the priests invented them. For the third, you speak of a host. Explain this article to me.

Gemser. Host is a bread which the priests consecrate and bring Christ in.

Victus. But I can not understand it.

Gemser. The priests make the bread into nothing, leaving only the form of the bread, and in the same form, instead of the bread, they put the body of Christ.

Victus. So I hear, it is not *sacramentum*, but *fermentum Pharisaeorum*; because the shape of the bread remains ever so small .and so large, so thick, and everywhere as before, before the priests breathe over it, or blow and cackle as the geese. Therefore I ask: whether Christ's body, arm, breast, thigh and bone, crown of thorns, nails and spear, are in the bread, which is smaller than Christ's little finger was?

Gemser. Yes.

Victus. Must he then shrink and curl up when the clergy blow out such words.

Gemser. What can you do?

Victus. I have doubts, that's why I'm asking.

Gemser. You should not scold.

Victus. I don't know any other words to use for it.

Gemser. One should not investigate.

Victus. So say you priests, when you are quite uncertain of your things. But I consider it (if it were true what you say), 2) that one should investigate and search the Scriptures, which bear witness of our Lord Christ, because the Scriptures praised the Thessalonians for investigating. For if the Scriptures tell of other things of Christ and teach us how Christ was miraculously conceived by the Holy Spirit in the womb, how he lived and spoke, suffered and died, rose again and ascended into heaven, the Scriptures should also tell how Christ is in the sacrament, which is as miraculous as any of the articles told.

Gemser. As I go, says Christ, you know nothing about it.

Victus. Bock 3) you, you bump.

1) In the old edition: müssest.

2) These brackets are set by us.

3) "Bock" is here from Carlstadt, because of the mockery" called "Bock Emser", set for "bend".

Gemser. Isn't it proper ?

Victus. Like this speech, that one should preach until the carved, cast, or painted idols run out of the church, that one should not lay a hand on them before.

Gemser. You don't have to do research on such things.

Victus. Why then does the truth say: Search the scriptures! and in another place thus: My sheep hear my voice, but the voice of the stranger they hear not; and thus: Ye shall not hear the word of false prophets, but the word of God shall we search day and night? You have never said this to any stone or wood, that Christ was in the host when he was on the cross.

Gemser. Christ's body is so great in the host when he hung on the cross.

Victus. You sing your song like a raven, but I cannot believe it yet. I would rather believe that Christ's body is as small in the host as he is born or conceived; but I believe none, unless you put the word of faith before me; otherwise, if I had to believe your wind, my cause would be worse than a reed's cause.

Gemser. Why?

Victus. A reed has only 12 or 24 winds blowing on it; but I would have to suffer as many winds as there are heads if I were to listen to and believe every priest.

Gemser. He who does not believe is condemned.

Victus. Cry out over your neck. I believe in Christ, in his suffering and all his words; but he who does not believe in Christ is condemned. Show me Christ's word, or a letter of faith from the Bible, that Christ's body is in a small host; and see if I do not believe!

Gemser. You are bound by the Bible.

Victus. I seek God in the Bible, and not Scripture in the Scriptures.

Gemser. What is the purpose of [the] Scripture for you?

Victus. To a testimony of truth.

Gemser. Let us speak Greek, Jewish and Latin.

Victus. Do you know these tongues?

Gemser. In the emergency.

Victus. What need is there?

Gemser. Do you not see the farmer standing behind us, diligently taking in and measuring all our words and speech?

Victus. Is it evil?

Gemser. So evil that the laymen of all first in

The people of the country would come to their Christian freedom and would not give a penny more to a priest for the sake of a sacrament.

Victus. So I hear you have something in your quiver that you could and should pour out.

Gemser. I am not scolding you, for you see that God now reveals to the simple some things that He hides from the wise.

Victus. Do you want to hinder God's power?

Gemser. egg, so no! But I wanted to keep my honor and supreme place.

Victus. Teach me, I will be silent like a water mill.

Gemser. One has understood this text *Hoc est corpus W6um* a long time thus: The bread is my body; as if it had been written: *Hoc panis est corpus meum*, which the Latin language does not suffer.

Victus. Is this not the text so that the priests, the new and old papists, want to lap and mend, cover and hide, and maintain that Christ's body is in the bread and his blood in the chalice?

Gemser. You hit it.

Victus. Did you cover yourselves with a shawl?

Gemser. Don't scold me, so I will tell you miracles.

Victus. You are a scribe.

Gemser. I scoff.

Victus. You cannot step back.

Gemser. How so?

Victus. This verse: *Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis traditur*, is a fully adequate verse, which Christ placed alone in the gospels, although with different words, since he spoke nothing of the sacrament, as Matth. 16, Joh. 3, 6.

Gemser. Prove it!

Victus. Obviously 1) , because the pronoun *Hoc* has a capital 8. But a capital letter means a beginning of a new sentence and verse. Accordingly, this verse is placed in the speech of the Lord's bread, as one tends to add something that serves to the speech or sermon and yet is a fully adequate speech for itself.

Gemser. But what is the purpose of this verse?

Victus. To whom the disciples learned what their memorial should be, and whom the Lord commanded to eat his bread.

Gemser: But where did Christ say about his body, which he would give and has now given for us?

1) In the original: dissolute.

Victus. In all the prophets and gospels in which his suffering is written.

Gemser. It does not sound.

Victus. The old violin, and the pope's laws and customs, and your honor have filled your ears with creaturely sounds, therefore it does not sound to you. But unstop thine ears, and stop thine ears, and naked ears, unto the words of God, and see if they sound not unto thee, which I have now told thee.

Gemser. It's hard to leave old habit and own honor.

Victus. That is why the path to the Kingdom of Heaven is narrow and bitter.

Gemser. Since you have begun, continue.

Victus. I should learn from you.

Gemser. Drive on!

Victus. The Greek tongue serves this division and also the perfection of the verse, that it is a special verse; because the Greek writing and speech has this verse: Hoc est corpus sto. with punctuation and letters, and better than the Latin.

Gemser. Vide, quomodo omnia rusticus ille perpendit.

Victus. You shall search and read, but I will listen.

Gemser. *Τούτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου.*

Victus. Interpret these words.

Gemser. Istud est hoc corpus meum, quod pro vobis etc..

Victus. I want you to tell me in German.

Gemser. But do you not see how this farmer opens his mouth and acts as if he wants to eat all our speech?

Victus. That is why you should speak German.

Gemser. It is not good that we reveal these things to the laity. For first of all, the peasants will be considered as much as the priests.

Victus. It does not harm me, nor you. I will be your guarantor that the godly man would love you because of the truth; without that you should confess God's justice, even with your harm, yes, even with your death.

Gemser. In such hope I say that I wanted to translate it thus: *Tuto* is the body of mine, which 2c. And it would be good, that one would have left the Greek pronoun and mixed it into the Latin.

Victus. Why?

Gemser. That one would have read thus: *Tuto est hoc corpus meum*.

Victus. I ask: Why?

Gemser. So people would have thought: What is the little word

Victus. But it would not have been unhelpful to the priests.

Gemser. The better it would be.

Victus. You always want to go the way of the monk.

Gemser. Mock!

Victus. For reasons, because it would have been a question or delusion that a thing had been called, and the same must have been the body of Christ.

Gemser. What would be the point?

Victus. Much; for you priests would have persuaded us laymen that Christ had, I know not what, in the evening, and had changed his body therein, whereon we had hanged silver and gold.

Gemser. You should not believe that.

Victus. Do not believe? I hear what you have made of the chalice, and how you say that you must have goblets of gold and silver, and lure our silver and gold from our bags.

-Gemser. I wanted to have given notice for my person gem and to have known that *luto* is a Greek pronoun.

Victus. Who knows what you would have done if the old mothers had brought pennies and guilders?

Gemser. I am too pious.

Victus. But the stingy and fools would have actually made a silver or golden box out of the little word.

Gemser. It would have been a fine speech: the body is mine, as the evangelists all say.

Victus. But what do you understand from the Greek lectionary, and what is it in German?

Gemser. *Tuto est* to soma mu 2c.

Victus. Speak German!

Gemser. The peasant will notice, quia verba sunt apertissime contra nos sacerdotes.

Peter, [a] layman. 1) Dear sirs! With leave that I speak! Do not resent me for asking, for I understand that you are talking about the body and blood, bread and cup of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Gemser. Prius, o Victe, dixi de rustico, quod audiret et ruminaret verba nostra.

Victus. What harm does it do?

Peter. Gentlemen, I notice that you are quarreling over a word that is not too familiar to me.

Victus. Therefore you, Gemser, shall speak German

and say what is said in German: *Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον.* [Luc. 22, 19.] Peter. This also I desire fervently.

Gemser. Is the body of mine, which is given for you.

Peter. That is a strange language.

Victus. Truly a mixed language.

Peter. I want to ask and hear if I would like to become more understanding from you.

Gemser. 1) If it were written like this, or interpreted like this:

If the body is mine 2c.

it would probably stand.

Victus. How? if some had come who would soon have said that a golden loaf had been made when you made the word *calix* into a golden drinking vessel?

Peter. Gentlemen! Speak more intelligibly, and hat German; for although I understand you in part, I do not understand you completely.

Gemser. In good German the Greek tongue reads thus: This is the body mine, which gave for you 2c. But it seems to me that it would be better to let the pronoun stand than I said.

Peter. But it would read strangely.

Gemser. Every language or tongue has something of its own, which cannot be interpreted into other tongues; and if someone wants to speak of a property of foreign languages, he must use the words of the same foreign tongue; therefore we have many Latin words in our offices. So also now we have fallen into the Latin and Greek language, and are to tell you idiots about the hidden content and sound of both tongues; therefore we have to talk to you by Latin and Greek words.

Peter. Go ahead! Who knows if I would like to memorize something. I have ever been struck on the hand with the Greek, Hebrew and Latin tablets, and have learned less than I have forgotten.

Gemser. Do you understand us? You are unfavorable and ugly to us.

Peter. Speak for yourself.

Gemser. The Greek tongue has articulos and pronouns that teach the genera nominum, and instruct that one can certainly see which word is entitled to the article or pronoun and which is not.

Peter. This wants to be good! talk forder.

Gemser. *Τοῦτο* is a Greek pronoun indicating a neuter name. Now the word Latin *panis*, in German Brod, is masculinum; therefore the pronoun *Τοῦτο cannot be* added to it, nor can the opi-

1) Here the old original print says Peter, which is an oversight.

nion does not consist of those who say: The bread is the body 2c. For the Greek language does not suffer it, as little it would be suitable in Latin, if I wanted to say: *Istud panis est hoc corpus meum*, or in German: The bread is my body.

Peter. That's good.

Gemser. Do you like it?

Peter. Well, because for a long time I could not find out how it would be possible that the bread should have become the body of Christ. I have always estimated it in the way that Christ pointed to his body and thus said: This is the body of mine, which is given for you. For Christ did not point to the bread, nor did he say, "The bread is my body, which is given for you. But they that say that the bread is the body, speak from their own selves, and lie, or make their wills very small. Listen: Jesus took the bread, and gave thanks to God, and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying that they should eat it in remembrance of him, and in the midst of his word he set forth the cause and manner of his remembrance, namely, because of this, and so that his disciples should remember that he gave his body for them. This opinion led Paul strongly, and those who speak otherwise are perverting God's word and are perverse people.

Gemser. Who taught this?

Peter. I heard his voice, but I did not see him, nor did I know how he came to me or left me.

Gemser. Who is he?

Peter. Our Father in Heaven.

Gemser. Oh, I wish I'd learned it from him!

Peter. Didn't you promise his spirit? Aren't you the poor man who gives God's living voice a creaturely form?

Gemser. Weiland, but not now.

Peter. If thou hast a desire in righteousness, as righteousness, and a fervent heart for it; then the Greek Scripture, which thou hast now read over, is a means bestowed upon thee.

Gemser. What assurance could you think of, that you have so firmly laid on your delusion, and have stood in it until now?

Peter. I have not a delusion, but truth and certainty, and can seal that the text is true.

Gemser. That's why I ask from the insurance.

Peter. If Christ should have redeemed us with his body when he was united with the bread, as you say, then Christ would have suffered in the host, or in the bread, or with the bread; without bread he would not have come to the cross, nor could he have suffered except in the bread; which is all obviously false.

Gemser. Who ever said that?

Peter. Those say it (though out of ignorance) who say that Christ's body was united with the bread, or in the bread, or under the form of the bread.

Gemser. How does that follow?

Peter. So they say: Christ said: The bread is the body, which is given for you. Is this not as much as saying, "The bread will be given for you and will suffer?" or, "My body under the bread, or my body, which is the bread, will be given for you? Is it not as much, My body is not given for you before it became bread, or when it is under the form of bread? From this it follows that Christ suffered secretly and concealed, as he is secretly and concealed in the Sacrament; this is contrary to God's truth and all the prophets. It also follows that Christ would not have given his body for us on the cross, for you priests are not able to represent a man who at the same time brought the body of Christ in bread. If you want to show Christ, tell how he took the bread when his hands were nailed to it. If you want to point out an apostle, prove that the apostles consecrated the sacrament at the time you are speaking, when they were all scattered and had fled from their shepherd and were suffering trouble in Christ. As to the third, it will follow that a loaf of bread baked by the baker must have been the body of which the Scriptures write much that it should be given for us; but this would be a strong contradiction of all the Scriptures.

Gemser. If you had been so experienced in your matters, why did you become very cheerful when I told you how the Greek language held up?

Peter. Therefore, that I may hear an outward testimony, by which I may now raise up and edify those who have fallen away, and now quiet and overcome those who resist. For my own sake I should not have the outward testimony; I want to have my testimony of the Spirit in my inwardness, which Christ has promised.

Gemser. Where.

Peter. Again, do you not know that Christ thus said, "The Spirit, the Comforter, will bear witness to you, and you also will bear witness to me? This is what happened to the apostles, who were assured inwardly by the Spirit's testimony, and then preached Christ outwardly and confirmed by the Scriptures that Christ had to suffer for us, and that the same Christ, Jesus of Nazareth, was the Crucified One.

Gemser. This is what is said by the apostles.

Peter. Are we not to be apostles, why did Peter say of Cornelio that he had received the Spirit like them? Why does Paul say that we should be his followers? Did not Christ promise us his Spirit as to the apostles? The Spirit alone leads us into knowledge of God's sayings, therefore it follows that those who do not hear God's Spirit speak do not understand God's sayings. They are also not Christians, as Christ says: Those are Christ's who have the Spirit of Christ. Therefore, God's Spirit alone gives testimony and assurance, Rom. 8. This is the reason that God's Spirit is a pledge and is called.

Gemser. Behold, if the Spirit bears witness, thou also shalt bear witness; why hast thou not brought thy mind to light sooner?

Peter. The spirit did not drive me fast enough; if it had driven and conquered me sufficiently, I would have concealed 1) or hidden much less than if I had had a ravenous fire in my bones. One must [at] times conceal the spirit, by reason of its honor, and fence with outwardly accepted testimonies at times. I almost knew that you and all the world, especially the scribes, would have laughed at me and said, "He would have raved if I had broken out sooner. But now the tongues are much more denouncing and meaner, therefore I push it to the tongues proclaimers in their own knowledge.

Gemser. Because you are so earnest and strict about hearing God's truth, I will also discover to you that this oration: This is my body, which is given for you, is closed with dots, and has dots in front and behind.

Peter. Is that good to what I said? Gemser. Ausbündlich gut.

Peter. Why didn't you say it before?

Gemser. I was afraid of the madness of some princes who claim to be learned in the Scriptures and have read nothing or little in them.

Peter. You shall confess God's words with joyfulness.

Gemser. I lacked the strength of spirit. Even though I didn't take it into condemnation [before], which I now hold in high esteem.

Peter. One should watch and not be hasty in the matter, and look at Pünktlein and everything with leisure and diligence.

Gemser. I must also not restrain you that this speech, this is my body 2c., is begun with a large letter in Lucae, is meant by the verse: This is my body, which is for you.

1) In the original: gehelen.

is not connected with the preceding words, but is a speech for itself.

Peter. How they GOtt has spoken for itself?

Gemser. Yes, yes, and that is why I soon had to stand with you and confess that Christ had said straight: This is my body, 2c. that he pointed to his body and not to the bread.

Peter. If you can raise something against it and outline my reasons, or even move them, do it.

Gemser. Although I cannot speak against it, I cannot remain silent.

Peter. Let us go away and continue to talk about the matter of how to eat Christ's bread worthily and how Christ's body is given.

Gemser. Tell me, what is this said: My body is given for you? when, how and why is it given, if it is a special speech, and not attached to the bread or united, as you and Victus speak, and I must confess it?

Peter. You should have enjoyed the Lord's bread and cup as the dogs eat the grass.

Gemser. Dear! Do not mock me.

Peter. He who does not eat the Lord's bread worthily spits out the body of Christ and becomes guilty of the Lord's body.

Gemser. I am a priest, and I have prepared it for myself and offered it in the Sacrament.

Peter. Oho! With four boots in one misten. 1) Fie you! you forgotten priest.

Gemser. Are you punishing me?

Peter. Freely and joyfully.

Gemser. Why?

Peter. That you are blind as a bat and do not know that the priests killed Christ.

Gemser. We are talking about the worthy reception of the sacrament.

Peter. I meant that we wanted to talk about the surrender of the body of Christ.

Gemser. You said not long ago that we should deal with these two articles in their entirety.

Peter. I let it happen.

Gemser. Why do you accuse me as if I had eaten the sacrament unworthily?

Peter. You pretend to be a good Paulensem and do not know that?

Gemser. I often eat mustard so that my eyes glaze over and sweat, and I still bite it.

Peter. You are a courtier, you can interrogate and keep silent when you are mocked.

Gemser. Tell me, why did you say that I ate the Lord's bread unworthily?

1) With the word "misten" Carlstadt mockingly calls the "fair".

Peter. O Paulensis! But do you not know how all Christianity sings, namely, that everyone should eat the Lord's bread in the judgment and sentence of the Lord's body? But if any man eat without knowledge of the body of Christ, he is guilty of the body of Christ.

Gemser. Cunning.

Peter. How so?

Gemser. I wanted to use these words of Paul, "He who eats the Lord's bread without distinction," against you, and to see you with them and to conquer you severely, so that you would confess that Christ's body is under the sacrament, and that we fall under the feet of the sacrament and show it divine honor, and are obligated to do everything that Christians now do. But you are cunning, and run away from my place of choice, and you dare to beat me with my own weapons.

Peter. Dismiss me the word "cunning", because I fight against you with truth and not with cunning. But that will probably be found in the sweep, whether Pauli's presented words serve you or me and are entitled to.

Gemser. Do not mock me, for I have Wittenberg letters.

Peter. It is nevertheless mocking and shameful to you that you boast of Paul as if he were your own and yours alone, and almost write from him, and carry on with him daily, and do not know what you are dealing with. And if I were to remain silent, the late Quintus Mutius would rise from the dead and say: "It is bad for such a brave man who wants to be like the Gospel, because he does not really look at and understand Paul, whom he carries daily in his mouth and in his pen.

Gemser. Do you think I don't understand Paulum?

Peter. The star 2) means ignorance and blindness.

Gemser. Let me catch Paulum Wider you.

Peter. Hit it!

Gemser. Every man shall eat the bread of the Lord worthily: he that eateth it unworthily is guilty of the body of Christ. He who drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily drinks judgment. 1 Cor. 11.

Peter. What is this new? Solomon said this more comfortably when he said, "Whoever eats the king's bread should eat it with great fear and honor, lest he fall into the king's wrath. If I were to eat with a prince, and eat my own bread, or such bread as I have, I should sit more honorably, and eat more politely,

2) Should the word "gestiren" perhaps mean gesturing - making gestures?

and with greater caution and timidity than in my house. How much more shall I eat with guilty honor the bread of the most high King, my Lord Jesus Christ, who innocently allowed himself to be choked for my sake?

Gemser. I shall eat the bread of the Lord worthily, that is: I shall know what kind of bread it is, how it is the Lord's bread, how the Lord is in it and under it, and shall beat my breast, give Him glory, and kneel down, and wait for forgiveness of sins through the Sacrament, and receive it as surely as I receive the Sacrament, and shall throw away all doubt, and rely on it and take comfort.

Peter. You have caught the sword by the edge, and hold the hilt out to me; how [g'e-] fchwinder you fence with it, the deeper you would wound yourself.

Gemser. Why?

Peter. Whoever misuses God's word, needs it for his own harm.

Gemser. I need it right.

Peter. On Pfäffisch and Papal Law.

Gemser. Is it not good?

Peter. It is evil and diabolical.

Gemser. Why?

Peter. Because he steals God's honor and glory and contradicts the truth and destroys Paul's teaching and makes nonsense people.

Gemser. You rave.

Peter. I will gladly swarm with you, so that I may be true and wise before God.

Gemser. You have told a lot of articles now. Tell me why Pope's teaching makes people nonsensical in this case?

Peter. When wise men eat great lords' bread at lords' tables, they are never afraid of the bread, nor do they bow down to the food, but to the Lord, and keep themselves honest and chaste before the Lord, and see not how the bread is, but why and how they eat with the king; this also the pope wants from those who eat with him. But when he speaks of the bread of Christ, he speaks of how we recognize, honor, and honestly eat the bread, though we never remember Christ, which is ever a nonsensical way; therefore the pope makes nonsensical people. He teaches how to bless the teeth, how to rinse the mouth, but how to look at and take care of the body of the Lord Jesus, the end-Christ does not teach.

Gemser. How does he steal GÖtTe's honor?

Peter. Dieblich.

Gemser. Why?

Peter. That he speaks, we are to the figure

of bread say: My God, until 1) you are merciful to me.

Gemser. Don't you have anything more?

Peter. The pope makes the suffering of Christ useless and null.

Gemser. As how?

Peter. If Christ forgave and redeemed sins for us in the form of bread, Christ died on the cross for nothing.

Gemser. How does the pope contradict the truth?

Peter. He says that we should remember the bread - but Christ did not tell us to do this - and makes us forget the Lord's body, of which we should be suspicious 2) as often as we eat the Lord's bread. Therefore, no one has eaten the bread of the Lord more unworthily than the papal crowd.

Gemser. Have you not eaten the bread of the Lord after the appointment of the priest?

Peter. Not in twenty years.

Gemser. How do you get so lucky?

Peter. I was under Pabst's spell, for my salvation, and learned that it is written: I will say goodbye to their ban and malediction. 3)

Gemser. How does the pope devastate the teaching of Paul?

Peter. Paul takes great pains to make us understand and suspect the death of the Lord, which the pope overthrows and puts before us his figure of bread and raises it so high that we forget the Lord's body and death because of great fear, sorrow and knowledge of his figure, and then pay no attention to what the Lord suffered on the cross, when we should have the greatest respect for it. Paul, however, leaves us in our senses and instructs us that we should enjoy the bread and wine of the Lord, which we do not see and feel, with the fear of the Lord, as the food of the most high Lord.

Gemser. Now I know that memory makes one worthy.

Peter. You have to add something.

Gemser. I have a delicious memory, because I just remember that the shape of the bread is the body of Christ.

Peter. Did Christ command you to remember? Does he say, "Do this in my memory?" or does he say, "Do this in the memory of the sacrament, or of the form of the bread under which my body is? Have you not yourself confessed,

1) to--be.

2) suspicious --- mindful.

3) Hiemrt is perhaps Zech. 14, 11. meant: "There will be no more ban".

[that the pronoun cannot demonstrate the word? Does not Christ want us to remember his body, which was given for us? Is thy form of bread also given for us? Has it been crucified and died? If we laymen confessed this, we would be as bad as the worst priests. You are a priest, and you feel what you want to encounter.

Gemser. Spare mine!

Peter. Spare yours; we're not bickering about money, but about the truth.

Gemser. For days and days I have heard. How we should prepare ourselves to receive the sacrament and the body of Christ, that I have always held that one thing is to receive the sacrament and to receive the body of Christ; therefore I have held one for the other, as have those from whom I heard it.

Peter. We say neither of your preachers, nor of your hearing. We discuss whether you are right or wrong. If you want to say: I speak right; then you must prove the right with divine justice and truth; without that I believe you nothing.

Gemser. How much I have heard: Prepare yourselves worthily to receive the body of Christ!

Peter. I believe you, but give me one word of Christ or of an apostle who speaks in this way. This I know, that Christ has nowhere given us his body to receive it, which our following disputation will explain. Christ also says, that his flesh is not profitable to us; and so also, that it is profitable for you that I should depart; if I go not, the Comforter cometh not. If all this is true, it is also true that we do not receive the body of Christ, either naturally or sacramentally.

Gemser. Prove that better!

Peter. Did Christ ever say: Receive my body! when he said: Take bread and eat it! 2c.? Therefore your preachers 1) would have preached to you more correctly, "See to it that you receive and eat the bread of the Lord more worthily, as Paul preaches.

Gemser. Is it not written: Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, there is no heaving in you?

Peter. Is this what Christ said when he said, Take bread and eat 2c.?

Gemser. No, but it is written at a different end.

Peter. Yes, at the end when Christ says: The flesh is not useful!

Gemser. Yes.

Peter. So also the reception of the flesh of Christ is not useful. Further I ask: whether Christ does not want to say by the above words that we will not feel life in us unless we eat his flesh and drink his blood?

Gemser. Right:

Peter. If you confess this to me, you must also confess that the eating of Christ's flesh is an inward taste of Christ's suffering, and that there is one meaning, that the Son of Man is exalted, that whoever looks at Him, that is, believes, should not perish but have eternal life.

Gemser. I punish you with not[en].

Peter. To receive Christ in this way is to accept Christ, that is, to recognize Christ warmly and fervently.

Gemser. This belongs on the Sacrament.

Peter. If one does not take the sacrament for eternity, he would still be blessed if he were otherwise justified. But to attain salvation without the taste of Christ is impossible; neither can anyone be justified without the art [i.e., knowledge] of Christ, Isa. 53. The sacrament is not necessary, the knowledge of Christ is necessary. You also know that Christ spoke long before the institution of the sacrament: Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son [of man] 2c. Therefore, you have not used Christ's words correctly.

Gemser. It is a little word, that is sacramentaliter, that answers many questions.

Peter. With the foolish, but with the intelligent it does not work; because the God-denouncers speak with Christ and say: spiritualiter, that is, spiritually we must eat the flesh of the Lord. Sacramentaliter is no more useful than the natural outward flesh of Christ.

Gemser. You pour out everything that is in your criticisms 2).

Peter. It will be better; for those who want to eat Christ sacramentally are worse than those who went away from Christ, or those who wanted to eat Christ bodily, than the unicorns and lions, from whom Christ wanted to be protected, since it is written: Libera a cornibus unicornium, et erue de ore leonis animam. [Ps. 22, 22.]

Gemser. Talk away!

Peter. The body of Christ sacramentaliter is of no use at all, because neither the death nor the resurrection of Christ can be seen in it.

2) "tripe"---intestines; i.e., inside you.

1) Concerning this word "Hutzelprediger" Luther remarks in his writing Wider die himmlischen Propheten: "O schön Deutsch!"

understood sacramentally, he is neither carnally nor spiritually useful, he is also nothing.

Gemser. You have struck the pope on the ear so that his whole face is blackened.

Peter. And all the papists too.

Gemser. And also the new papists. But what must we do to spiritually accept or receive the body of Christ?

Peter. We must leave and not do.

Gemser. This is too sharp for me. Tell me, how shall we receive the bread of the Lord worthily as you speak?

Peter. He who has a fervent remembrance of the body of Jesus Christ, and desires to prove it outwardly in the church by eating the bread of the Lord, is worthy to receive the bread of the Lord, as Christ says, "Do this in my remembrance. He that hath not the right remembrance of Christ is not fit, as Christ would have him fit.

Gemser. Until willing and undaunted to continue talking.

Peter. See! Do we want to bring a speech back often?

Gemser. Yes, it does no harm, because this matter is strange. In which article is the memory thorough?

Peter. You are a master and should answer me, and ask me.

Gemser. Turn to nothing, neither to my worthiness nor to my great clamor, and answer my question.

Peter. The memory has many parts in Christ, but one article is the most important, which we must understand and be aware of, if we want to eat the bread of the Lord worthily.

Gemser. Make him nameable.

Peter. The delivered body of Christ is that which must be remembered by every one who will eat the Lord's bread without judgment. But we will speak of it at the proper time and place.

Gemser. What does Paul call this article and his knowledge?

Peter. Paul calls him the death of the Lord, and he calls the memory the proclamation. But you shall understand this by circumstantial speech.

Gemser. You talk, I want to hear.

Peter. You are doing this out of humility.

Gemser. From Nothdurft.

Peter. The words of Paul are thus: Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you; do this in my memory. This is the new testament in my blood; do this as often as you can.

you drink it in remembrance of me. Paul says with bright words that we should do everything in remembrance of Christ, as eating the bread of the Lord and drinking from His cup; but by this Paul instructs us that the remembrance of Christ should set us on fire and drive us to take the bread and the cup of Christ.

Gemser. You wipe over there, as a frightened hare over the bush.

Peter. What is it?

Gemser. You are afraid of the little word "broken".

Peter. Why?

Gemser. Paul fixed our opinion, the priest, for he says: This is my body, which is broken for you; but this has no reason, if you will not let the body of Christ come in the form of bread 1); for the bread is broken, and the body of Christ cannot be broken in itself, but in the form of bread Christ's body is broken per consequens.

Peter. Oh poor and unfunny man! Do you think that Christ's body must be broken as bread is broken? Do you not know that it is written: You shall not break a bone of him? Knowest thou not the manner of speaking, that it is said, Thou hast a broken spirit? a broken spirit? Do you want to say that Christ was broken in the form of bread? You cannot obtain that. Tell me, who broke him? Will you say: Did Christ himself break the bread? I answer, "If Christ was not in the bread when he broke it, nothing was broken in his body when he gave the bread to his disciples.

Gemser. There is another nature of Christ in the Sacrament, and outside.

Peter. Therefore you priests have another Christ in the sacrament than we laymen have on the cross. He who has broken limbs has them where he is broken. Now I ask further: Did Christ break Himself without hands?

Gemser. No.

Peter. So you cannot point to an apostle who broke Christ's body in the bread, as you can point to the fact that they ate the bread. It is false that Christ's body was broken in the bread, and false that Christ's body was broken on the cross in the form of the bread.

1) want". This word is required by the context, but in its place in the original print is "nit", i.e. not. (Walch.)

Gemser. Let us remain in the matter we have begun and see with what words Paul speaks of memory and of that which we are to remember.

Peter. Paul calls the broken body and the shed blood the death of the Lord; we are to remember it. But Paul calls the remembrance the proclamation, as I said.

Gemser. Speak more, and give me the words of Paul!

Peter. As often as you eat of this bread (says Paul) and drink of this cup, you shall proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes.

Gemser. Explain.

Peter. It is so clear to me as a bright light.

Gemser. I realize what we need for the worthy reception of the Lord's bread and cup, namely, the remembrance and proclamation of Christ's death. But still I do not understand the proclamation.

Peter. Learn to understand this: In the heart is believed unto righteousness, with the mouth unto salvation [Rom. 10:10].

Gemser. Add this verse to the memory and proclamation!

Peter. The memory of Christ may not be without faith and knowledge of Christ, as little as I could have a memory of my father if I had not known him. Therefore, the memory follows the knowledge or faith, with essence and types. If knowledge is fervent and loud, memory is fervent and loud. If it is by hearsay, the memory is also skillful.

Gemser. Can the memory also justify?

Peter. Why not?

Gemser. Prove it!

Peter. Isaiah paints the mocked and dead Messiah in his horrible bitterness; after that Isaiah says: that the Messiah will make many of his servants righteous by his art [i.e. the knowledge of him].

Gemser. Is this the text: *scientia sui justificabit Ipse multos*, Esa. 53, 11.?

Peter. You said it.

Gemser. Do you therefore mean that Christ's memory, in the way he was maledicted, ridiculed, nailed and strangled, also makes him just, as his art?

Peter. I want that. For it is written: They will say that they have done this in my memory.

Gemser. What could you rhyme with this clause: With the mouth one believes to salvation?

Peter. The proclamation of the death of Christ. For the proclamation is a speech of faith, which proceeds from the heart through the mouth. Therefore, the outward confession or preaching of the death of Christ is a sign or fruit of inward righteousness, that all those who hear such outward preaching must say: God is in the man who preaches, or God speaks from him.

Gemser. So I understand that the remembrance of Christ must be so rich, so abundant, and so powerful in the one who wants to eat the Lord's bread, that it compels the man to preach publicly before the congregation, or otherwise proclaim the death of Christ, and then to eat (out of great love and remembrance) the Lord's bread.

Peter. You have guessed this; do you not know how Paul preached about Christ in Troada, and the people were driven to eat the Lord's bread?

Gemser. Yes, as in the stories [of the apostles] at the 20th chapter.

Peter. Do you also know that the disciples remained steadfast in the teaching of Christ, and afterward also remained in the breaking of bread?

Gemser. Good.

Peter. Do you know that a proclamation of the death of Christ must always precede the breaking and taking of the Lord's bread? Gemser. From whom? and from what?

Peter. The preaching of the death of Christ is necessary, as Paul says: "You shall proclaim the death of the Lord as often as you take it", which is also indicated by the apostles' stories. The sermons of the resurrection or birth of Christ do not add anything to the reception of the Lord's bread, although the articles of the birth and ascension of Christ may be included.

Gemser. From whom?

Peter. From one who wants to break bread, or from another.

Gemser. But I think it is unnecessary to examine all the recipients, since Christ gave his bread to Jude the betrayer.

Peter. You have now heard me speak a great deal. I also consider it sufficient to understand how Christ's and Paul's words agree, and what man needs, so that he may take and eat the Lord's bread worthily.

Gemser. Good brother, in inexperienced matters it is not a multiplicity that one thing is brought out twice.

Peter. What is it?

Gemser. Again, we will speak of the worthy receiving or taking of the bread.

of the Lord, because I realize that there is still something in the pen.

Peter. What?

Gemser. The word *dijudicare*, which Paul used, means in German: to judge very well, to estimate well, to judge fiercely. The Greek word *δικαπίνων* means: to discriminate and to judge.

judge. Whoever wants to distinguish a thing correctly must look at the thing inside and out and consider it completely, which he wants to distinguish.

Peter. What are you talking about?

Gemser. To Paul's speech, which reads: "He who eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks judgment for himself, so that he does not distinguish the body of the Lord.

Peter. This word we have acted temporally.

Gemser. Be at my service and let's do one more thing.

Peter. I want to hear how you heard me.

Gemser. You say that anyone who wants to receive the sacrament without harm must have the memory of Christ and judge the body of Christ with great diligence and also proclaim the death of Christ outwardly. But all this we priests take from Christ, as you say, and put on the sacrament.

Peter. What do you sacrament? Where did you learn the Word in the Scriptures?

Gemser. Take it for granted that I cannot speak out; and act as if you hear the word "bread" as often as I say "sacrament.

Peter. Stride henceforth!

Gemser. We clergymen, priests and monks say that the Sacrament forgives sin and preach thus: O sinner, if your conscience, because of sin, frightens or oppresses you, and you cannot get rid of your fear and burdens, go and take the Sacrament for your sin, and be satisfied.

Peter. You false prophets! You promise people God's kingdom for a piece of bread; what would you promise for silver and gold if you were not ashamed? You promise peace of conscience to the simple in things that are less than conscience, and that cannot give or make peace.

Gemser. Drive on!

Peter. It is true. I know that even by your secret hissing and hissing you can make the bread neither better nor different. Why do you say that sin can be forgiven when you have blown above? Would it not be as much, [as] if ye thus said, Men! press

If you have sinned and desire peace, take a handful of barley and eat it in God's name, and you will be absolved of your sins and satisfied in your conscience. In this way the pope gave letters of indulgence, and the false prophets of old took wheat and grain, and our priests took sacrificial pennies for sin. Men's consciences were also satisfied with themselves and with the people, but how before God? did they not have a false peace and security, when there was neither peace nor security? Let it not surprise thee that foolish men believe, and are satisfied with lies: for they let every wind that blows upon them pick them up, drive them about, and put them down; but they shall be put to shame in the end, and shall see rightly how they are deceived.

Gemser. Martin Luther gave the advice himself.

Peter. It is a great pity that the simple-minded people sell themselves with respect for some person; for they are not attached to the mere truth, but to the person, therefore they cannot hear or see the mere truth, because they have such a thick foreskin stuck in their ears and eyes.

Gemser. The bread has the body of Christ.

Peter. Even if I confess that Christ's body is united with the bread, it would be false and deceitful if I gave the bread of a little hermit so much power and strength that it would forgive and pacify our sins. What I give to the bread, I take away from the suffering of Christ. Also, Christ's body or death would be of no use at all if Christ had not been God and sealed by God the Father when he was and still is a man, and thus Christ had not recognized his suffering and death in the highest. Now reflect, dear Sophist, and see how Paul also instructs us to recognize the memory of Christ's bitter death, so that we remember, if we go back a thousand and about five hundred years, how well our knowledge and memory should go beyond time and place and be attached to none who do nothing for the forgiveness of sins.

Gemser. I fear that you are just, and that we are playing monkeys as often as we worship the sacrament, that we take it in silver and gold monstrances, that we carry it around our towns and villages, that we want to protect and preserve ourselves and ours with it, and that we want to chase out the devil; because what we give to the external bread, we take from the death of Christ.

Peter. Well, what do you think of it now?

Gemser. I consider it a lousy trumpery and cunning Sin and pain would bear, and that [it] should be sought 2) deceit that one has talked about the sacrament for a when our sins terrified or grieved us.

while. For the sacrament is an external thing that can Peter. You speak well and rightly. John the Baptist neither make us blessed, nor holy, nor pious, nor better, would not have pointed to the mere Christ if Christ, nor righteous, nor free, even if we look at it a thousand covered in the host, were to forgive our sins. Christ would times. I am afraid that the prophet Haggai 1) prophesied also have been so favorable to us that he would have about us when he said [Cap. 2, 13]. They put a piece of consecrated this to us, as we must eat his bread, if we holy flesh on the hem of their garment and say: what they wanted to be sure of the forgiveness of our sins. touch is holy.

Gemser. How then Paul?

Peter. You are more unstable and fickle than a feather Peter. He points us to the memory of Christ's death in the wind. Now you hold all things with me, you shout when we are oppressed by our sins, therefore he says: with the priests; one time you talk papistically, the other "Many have been justified through the obedience of one time truly about your sacrament; sometimes you step to man. [Rom. 5, 19.]

me, sometimes from me, you Proteus you!

Gemser. Resolve!

Gemser. So I am nimble out of great subtlety. It is also Peter. Whoever wants to be sure of the forgiveness of useful to me, because I flee the cross and have good sins and to eat the bread of the Lord worthily and without harm, which you call "receiving," must be sure in the knowledge of the death of Christ, that is, must understand and accept the death of Christ as God our Father promised it and seal it with the heart that God is true. He who is thus skillful is skillful; but he who has a fault in one thing is unskillful and unworthy; it would be better for him to eat the bread of a peasant than the bread of the Lord.

Peter. I believe you.

Gemser. If I could not do this art, I would have been despised long ago.

Peter. However, it is not Biedermännisch, also not who is thus skillful is skillful; but he who has a fault in one Christian. It would suit a careless liar better than you. thing is unskillful and unworthy; it would be better for him to eat the bread of a peasant than the bread of the Lord.

Gemser. I still say that Haggai prophesies about us.

Peter. How so?

Gemser. We say: If the bread is given, it can forgive sin and make everything holy that only adheres to it. So we give as much honor, praise, love, and fear to the sacrament as to the body and death of Christ.

Peter. You have no reason for this in Scripture.

Gemser. Not one letter. Christ said: Whoever loves father or mother more, or as much, than me, is unworthy comes. With this, Paul knocks down all the missal of me [Matth. 10, 37.]. What will he say to us, that we keepers, monks and priests in one heap. For Paul says: honor, fear and love much less a lesser creature, which "When the Lord comes, the Lord's bread will no longer be eaten, nor will the sermon be preached before it is has neither soul nor body, that is, bread, than him?

Peter. He that esteemeth the bread of the Lord, or received; and by this he implies that the Lord will not come feareth, honoureth, or loveth it, as the Lord's bitter death, into the bread or sacrament, but if he comes, the is unworthy of the death of Christ, and incomprehensible; sacrament will die. Therefore Christ cannot come into the and taketh, and eateth the bread of the Lord also Sacrament. He remains above in heaven and holds it until the time of refreshing comes. (Apost. 3:20, 21) unworthily, unto judgment, to his hurt and fall.

Gemser. If it were right that we should worship, or fear, Whosoever therefore shall eat of this bread unworthily, the bread of the Lord, and honor it so magnificently, the and drink of the cup of the Lord, is guilty of the body and prophets also prophesied of the holiness and blood of the Lord.

righteousness of the bread, and foretold us that the bread would be our

Gemser. That is frightening.

Peter. Let man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup of the Lord.

1) In the original: "Aggaeus" and "weisgesagt".

2) In the old edition: besucht.

Gemser. So I hear that I should be certain of the matter?

Peter. He who is to examine or feel must know and not imagine. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily was betrayed, took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, that distinguish not the body of Christ.

Gemser. So it is better that we abstain than that we take it.

Peter. You said it.

Gemser. We have gone far into the field, and see the sun is coming to a head; 1) therefore let us turn back, and draw up the matter of the surrender, until a considerable time; then I will hear and learn how Christ is surrendered; to whom he has given himself; from what causes, and for whom, or to whom too well he has given himself; what we are to understand and know therein; and how our spirit must be assured by God's Spirit.

Peter. What do we want to talk about now?

Gemser. Of the matter that is now touched, in that say that Christ does not come into the Sacrament; would be too close to all priests and monks.

Peter. Are you the great warriors [i.e. giants] children of Enakim who can pull down God from heaven?

Gemser. We can do it and do it in the power of others.

Peter. Who gave you such foreign power?

Gemser. Christ, in that he said: This do in my memory. Peter. Did Christ also tell you to bring his body in loaf?

Gemser. Yes.

Peter. I have believed it to be true, and I know that it is true that you priests are lying, for Christ did not command you to force his body to come into your hosts.

Gemser. What?

Peter. Christ says: You shall take his bread and eat it, with the addition that as often as you take and eat it, you shall take and eat it in his memory. As Paul says, "You should do this. And all Christians are able to do this, the unvarnished ones better than the varnished ones. 2) They are truly the female warriors, who by such words have forcibly stolen their supposed and falsely vaunted power, by which they pretend to bring Christ's body in a little bread.

Gemser. Methinks Paul almost and well fortified our power when he said: I have received it of the Lord, which I have given you. For the Lord Jesus, in the night that he

was betrayed, took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, saying, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. There, there, behold,

Peter, how Paul is saying mass, repeating the words of the Lord, and bringing his body into the bread, and also giving us the power to ask for and bring the Lord's body

into the sacrament. Peter. Oho! Egg, how ridiculous is your talk to me!

Gemser. Why?

Peter. Did Paul give you with these words: This does the power to conjure the body of the Lord into the bread and to hold mass? Would that a blind man could grasp this in the dark of the night, that Paul does not do

otherwise than to relate the word of the Lord and the time when Christ instituted his supper, and to teach us that we

should eat the Lord's bread, not as other bread, but in his remembrance. If you want to take from such repeated words a special power to drive the body of the Lord into a

little bread, as Christ is said to have done, as you say, I would like to say that Moses gave us power to create

heaven and earth, and that Moses created all creatures

when he began to describe the creation of heaven and

earth. If you want to take one, you must take the other. If

you would prove your creation of a new world by deed, I will also believe that you, or another seedling, can claim and bring the body of the Lord into the sacrament.

Gemser. But what did Paul do with the word of the Lord?

Peter. Much good; for he reminds us of the time of Christ's passion, the skill and manner in which we should

eat the Lord's bread.

Gemser. Explain yourself!

Peter. For the sake of time, we are not to eat the Lord's bread as swine, for when he gave us bread in remembrance of him, it was the night in which he was innocently betrayed on our account; therefore it is right that we should stand in the bitterness of our lives when we eat his bread. Because of the suffering, it is evident that we contemplate the greatness and atrocity of our sins, and Christ's exuberant obedience and fervent love. The way stands in the remembrance and proclamation of Christ's death, as much has been said;

3) "more sinful" is probably meant to be as much as: sinking.

1) "Rieß" i.e. Rüste, Rüst, Rast, or Ruhe, here means sunset. (Walch.)

2) d. i. Plate carrier.

This is the reason why Christ pointed to his body and said, "The body is given for you; before there was none given, neither was there any who would have been given; neither will there be any after me, for it is I, and my body is the same, and truly the body which is given for you. Whosoever therefore shall take and eat the bread of the Lord, considering all things, hath cause enough to eat the bread of the Lord more earnestly, though it be neither holier nor better than any other bread.

Gemser. After all, Christ has blessed the bread.

Peter. So it is said: He gave thanks; hear: God, his Father. Therefore, some call the Sacrament a Eucharist, as if the Sacrament alone were a Eucharist, which follows its brain more than God's word.

Gemser. This thanksgiving was ever a real power through which Christ brought His Body into the Sacrament.

Peter. Prove it! You fled from your previous defense and now take another umbrella for yourself. If your first reason had been good, when you let yourself be heard with the word, "This is in my memory," you would have kept the place of election. But because thy foundation hath forsaken thee, and put thee to shame, thou seekest this: Christ gives thanks, but he will keep you as he did before.

Gemser. I have three kinds of ground or sword; when one ground sinks, I flee to the other. Is it not delicious, when I slay one sword, that I catch another 1) and protect myself?

Peter. This is a sure sign that the sunk foundation and the broken sword have not become firm and strong. But he who fights with truth has the very best foundation and the very strongest sword, since truth is the very strongest.

Gemser. I don't care much about protecting myself and barking back at you.

Peter. [Thus you are a born sophist, a deceiver, a deceiver. You should, however, according to your fame, force your cause, coerce your enemies, press them, frighten them and see them with power, and shut their mouths with truths, so that they could not contradict you.

Gemser. My reasons have good appearances.

Peter. You should not only have appearance, but also truth. Now put forth your appearance, and let us see how bright and light your appearance is.

Gemser. One is this: JEsus took the

1) In the original: Herwische.

Brod, and blessed's. The other: This is my body, which is given for you. The third: This do in my remembrance.

Peter. It still seems so far and so dark that I cannot see that one serves the priests for these reasons.

Gemser. You have stupid eyes.

Peter. If you have sharp eyes, lead me into your supposed light. But I fear that you have such sharp eyes that they see with great sharpness that there is nothing there.

Gemser. Jesus took the bread, and blessed it or thanked God.

Peter. Will you hold the Blessing and Thanksgiving for One Thing?

Gemser. Yes. For one evangelist wrote the word bless right at the end when the other wrote the word give thanks.

Peter. But show your semblance that Christ has made Himself into the Sacrament through His blessing, and that you priests can bring His Body and Blood into the Sacrament through Christ's blessing?

Gemser. This is so clear that [it] needs no proof.

Peter. But it is so dark to me that I can't believe anything the priests say.

Gemser. You show that [there is] darkness!

Peter. You have made yourself famous of the light and are not able to show it. Therefore, I am not guilty of showing the darkness. He who is famous of light or appearance must prove his cause with writings or witnesses.

Gemser. Christ gave thanks, and by the same words of thanksgiving He brought Himself into the Sacrament.

Peter. Since you talk so much about thanksgiving, I ask you what Christ said when he gave thanks? When Christ raised Lazarum, he also gave thanks to God, and the form of thanksgiving is included in the same history. But I know neither the manner nor the form of this thanksgiving; but if you know the form, then tell it!

Gemser. I have never heard of it all my life, nor have I paid any attention to it, nor have I asked about it.

Peter. So you boast that you do not understand. It must be necessary for you to know the words of thanksgiving that Christ used when you pretend that through the thanksgiving of Christ you can bring the Body and Blood of Christ into your Sacrament.

Gemser. Do you have more faults with me?

Peter. Much.

Gemser. Pour out!

Peter. If Christ brought Himself into the bread or into the cup by the blessing that you help yourselves, it would follow that Christ would have been in your sacrament before, because He spoke these words: This is my body 2c., and that these words: This is my body, do not serve that you bring Christ into the sacrament.

Gemser. More here!

Peter. If Christ had come into the sacrament, he would have left his place where he was sitting; for Christ always left his former place when he came or went to a new place, as the Scriptures show, John 6:1, 3, 15, 17, 19, 25. Item, when Christ went up the mountain, he left the valley. When Christ also ascended into heaven, he left this world, speaking bodily. Is it not written: I will go from you and come to you again? [John 16:16, 22.]

Gemser. All this is true naturaliter, but sacramentaliter and supernaturaliter it is true that Christ is at the same time in many ends.

Peter. Do you also have a reason for this in Scripture?

Gemser. No.

Peter. You are a liar like that.

Gemser. So the whole bunch has to lie.

Peter. This is possible and human. 3 Mos. 4, 13. 2Mos. 19, 8. ¹⁾

Gemser. Have you poured out your opinion completely?

Peter. No; I keep something in the barrel and in stock. But there is one thing I will not say to you, that this is a sandy reason, when the priests say that the words of benediction or thanksgiving, which they do not know, are so powerful that they could drive Christ into their sacrament. For if their speech existed, it would also have to exist and be that the priests of the old law would also have brought their bodies into the food and drink, yes, even into the people, which they blessed. In sum, it should follow that you priests and monks bring your bodies into your food and drink when you bless your food and drink or read the Benedicite, and that you yourselves and your guests eat your body and your flesh and blood; that you should also bring yourselves sacramentally into the food that you receive blessed or with thanksgiving. For Paul immediately uses the word Eucharist 1 Tim. 4, 3, when he speaks of the common custom of all kinds of food. So you see that your first light and reason is a dark lantern.

¹⁾ Instead of this last passage, which would not puff, it should perhaps read: 4 Mos. 15, 24.

and a sand drive, 2) to you who misuse the bright Scriptures.

Gemser. So the other reason will serve me: This is my body 2c.

Peter. Little; yes, nothing.

Gemser. Why?

Peter. You priests say that Christ is in the bread, or under the bread, or in the form of the bread, therefore the words now reported do not serve you.

Gemser. It is written: This is my body 2c.

Peter. Therefore it is against you. Forasmuch as it is written, This is my body, 2c. this is another saying, Under this, or in the bread, is my body. So if Christ had said, Under the bread, or in the bread, is my body, you would have an appearance.

Gemser. Is it a sin that we add an "in" to it?

Peter. Truly a great sin, for God says: You shall not add to it [Deut. 4, 2]. Yes, a falso) The highest priest would burn you if someone falsified his bulls with such a little word and brought a different meaning into it than you bring Christ into his speech. If you priests wanted to defend your sacrament with such finances, you would have had a better reason in the words of the cup, since the words of the cup are thus: The cup, the new testament, in my blood 2c. From these words you would have had a better reason to say that the cup is in the blood, and must be in the blood by virtue of the words of Christ, if you read them and said, The cup, the new testament, is in my blood. For that ye say, The body of Christ is in the bread, or in the form of the bread, is not right, because there is no "in" in the speech of the cup.

Gemser. Yes, dear, we would have hit the mark.

Peter. Not hit. You would have made a delicious mockery of the written text if you had said straight: The chalice is in the blood, which the text says, and is a new testament to it.

Gemser. What would the peasants have said? Not that: I don't see blood, in which the chalice is; the chalice I see, blood I don't see? Perhaps the peasants would have stoned us.

Peter. Ei, so no.

2) In the original: Sand Trip.

3) d. i. kalsatto - forgery. In the old edition: Falſet.

4) d. i. skirmishes.

Gemser. Ei, so yes.

Peter. I do not believe it.

Gemser. I know it for certain, for they would not have seen blood if the cup had been in it.

Peter. Can you not overstate them, and say: You must see your reason and dull your senses, and act as if you can neither see nor taste nor understand.

Gemser. You mock.

Peter. You have persuaded the laity that they taste bread and wine, and yet they cannot say that they taste bread or wine when they receive your sacrament. Likewise, you would have made them believe that your cup was in the blood, which they could not see. You speak only thus: faith comprehends all things, understands all things, and is able to do all things; therefore faith also is able to see the blood which neither angelic nor human eyes see.

Gemser. I don't know if you are mocking ours or not.

Peter. How may I?

Gemser. But how, if he straightly said: The bread is my body; as Christ said?

Peter. Christ never said that the bread is his body; nor does the Greek tongue suffer us to apply this expression "that is" to the bread as indicated above. In addition it is mocking that one wants to say: the bread is my body 2c. For it would read in this way: the body of the Lord, which was to suffer and be given for us, is bread, and not a natural human body. It is not the body born of the mother Mary, but a loaf made by the baker. Moreover it is contrary to the stream of all the prophets which are written of the giving of the body of Christ, and to all the gospel and apostolic books: for this is ever true, That whosoever is not with the scripture scattereth, and is contrary to the scripture.

Gemser. So let me serve the third reason.

Peter. This one: That does in my memory?

Gemser. Yes.

Peter. I have nevertheless heard great hempputters who use these words "das thut in meinem Gedächtniß" to the sense that they want [da^mit erhalten wollen, dass die Pfaffen den Lerb und das Blut Christi in das Papistische Sacrament laden und bannen könnten.

Gemser. Who are the hemp cleaners?

Peter. Who are called Doctores; who wear round, beautiful and pointed little hats, and go about in long dresses, and stand as the bristling and

wooden hemp plasters dressed in beggar's plundery.

Gemser. Gemach!

Peter. How can I speak of them in this way? Because one of them says that the bishops consecrate priests by these words "that do in my memory"; but another one says that the priests are gazing Christ into the sacrament; the third one leads in another way.

Gemser. I mean, Christ has given us by these words "das thut" 2c. Machst given us to demand his flesh and blood into the sacrament, when we read such words.

Peter. O poor blindness! Is it one thing for you to read and to do? Did Christ speak before of reading or doing? or did Christ say before what his disciples should do, before he said: this do 2c.?

Gemser. What should we do?

Peter. You shall take the bread and eat it; you shall do this in remembrance of the Lord, as Paul says, "You shall proclaim the Lord's death as often as you eat the Lord's bread and drink from his cup.

Gemser. Let's continue talking about some reasons.

Peter. From which?

Gemser. From the acknowledgement.

Peter. Do you think that Christ changed his body into bread through his thanksgiving?

Gemser. Yes.

Peter. So you must also confess that Christ changed His body into the five barley loaves, because there Christ also gave thanks, or blessed, as you say, because right there is the word: He said well [beneckixit, Matth. 14, 19. Marc. 6, 41. Luc. 9, 16.].

Gemser. Stay on your track.

Peter. If the blessing or the dedication and thanksgiving of Christ was the power by which Christ put his body into bread, and the power which Christ gave to the apostles, then Christ instituted his sacrament long before the night when he was betrayed, against all the scribes and also Paul. It also follows that Christ fed many thousands with his body; that Christ also gave his flesh and blood before others, except the apostles. You would also have to admit that. Christ thrust his body into Lazarus' body when he raised him from the dead.

Gemser. You make me almost doubt.

Peter. Now suppose that Christ put his body into bread on Thursday, when you were speaking; do the priests therefore have the same power as Christ?

Gems. Equal and greater. Majora his facietis. (Jn 14, 12.)

Peter. Now I hear that the grind-dense parsons can bring the body of Christ into their supposed shape of bread, the Christ cloth could not.

Gemser. No. Christ also changed into bread, but with a bright voice: But the priests bring Christ into bread with silent blowing.

Peter. That's good! Rhyme! Let's clear our throats so that we don't laugh ourselves to death.

Gemser. Christ ever said: This is my body.

Peter. Christ stood present and said, This is my body 2c. Therefore, if a priest says, This is my body; take, eat the bread; and we eat, we eat a lousy priest. But if the priests speak of the body of Christ, and think back as Christ stood, and said of his body, that his body was the body which was promised to be given for us, they speak rightly. But he was not in the bread when they say.

Gemser. Don't the priests have a command to put Christ's body in the bread?

Peter. We read all kinds of command and many articles by which God commanded His apostles all kinds of power but among all of them we do not find one who said that Christ gave the ministers power to put His body into the bread and His blood into the cup.

Gemser. That would be it?

Peter. I say. Yes. For Christ gave his disciples power to preach, to baptize, to cast out devils, to heal the sick, to beat the dust from their feet. To raise the dead. But among all the commands I do not see one that said: You shall, or shall bring my body in a little bread. I would like to see a letter that you ink eaters may boast and base yourselves on, that Christ commanded you to bring his body into the bread or form of the bread. Therefore I say that you have imputed this power to yourselves shamelessly, deceitfully and fraudulently.

Gemser. Shall Christ then remain forever above?

Peter. It has ever been decided by Paul above, also by us, that we no longer need the sacrament or bread of the Lord until the Lord comes. When Christ comes again from heaven, the sacrament and all external things will pass away.

Gemser. Christ comes secretly into the Sacrament; but Paul speaks of the clear and manifest Advent.

Peter. If Christ enters the Sacrament secretly, he must be ashamed of his future or afraid of you.

Gemser. To us priests, Christ comes secretly.

Peter. Truly, he comes so secretly that you yourselves do not know whether he comes into the sacrament or not. For there is no priest who may receive this by his oath, that Christ came into the Sacrament at his request as great as when he hung on the cross.

Gemser. I have said masses often and much, but never felt that he was coming.

Peter. I know that.

Gemser. Wouldn't Christ secretly descend from heaven?

Peter. No.

Gemser. Bring fonts!

Peter. Two men said to the apostles: Christ will come when you saw him ascend. [Christ visibly ascended into heaven, so he must also visibly return. I will not be persuaded any more, for the apostles of the secret Advent neither hoped nor longed for their bread.

Gemser. I don't know who the two men were, so I would much rather hear Scripture.

Peter. Take Christ's word, who thus said: If they say: Here is Christ! there is Christ! (as you priests did for a long time, saying: In the host is Christ, and in that host, and in every corner is Christ); you shall not go out, nor believe. For Christ's future will not be secret, but as apparent and visible as the lightning that shines from the beginning to the end (Matth. 24, 23. 27.).

Gemser. This is what Christ said about the other Advent.

Peter. There are not more than two Advent, one in the form of the cross and suffering, all here on earth; the other in glorious form. The third you must not make up, and you cannot add one of the two to the host. Christ will hold heaven until the day when all things shall be brought to an end; as Peter said in the Histories [Cap. 3, 21.], and we have set above.

Gemser. I think it is hard for you to believe that Christ should be in many places at the same time.

Peter. No. I believe it so easily that you can bring him to many ends and put him in a time when I believe that St. Anne had five heads, and an innocent child had a beard twelve cubits long.

Gemser. Do you not believe that Christ is present in ten thousand places in an instant?

Peter. I don't really believe it. But I believe that you would gladly bring him down from heaven if he were so forgotten and came down.

Gemser. Do you also not believe that Christ stands in many ciboria at the same time?

Peter. In your prisons?

Gemser. What are you doing in prison?

Peter. You are accustomed to shut your God with many iron doors, and to set many iron bars and locks against him, so that he may not escape from you, and thereby you do great mockery and scorn and shame to Christ our Savior.

Gemser. Scornful!

Peter. You have invented a God who is not a God.

Gemser. He is Christ.

Peter. Christ is in heaven bodily; if you show Scripture that he is in your bread, I will speak differently.

Gemser. We bring him down.

Peter. O you powerless priests! Do you want to ascribe such a great power to yourselves? It belongs to a greater power to bring Christ from heaven into the sacrament, to cast out devils, than to throw great rocky mountains into the sea, which you are not able to do, I know, if you would try to cast out devils, that you would be worse off than the seven sons of Skeva the Jew got. Apost. 19, 13-16.

Gemser. What we do, we do in good opinion and in honor of Christ.

Peter. You honor Christ as a cat honors its caged mouse.

Gemser. Ei, no.

Peter. Now even if you mean all things well, to speak from human opinion, nevertheless you should leave your good opinion, if you do not know that God the Lord likes your good opinion, and should think of Peter, who had a delicious good opinion to speak humanly, because it was repugnant to him that Christ should be thus mocked and martyred; and nevertheless he had to hear this: Depart from me, you Satan! (Matth. 16, 21-23.)

Gemser. We thought it would be honest to Christ and good for us to bring Christ into the bread and keep Him in it as in a wonderful temple.

Peter. Where do you have such a noble reason?

Gemser. In the writing.

Peter. Put down the fonts!

Gemser. What shall I put here? knowest thou not that Moses GOD built a tabernacle, and Solomon after him GOD built a house?

Peter. Where is your reason for building a house of bread for Christ?

Gemser. It is arAumsutum a mmili.

Peter. You should probably with such a roll fsmriH) devastate the whole of Scripture and make the dear suffering of Christ quite invaluable.

Gemser. Is it against the Scriptures and Christ?

Peter. There is too much against the Scriptures that you have no reason for it. But it is against Christ that you priests want to make a temple for him, which human hands have wrought. Christ is the highest priest, and has entered the eternal tabernacle through One sacrifice and One death, which God's hands alone have formed, without the action of any creature. From the same temple and tabernacle, you bold men may demand Christ into a thing that is consumed by worms, by fire, by mice and sows, or by fattening pigs, as you priests are.

Gemser. Is that wrong?

Peter. What house will ye build me? shall I rest in your bread? saith Christ; have ye not devised and invented all these things? have ye not chosen such ways and abominations yourselves? Out, out, you dogslayers!

Gemser. The cup we bless is a communion of the blood of Christ. Behold, and take it into thyself that we bless the cup, and that the cup is a communion of the blood of Christ.

Peter. The benediction stands in remembrance and proclamation of the death of Christ, as Paul interprets in the following chapter, and is reported above. Otherwise, I do not know what the form of the benediction has been, and I would like to know it.

Gemser. Answer me that the chalice is a communion!

Peter. In it is the communion that no one should drink the cup of the Lord except he who understands why Christ shed his blood; and out of great love and gratitude and fervent remembrance he should drink of the cup of the Lord, which is not drunk blessedly without the communion of the Lord.

Gemser. Verba consecrationis that act and create.

Peter. Who invented them?

Gemser. Fingere licet.

Peter. Lapidare jus est. How much is the strong words?

Gemser. Five, as five wounds are; he who omits one cannot consecrate.

Peter. How much is the same in Greek? Gemser. Four.

Peter. This is not how the apostles consecrated.

Gemser. Are you surprised at this? Let us increase daily in the knowledge of Christ.

Peter. It is said that Christ spoke Jewish and Syriac mixed together; if this is true, you would hardly have two words left.

Gemser. Our power is expanded and extended.

Peter. That's what I wanted to have.

Gemser. What do you want to do? Do you want to make other words?

Peter. I know this for certain, that the body of Christ, without suffering, would have been useless to us, when Christ said: "The Son of Man must be lifted up, so that everyone who sees Him rise, will not perish (Joh. 3, 14. 15.). Therefore, this clause "who is given for you" is as firmly attached and of equal force as this clause: this is my body. I will prove this by memory, although I do not think nor believe that such words are verba consecrationis.

Gemser. You are stiff-necked.

Peter. Against lies; but to the truth I am soft.

Gemser. Shouldn't Christ come into our Sacrament when a priest reads such words?

Peter. Should Christ then jump on any priest for his stinking breath?

Gemser. Why not?

Peter. After all, the more part of the priests is the Pharisaic generation and viper breed, to which Christ does not want to approach, nor do they have much to do with them. .

Gemser. Christ must come because of the words.

Peter. After all, the Pharisees also had God's word, and so well that Christ said: You shall hear them! (Matth. 23, 3.) Nevertheless he did not want to approach them.

Gemser. He was afraid of them.

Peter... Christ should be much more afraid now, because now the priests tear Christ with teeth, and kill him for three pennies. God says to such sinners: Why do you take my word into your mouth? (Ps. 50, 16.) Therefore it does not help you 2c.

Gemser. I ever meant that Christ should go into the Sacrament.

Peter. Christ has truly troubled days, and is tossed about by priests more mockingly than a log of wood.

Gemser. You're comparing Christ to a lotter wood?

Peter. No. But I say that the lottery boys are much more skilful with their wood than the clergy with Christ; for the lottery boys abstain and remain more sober and speak their rhymes well. But the priests stink early of wine or beer, as a jug of vinegar stinks of wine or beer, and some of them are still so full in the morning that they can neither bear their heads, nor stir their tongues properly, and slur their words, and do not read. Some sleep under the still mass, as one did, who fell asleep and stood in a dream and said, To me! for he dreamed that he sat in the wine cellar. But another stood in the still mass in his dream and said: Shuffle the cards. Now see if the lottery wood is not better handled by the lottery boys than the words of Christ by the priests! But who can believe that such a wine bottle can bring Christ into the Sacrament? But if Christ is in their power, his cause is worse than the lottery wood's nature.

Gemser. I myself do not believe that Christ has fellowship with such priests.

Peter. Why do you call us poor peasants to fall down and beat our chests when you drunkards 1) pick up your idol bread?

Gemser. Decide!

Peter. You priests have printed Christ's blasphemous image on your bread with a branding iron that stains all consciences, and God considers all images an abomination and hates and scorns them; therefore I do not believe, even for this reason, that you are able to change Christ into your sacrament. For he ever did his Father's will here; should Christ now be contrary to the same will? I do not believe it at all. Your bread is idol bread, an abominable and rejected bread.

Gemser. Gemach!

Peter. The image also makes the simple think that Christ has turned into the image, and that Christ's feet are where the image's feet are; Christ's head where the image's head is. Some think that the priests spill Christ's stomach when they turn the image upside down, and so on.

Gemser. We know that images are nothing.

Peter. We also know that they are less than dirt, and ropes laid to the fall.

Gemser. How will it be if we need bread that is not idolatrous [i.e., not marked with a picture 5]?

1) In the original: drunkards.

Peter. Yet you are not able to bring Christ into it and will die at the hands of the wicked; but they do not serve walk in it. For a short time I ask you whether you are able you for your delusion.

Gemser. Therefore, we have only five words, which we call *verba consecrationis*.

Gemser. Your question is a noose, accused to the train and entanglement.

Peter. But you owe me an answer.

Gemser. Christ is in the Sacrament with his immortal and glorious body.

Peter. Why?

Gemser. Christ died once, will die no more; as Paul teaches to the Romans (Cap. 6, 9, 10.) and the stories of the apostles (Cap. 13, 34.).

Peter. You are a brave Paulensis.

Gemser. That's me.

Peter. But you know little of his teaching.

Gemser. More, because the whole world.

Peter. Are you so learned and do not know that Paul says: The Lord took the bread 2c. and said: This is my body, which is given for you? The mortal body was given into the hands of the Jews and Gentiles to be strangled, and not the immortal.

Gemser. Yes, this is true, when Christ transformed Himself into the Sacrament.

Peter. It is true before noon if you are sober, after noon it is a dream if you are full.

Gemser. What are you mocking?

Peter. Can you bring another body of Christ into the sacrament, which Christ should have brought in?

Gemser. No, but with a different shape and form.

Peter. In which?

Gemser. Christ brought Himself into the bread with a poor form and with the form of a servant. But I and my like bring Christ into the sacrament with a glorious form.

Peter. Where do you have a reason for that?

Gemser. Reason or no reason, so it is. He who does not accept my word will not be saved.

Peter. No. You wouldn't lure me to your cob with such a pipe. The devil take your words in all pieces!

Gemser. How else could we defend *verba consecrationis*?

Peter. I am also afraid that you have nothing to do with it.

Gemser. Why?

Peter. If your *verba consecrationis* are right, they have this meaning: this is my body, which is given for you, that is, which is taken away and given to you.

Gemser. Therefore, we have only five words, which we call *verba consecrationis*.

Peter. Count them!

Gemser. Hoc, est, enim, corpus, meum. [For, this, is, my, body.]

Peter. You leave out the pinned words: Who is given for you.

Gemser. Of course, so that we insist.

Peter. As butter in the sun, and a thief on the gallows.

Gemser. Not so evil!

Peter. A thousand times more annoying.

Gemser. Why?

Peter. Therefore, that you interpret Christ's word differently than he does.

Gemser. Prove it!

Peter. Easily. Christ says: it is the body in the form and shape that could and would suffer; you reverse that and say: it is the body that could not suffer.

Gemser. What causes you to bet so firmly against me?

Peter. Truth and justice of God.

Gemser. If I want to hear it from you!

Peter. Christ wanted to redeem us and lead us out of the devil's kingdom and power, as out of Egypt, into God's kingdom and power. But Christ could not end that, because by his death, as God had decreed. He had to fulfill the figure of the Paschal Lamb and stretch out his hand to the wood.

Gemser. Talk more!

Peter. Christ had to make us, who accept him, righteous from our sins with his righteousness; but he had to accomplish this by dying.

Gemser. What is the same justice?

Peter. Obedience to death.

Gemser. Would you have writings?

Peter. Through the obedience of one man many men have been justified. (Rom. 5, 19.) But Christ showed obedience with his shameful death, when he was obedient unto death, the death of the cross (Phil. 2, 8.).

Gemser. Do we not have this righteousness through the resurrection?

Peter. No. We have the righteousness of our death through the death of Christ, and not through the resurrection.

Gemser. It is written: Christ arose for our righteousness' sake. (Rom. 4, 25.)

Peter. This is the justice of the Auf-

The first resurrection of the spirit, which only has its beginning here and will burst forth after the end of death. The righteousness of death precedes, the other follows.

Gemser. You should sheerly pull me into your orbit.

Peter. If Christ has been transfigured 1) and immortalized in the sacrament, and has come into it by virtue of his words, then we do not have the first righteousness. But he that hath not the first, hath not the other, and shall be false, that his body is given for us. But if Christ's mortal body was in the sacrament, you cannot, by virtue of the words of Christ which he spoke, bring his body into the bread in any other form or shape than he brought himself into it. Thus you must say that Christ's mortal body is in your sacrament, and that Christ dies every day when you offer him, which is contrary to God's truth.

Gemser. I soon saw these snares and realized that you would see me before I would answer you. If I say: Christ's mortal body is in the sacrament, then you witness and see me, and say: Christ is still mortal. But if I say: Christ immortal body is in the sacrament, it follows that we have no verba oov86orationi8, and that our foundation falls, on which we built. Therefore, I do not know what to say.

Peter. Confess the truth and say: Christ's body is not in the bread, nor is his blood in the cup. But we are to eat the bread of the Lord in remembrance or knowledge of his body, which he gave into the hands of the unrighteous for us; and to drink of the cup in knowledge of his blood, which Christ poured out for us; and, in sum, to eat and drink in knowledge of the death of Christ.

Gemser. If I could escape the noose held in front of me!

Peter. Good.

Gemser. But how?

Peter. Christ did not speak of the resurrection when he gave his bread and cup; therefore it is not necessary for the recipients to be concerned with the resurrection. Christ will drink and give us a new and different cup when he brings his resurrection to full fruition in us.

and the bread and wine of death will cease. Therefore Paul said (1 Cor. 11, 26.): You should proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes; as if he said: When he comes, your dying with Christ will have its end. But now, before we sufficiently die to our strength, as often as we want to eat the bread of the Lord and drink from his cup, so often we must confess the death of the Lord with heart and mouth; 2) that is, we must also feel the death of Christ in us, and feel the righteousness of Christ, not ours.

Gemser. God be praised!

Peter. God help us into the heated knowledge of the death of Christ!

Gemser. Amen.

He who can better instruct us, let him do so, and soon, for the sake of his spouse; for we are soft, willing, and eager to accept and honor God's truth, to whom be glory forever!

4) Whoever has the desire to read these matters in a straightforward manner, may read this booklet:

Whether one can prove with holy scripture that Christ is in the sacrament with body, and blood, and soul?

Item, the interpretation of the eleventh chapter 1 Cor.

Item, the interpretation of these words of Christ: This is my body, which was given for you.

Item, that the sacrament is not a sign by which men can strengthen and assure their consciences.

Item, against the old and new papist masses.

Item: the faith in the promise and sacrament, as the new papists speak, is a false faith, gives birth to sin, and does not forgive sin. In which he will also find more, and other reasons.

2) In the original: Muth.

3) "the" of us put instead of "our" in the old edition.

4) The following register of Carlstadt's writings does not originally belong to the "Gesprächbüchlein", but will have been added only in a second edition in 1525, because the writing mentioned in the second place, "the interpretation of the 11th Cap. of the First Epistle to the Corinthians" is identical with the "Schrift vom widerchristlichen Mißbrauch", No. 3 in this volume, in which (§ 6) already this "Gesprächbüchlein" is referred to.

1) In the old edition: declared.

4. John Oecolampad's Sermon on the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. *)

1521.

Translated from Latin by M. Aug. Tittel.

Joh. Oecolampadius [wishes] Bernhard Adelmann von Adelmansfelden, canon in Augsburg, his patron and friend in Christo, Heil!

According to old custom, [I] should have received you with some reverence when you came back from the bath. Since I do not know anything else to offer this time, I ask you to accept this speech as a bad gift, even though it hardly deserves the rain of veneration. And if you like its content, let it enjoy the honor of your protection, and thus come into the hands of others; or else keep you assured that I will not lack the duty to wish you happiness, as much as is in me. Given from the monastery of St. Alton. 1)

Joh. Oecolampadii Speech of the Holy Sacrament of the Altar.

Since the most precious and incomparable and holy treasure, namely the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, is always presented to us for a daily sacrifice and spiritual meal, or even for the special joy of some feast, we must take every care, my beloved, that Solomon's parable about fools does not also apply to us, namely: "What good are riches to a fool who has not so much wit and understanding that he possesses them? Or the well-known proverb: "What shall the cow do with muskets?" or according to the evangelical saying (Matth. 7, 6.): "What shall the pigs do with pearls?" or that we are not scolded by the apostle (which is terrible to hear) "guilty of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. (1 Cor. 11, 27.) We must therefore take heed.' For this is where our much come into great danger, yes,

even get lost, as the apostle says (v. 30): "That is why there are so many weak and sick among you, and a good part sleep. And is this no wonder. For it is a secret (sacrament), and the most secret of all, covered with many blankets, and above all human understanding, and a medicine (or antidote) very harmful to evil hearts. We will speak something about it (as the present feast and your desire requires). But you will be willing to listen and pay attention.

(2) It will therefore be well worth the effort to hear and remember my opinion, and indeed the opinion of all pious men and scholars, as in everything else that Jesus Christ, our Master, either taught or appointed, and to accept it well and willingly; not, however, what comes to us first, as most people do, but what Christ primarily had in mind, and what he primarily intends for us. But I take care (as is usually done in a wrong way in all matters) that in this holy action the right purpose is met by very few.

(3) For since there are three things to be observed here: (1) the proper use of the sacramental signs, namely, the bread and wine; (2) the due worship of the present Christ; (3) the secret (or spiritual) incorporation and care for the spiritual body which is given to us through the bread and the true body of Christ; and since each of these things is to be well observed, how many are there who take all this to heart? Many can be found who have to do with godly opinions, business and ceremonies, as often as this holy custom is celebrated, but are not provided with proper faith toward Christ and due love toward their neighbor. There are also many who, in the use of the sacraments, adhere to the head, but do not seem to respect the members at all, i.e., who are completely devoted to the worship of Christ, but neglect the brethren and sometimes even hate them, and thus ridicule Christ more than they venerate him. Behold, this is a perverse

1) Oecolampad lived two years in the Brigitten Monastery Altmünster in Augsburg 1520-1522, then he went to Franz von Sickingen and from there still in 1522 to Basel, where he received a letter from Luther, dated June 20, 1523. (De Wette, Vol. II, p. 352.)

*) This sermon appeared in a single edition in 1521 under the title: 8vrrno äs kucranwuto "uoüarlstias, then also in the same year added to the sermons vs vera rssursrtioue and vo Auuckio FuuxsrtÄtis. We reproduce the text according to Walch's old edition.

Trade, there the sincere love, as the purpose of such a high mystery, is not perceived. We want to talk about these three pieces properly, and as much as serves the matter. And first of all of the sacramental custom, namely, what to think of bread and wine, and with what unity¹⁾ one must come to this table.

(4) Therefore, we need a special and deaf simplicity here, so that we avoid presumption and trust in the omnipotence of the Word of God more than in the weakness of our intellect. Our presumption is always repugnant to God and dangerous everywhere, but [in God's word and divine things]²⁾ is the most dangerous. Weak eyes are blinded by the sight of the sun; and he who investigates majesty (or high things) is oppressed by the glorious clarity. In vain we try to add a cubit to the measure of our intellect given by God. Our mind is like the Ark of the Covenant, which is made not by the whole cubit, but by the half cubit. God has also set limits to the mountains and hills of the mind, beyond which they do not rise. We may be elevated like hills by the pinnacle of reason, or as high as mountains, but we cannot go beyond the set limits. Therefore we believe without a doubt that under this bread the true body is present and under the wine the blood is contained. It should be enough for us to know as much as we learn from the Holy Scriptures. But otherwise our mind must be captured for the service of faith.

(5) How he who sits at the right hand of the Father above the heavens is also present on the altars is incomprehensible to us, but it need not mislead or distress us. Although the Almighty holds the throne of His Majesty in heaven, He is not lacking in presence in the mysteries and in our faith. Even the lineaments³⁾ do not leave my face, and yet they give their full and complete form in many mirrors, in which way Basil calls this mystery a counter-image or pattern.

6) Whether, by the way, the essence of the bread and wine ceases to be, and the accidental qualities exist for themselves, or whether it is transformed into the body of Christ according to its greatness⁴⁾ and perishes, or whether it contains Christ in itself, so that it can at the same time

1) Instead of "unity", according to what is said in § 7, it should probably read "purity".

2) These bracketed words are inserted by us instead of the word: "everywhere".

3) i.e. the trains.

4) So put by us instead of: become.

Bread is what it seems to be, and must be called bread, is none of our business; idle schools may deal with this. What if we do not know how this bread is transformed into the flesh of Christ, since we do not even understand how common bread, which we eat at home, becomes our flesh? Yes, what wonder is it that our dull senses are also astonished at the denial that the essence does not perish, and that the accidental qualities cannot endure or take place without a body, and on the contrary say that the body of Christ is present, although the essence of the bread remains? What, I say, is the miracle, since we do not know how the child Christ was born without violation of the virgin womb, or how he came to his disciples with the doors closed after his resurrection? This, I say, does not concern us; it may be possible in whatever way it wants. To ask in unbelief about the sacraments, how they are done, deserves a very hard answer, as the examples show enough: namely to Nicodemo, who did not understand the mystery of regeneration; and the Jews, who quarreled about it: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat? (Joh. 6, 52.) Let us have enough of the angel's word, who said to Mary, who asked him, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you," for here also everything insists on the power or might of God, who speaks, so it is done, and who does everything he wills in heaven and on earth according to his good pleasure. So then our presumption must not prevail here. There may always be bread and wine, but here we seek nothing less than bread and wine. We do not ask here for that which feeds and satisfies the body, but for that which refreshes and fills the soul. We do not look at the visible, but at the invisible. What we worship, what we hunger for, what we see with the eyes of the mind and in faith, a blind Homer sees as little as one who has lynx eyes. They are fools who want to run from one altar to another and make noise. Such bread may or may not remain wheat bread after the blessing, but it is not wheat bread for us, but heavenly bread; whether it is leavened or unleavened, we still have an unleavened Easter, namely Christ. We leave aside here everything that the servant of God puts on the altar, and stick only to that which is from heaven, and which the Holy Spirit has blessed and sanctified. Whatever it may be, it is only for us, instead of a sign and image, that the true body of the present Lord is to be found.

Christ covered with a sheath. I do not mean a mere image or figure, such as the first sheaves of Abel, or the sacrifice (offering) of Melchizedek, or the paschal lamb, the manna, the shewbread, the toasted bread of Elijah, and other figures of the Old Testament. Away with such blasphemy, that we should attach as much to the shadow as to the light and the truth, and to the same figures as much as to this most holy mystery. For this bread not only signifies the body of Christ, but is really the body itself. In this we believe Christ, the supreme truth, who cannot deceive, and has said, "Take and eat, for this is my body." So we confess badly that Christ's body and blood are present and contained, but how and in what way we leave unasked, because it is neither necessary nor useful. Every Uzzah [2 Sam. 6, 6.] must not touch the ark with unholy hands, nor must every one (of the people) come to the smoking mountain.

The rest, which the mind worships with devout silence and holy wonder, a joyful heart should accept and embrace with all inward and outward adoration. Let us bring to this sanctuary a chaste heart, and a body free from all impurity. This custom must be celebrated with respectable modesty and an adornment that befits Christian modesty. For everything that is blessed and sanctified must be acted upon in a holy and godly manner, how much more so that which the Lord Himself has blessed (or consecrated) in such a way that the One who blessed it is Himself present and revered. Therefore, where something unworthy takes place, it undoubtedly brings contempt and disgrace on Christ. Therefore the fathers have justly decreed punishments against those who do wrong in this. For he who is dissolute and careless in these high things will certainly be of no use in any good work.

(8) That Christ did not actually command us anything about ceremonies in this use is because he brought to our minds the higher and more important things, against which the enjoyment or use of this sacrament and the reverence to be paid to it, as well as our zeal and effort to send the heart to it through confession, fasting, and the like, are to be regarded as quite insignificant. Not as if this should be put aside, but because the more important things must come first and not be omitted. Therefore Origen in *Matthaeum* counts the frequent communicating among the tithes of cumin, mint and anise, which the Pharisee takes away. For the more important thing, which must never be refrained from, is judgment, barm-

cordiality and faith. That is why the customs and ceremonies are not always the same in all churches, and many things are and will be changed in the following years. In former times, when St. Jerome was still alive, they ate the body of the Lord in common (or individual) houses. Today, however, it would be a great abomination to take such things other than in the temple or from the altar, unless sickness or some other need required otherwise. Before this, communion was held after the Lord's Supper, and especially on Green Thursday, which was still held this way at the time of the Carthaginian Concilii. Today, healthy people must enjoy this heavenly bread only sober. Before this it happened every day, now of the year any time. This is certainly a great sign of cold love, and a proof of a terrible ingratitude. Unfortunately, the priests are usually blamed for this; while they should call the guests to frequent visits to this holy table with godly exhortations, they often push them away, and thus grieve the eager souls, who are so eager for it, as unworthy, who are not subject to any canonical punishments and are excluded from it. On the other hand, at Easter, they let the most diverse people join them together with the saints without distinction. But each one may bear his own judgment!

(9) Before this, these mysteries were not offered in gold and silver, for Peter said, "I do not have silver and gold" (Acts 3:6). Therefore Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse and martyr, carried the body of Christ in a basket and the blood of Christ in glass chalices to the sick. Today (namely in the papacy) this is almost the most noble concern, that only the vessels are pure and precious, about the souls it may stand, as it will. In the past, everything that was precious was sold to feed the hungry and redeem the captives. Today, church property is increasing because the poor are suffering from hunger, and it is distributed least among those to whom it belongs most. Before this, both figures were given; which custom has nothing criminal, and still takes place in some places. Today, however, the laity must make do with one figure when enjoying this great mystery. Yes, it is desired that, with the permission of the popes, 1) the northern peoples use only the one form of bread in the Lord's Supper. The northern peoples take only the single form of the bread in the Lord's Supper. 2) From this it is clear that the main work of godliness is neither in the constant sacrifice (mass),

1) Should probably mean: arrangement.

2) As it seems, both priest and people. (Walch.)

nor in the reverence that one otherwise has to show to these high mysteries, but in faith in Christ and in love towards one's neighbor. "I want," he says, "mercy, and not sacrifice." (Matth. 9, 13.)

(10) From this, then, let us move on to what is more necessary and what we want to say about the other. Let us then consider more closely what the high, majestic, holy, inestimable thing is that is hidden under such a cover. It is, however, the highest thing, to be admired before heaven and earth. For here is the pearl, which we all must use our possessions to buy. Here is the box of graces and truth, so full of these jewels. Here is the most precious fruit, not from the cursed earth, but sprouted from the Blessed Virgin Mary. It is here of which David says, "There shall the little wheat stand on the height of the mountains." 1) Or as the .Ours 2) read, "There shall be a stronghold on the earth, on the heights of the mountains, its fruit shall be exalted on Lebanon." It is here the living, life-giving bread, "the bread that came from heaven," thus bringing us into heaven and making us heavenly. It is here the sacrifice of all sacrifices, the chief burnt offering (or whole sacrifice) of the most pleasing and sweet savor before God, pleasing Him above all, thereby making sufficient for our sins, and thereby pleasing to God what is pleasing to Him. And what the same is, we have said, and say it again:

It is "the true body and the true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Body, which in Mary, the virgin, was assumed by the Word into the unity of the Person, thus suffered and died for us, also afterwards transfigured again by the triumph of the Resurrection and Ascension. What higher thing can be said or considered? The body of Christ is there, therefore Christ himself, God and man, is there. We worship him, we bend our knees before him, we long for him. Him we praise on earth, whom the heavenly hosts praise in heaven; and whom they behold in glory, him we have before our eyes in faith. He is with them with his face unveiled, but with us with his face veiled. He feeds them and us with the same bread, and there is no other difference between them and us, but that they have come to the full glory.

We are assured of the same glory through such a pledge. We are both incorporated into Christ through eating. We both enter into the Spirit of the Lord, that no other will of the Lord be but in us. We are conformed to Christ through grace here, as they are through glory there. We are conformed to Christ here by virtues, those there by rewards. But we still have to wait for bliss until we finally, after this life, enjoy it with others, as is right. This is the right heavenly bread and heavenly drink, when one gulps down the recognized God in certain and undoubted faith into the bowels of the heart. Who will always give us such bread? Who will give us (or would God!) that we are always satiated by His flesh? Away with all small faith! "Believe (says Augustine), and you have eaten." Faith makes GOD present before us; faith feeds, for one need not take Augustine's word, or the 6th Cap. Johannis, as if one had to believe that Christ is present and to be eaten only when we see or feel the holy bread present, but we eat Jesus, the Son of God and of Mary, the Savior of the world, always truly, as often as we believe in him at any time, no matter in which place it may be. St. Chrysostom also speaks to this effect in his interpretations of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when he says: "Do those enjoy the supper who come to it once or more or less in the year? No! Neither those who go once a year, nor those who go several times; but those who come with a pure conscience and chaste heart and blameless life, they always go to communion, but those who are not of this kind, never at all."

This is the most blessed meal, from which no pope will keep us, and from which only unbelief will exclude us. Of course, this is the greatest comfort for us, that God always dwells in us, if we are obedient to His word and willingly listen to it. It is well for us that we can become children of God if we believe in Christ. But if in the sacrament of bread the flesh of Christ is miraculously and supernaturally present (although the spiritual meal goes far beyond the sacramental), the spiritual meal becomes somewhat more respectable. 3)

(13) For how can it not be great that the most beautiful of the children of men should be present, and that the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, should present himself? Now if we always

3) Should probably mean exceedingly glorious.

1) Ps. 72:16: The grain will stand thickly on the top of the mountains.
2) The preceding is Oecolampad's translation. By "ours" he refers to the Vulgate.

say that if we had lived in Christ's time, when he visibly walked among the Jews, we would certainly have done everything to be worthy of his most gracious sight and to see him: what will we fail to do, since he is really present? Why do we not humble ourselves? why do we not worship him? why do we not implore his help and mercy? Do we regret that we do not see him with bodily eyes? Oh, it does us no harm; we have no harm but benefit. By faith we see much more blessedly, even more surely, than the Jews with bodily eyes. Those who have not seen and yet believe are more blessed than those who have seen and believed, not to mention those who have seen and yet have not believed. For they are wretched and miserable.

There are three kinds of people who have either seen Christ blessedly or still see Him. Blessed are they who have seen with their eyes that which kings and prophets were not privileged to see. Blessed are those who look closely at the Word made flesh and turn their eyes to the heavenly things. But the most blessed and perfectly happy are those who see and praise the King in His adornment, as He is more glorious than all angels, with unwavering and tireless eyes. Our condition is like that of the middle window: we are worse off than those in heaven, but better off than those who have followed the body after Christ. They surpass us in glory, but we surpass them by faith, if we have but hoods, and are not more drowsy in them than they, and do not fail in our duties on occasion. We hear how eagerly and cheerfully the shepherds from the neighboring pastures or drifts ran to the child who had just been born in Bethlehem, and even the wise men hurried from the distant Orient, and how cheerfully, eagerly and hurriedly the people followed him, with great effort and difficulty, in the villages and towns even into the solitude, and almost before the sun had gone out, when he taught and performed miracles, so that they were sometimes in front of him, sometimes behind him, sometimes at his side, pressed him, fell at his feet, listened to him, and asked partly for themselves, partly for their own; some have been carried to him on beds, others have been lowered through the roof to his feet with the ceiling torn open; some have asked him to come to them, others have been afraid to ask him. But we also have such love and desire for Christ. Immanuel or God is also with us. Ex

Will also do wonders for us. Why are we so unmerciful and unjust to ourselves that we do not seek our own salvation through spiritual attendance (or submission)? Why do we not go to the invisible One because of our weakness? Do we doubt that this is his body, which he himself confesses with his mouth that it is his body? Do we want to cook the lamb by parables or interpretations, and (which would be sin) burn the bones of the king of Edom?

(15) Let us gladly make ready an inn for Christ, and let us often prepare a feast for him. Let us invite and refresh him often. Christ, in turn, will be hospitable and will feed us splendidly. He invites us and calls: "Come to me, all you who labor" (Matth. 11, 28.). He sends his servants and even forces us with threats to stay with him (Luc. 14, 23.). He prepares a meal (Matth. 22, 2.) and offers Himself to us as a fatted calf. He refreshes us so that we neither hunger nor thirst forever. How shall we depart from the Lord? "He has words of eternal life" (John 6:68). Let us be impudent with Magdalene, and pass through to his feet, fall down there, wet them with tears, and kiss and anoint them in godly devotion. Let us at least touch the garment with the bloody woman, and power will come from her (Luc. 8:46). Through the touching, which we either do in faith or which happens to us out of his mercy, we will be healed. He will heal leprosy by touching, enlighten the eyes by touching, drive out all diseases, cast out all devils, raise all the dead. Let us touch the Lord in faith, and he will touch us in mercy. The LORD thirsts for our faith, that he may water us with the water of life. He hungers for our righteousness, that he may feed us with the fruit of his merits, which his hands have made. Our righteousness creates faith; I say freely, faith is our justification. Our faith makes this mystery either powerful or ineffective, wholesome or unwholesome. For the Lord also calls it especially the mystery of our faith. Without a pledge, you would not have believed that your wounds would be healed, your wrongs cleansed, your sins forgiven. Therefore he gives his body as a pledge, so that all doubt and unbelief may be removed from the mind. It matters not how fatal, how various, how obsolete the disease may be. Whether thou

If you already stink and rot and perish, believe, for then of all pleasures and of all happiness, the most lovely you will live for the sake of this bread. So by the treasure happiness itself and the most abundant fullness of all of faith we can become more blessed than those with goods, the most certain peace, the most constant truth, whom Christ walked on earth. For this cause he hath the most correct justice, the purest holiness, goodness withdrawn himself from before our eyes, and hath gone and love itself. And what is said or thought to the highest, to the Father, that our faith might be strengthened yes, quite incomparably more than can be said and thereby, and not weakened or diminished. But if we have thought. This is the true bread of angels, the manna, neither, and see him neither with the eyes of the body nor which Christ presents to the angels and the blessed, but of the mind, we are justly counted more wretched than gives to us in secret; but which, as faith grows, becomes they. We must therefore see that our mind becomes purer more and more evident, and as we sigh for it more and from day to day and increases in faith in such a way that more in our hearts, our hearts are more and more it not only sees more than they do, but also attains to the refreshed and filled with sweetness.

glory of the angels and heavenly spirits, from which we 16 What shall we repay the Lord here? With what kind remain so far removed as we are or deviate from the of submission does he want to be honored? What does he worthy knowledge of Christ, the God. For when this cover give in such a high matter? Here, too, one can feel the is removed, that is, when the imperfect knowledge is ordinary kindness of God. He is always equally kind, the transformed into the complete vision of God, we will also sweet Jesus. He does not give anything heavy, nothing be like the angels. Since we must strive at all times, but hard; he does not urge people not to eat for many days, especially at the hour when we are awaiting such high to make heavy journeys, to cry out certain psalms (or mysteries, that not only Christ may descend to us from songs), to confess and count their sins fearfully, or heaven, but also that we may seem to ascend to him in anything else that can make things difficult and heaven, in order to praise him all the more fervently discourage people. "Do this," he says, "in remembrance among the angelic hosts and to extol him with blessed of me." What is easier? what is cheaper? what could he songs, His light is presented to us more clearly, and we have asked for that is easier? Who also does not want to are permitted to see the splendor and glory of the most think of it once, what should he start once? Who does not beautiful body, which was formerly so disfigured that like to think of a friend? What is easier than that? There is nothing beautiful was seen in it, and suffered so much nothing more common among friends than that they shame and disgrace of the worst death, but is now always think of each other. And friends have a good endowed with the highest glory and blessedness. And memory of this, especially if they have become fond of since this is the greatest joy, to see such things, one may one another through some strange virtue or good deed, also get to know the most wise soul of him, since the as all such things are in Christ toward us. The treasures of wisdom and knowledge of God are no longer remembrance is probably the least part of gratitude, and hidden, but are revealed and shown. And through this, as that is what Christ requires of us, nothing else in the least. through a door or way, one comes to truth and life, yes, But if we do our duty well even in this bad thing, we shall the same is suitable for life, through which we are not fail in any other of our duties; we shall willingly take it gradually brought to higher things. There, however, all upon ourselves, and in no thing be tardy. We will, as it everything attracts our eyes in the highest perfection and were, be forced to love him; we will thank him, serve him, makes them so happy that then all the glory of our great and sacrifice ourselves to him completely and voluntarily, Master lies clearly before our eyes and is discovered. He submitting to all danger, being joyful in adversity and shows Himself to His creatures without all mystery and affliction, going into death and all pain as it were dancing. darkness, namely in that which we have neither known Such a glorious and drunken cup is the cup of the Lord. nor 1) recognized of God, or have only guessed, as the "This shall ye do," saith Christ, "in remembrance of me." the source of all being, yes, the being itself, and the source The benefits of Christ can be remembered with pleasure, of all life, the life itself, the origin. but Christ Himself is remembered with even greater pleasure. The benefits would not be half so pleasant if they did not come from Christ: but Christ, without all such benefits, is not only to be remembered, but also to be remembered.

1) Thus set by us instead of: as.

worthy of all love and honor; even if he showed the creatures nothing good (that we put such an impossible case), but all kinds of evil. Let us first remember [him,] through whose majesty and excellence it happens that his good deeds must be dearer to us, especially since he wanted them to be so great that through them he would be even dearer to us, and through their remembrance his memory would always remain fresh with us. And we should not forget any of them, because they are not only great in themselves, but also come from him who is the greatest of all.

(17) But we are always forgetful, especially when we are well; we do not remember Christ and his benefits. But the unceasing goodness of Christ has also counseled us in this. For in addition to innumerable good deeds, he has also done this unheard-of one, and has offered us the tokens of his miracles. For he has given us his flesh for food and his blood for drink. Therefore the ingrates' shame must be the greater, but the pious' fruit and benefit must be the richer. In such a great heap of good deeds, however, he especially wanted to solemnize the memory of his death, because even hearts as hard as a diamond can be melted by it, and in it are many other great good deeds, such as the Incarnation, the Resurrection and the Ascension 2c. Thus Paul says, "As often as ye shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall proclaim the death of the Lord, until he come."

18 He also established it in such a way that nothing would be lacking to preserve and promote its memory. At this time he chose the last supper, which bordered, as it were, on death and life. He calls it a new testament, so that the memory of death, which confirms a testament, would be all the more sacred and unbreakable. For this he uses strange words and signs; for the signs of bread and wine rhyme well with suffering. No bread is made out of ground grains, and before the flour is mixed (or kneaded) with water and baked by fire. Nor is any wine made except from pressed grapes, which therein are a true image of Christ and of those who belong to him. These signs may still be obscure, but Christ himself reveals the secrecy of them in his words, when he blesses the bread and says: "Take and eat of it, all of you; this is my body, which will be given for you. Likewise also he took the cup, saying, This is my blood, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

Why does he commemorate the surrender and shedding? namely that he pressed the memory of suffering firmly into our hearts.

19 This is also indicated by the customs and offerings of our sacrifices. For they are nothing else than souvenirs or memories of that one sacrifice, which was offered on the cross for us. It is always only one sacrifice through all times and oers, because it is only a memory of the one sacrifice. And this memory is our thanksgiving. For since we can do or offer nothing else, we at least do what is offered to us and what we can still do, so that for so innumerable and great benefits we only cherish one memory as grateful people. Hence the name Eucharistia, which means thanksgiving, has been attached to the mystery. So you see that everything depends on the fact that we hold the memory of his good deeds above all precious and valuable. Therefore, let us be careful and always keep the words of the testament in mind. If we now, like Moses (Deut. 6, 6. ff.) we are commanded by the commandments (that they should always be in our hearts and told to our children, that we should remember them when we sit in our houses and when we walk, sleep or watch, and bind them, as it were, as a sign on our hands, so that they may speak, If, I say, we also bear the good deeds thus engraved as it were on marble and indelibly inscribed in our hearts, the remembrance of them will not be idle or unfruitful for us. For under the spruce the fire will burn.... And Paul reminds his Timothy of these things: "Remember," he says, "that Jesus rose from the dead!" (2 Tim. 2, 8.) For it will compel us to love Christ, so much so that even death itself will not be as strong as our love; and if we can rid ourselves of everything, yet it will not be possible of the love of God. There we will be unspeakably willing to do all godly works. There we will burn with eagerness to give thanks. Sweet tears of joy will flow. Then the heart will become fiery with holy ardor, and a joyful mouth will utter these generous words: "My heart is ready, God, my heart is ready". (Ps. 57, 8.) "Thy will be done, O Lord." (Matth. 6, 10.) "O Lord, what wilt thou that I should do?" (Acts 9:6.) "What shall I repay the Lord for all that he has done for me?" (Ps. 116, 12.) Therefore they are not foolish, but everything earthly.

The man also denies himself and offers himself to God as a complete sacrifice; he does not want to keep anything from his former will; he tolerates everything that has to be tolerated and does everything that has to be done. Then the yoke will be easy and all the burden of the Lord will be light. He does not care much that the body is mortified, that the inheritance and wealth are distributed among the poor, that evil is repaid with good, that enemies are appeased with benevolence, that one rejoices in tribulation, that one suffers death for the sake of the truth and the confession of faith. Yes! He is thus united with Christ and One Spirit with him. In this way the blood of Christ adorns the chaste cheeks of the brides, as Agnes said. Thus the flesh of Christ makes strong arms of His fencers (or fighters), in that from the heart of Christ goes juice and strength into the veins of the souls, and moistens (or refreshes) the marrow of His joyful Spirit, and consequently also fortifies the bones. There the flesh drives away the leanness of the minds, and the blood the dryness (drought) of the same. The flesh makes fleshy, fat and strong, the blood makes moist, cheerful, fresh and drunk. There the unleavened bread of the heavenly Adam makes the dough (lump) pure and alive, which before the leaven of the earthly Adam had spoiled. And in such delicious and cute food the ingratitude of the people cannot be described. Oh, what stupidity and wickedness it is that they are disgusted and repulsed by it, as by something abominable, and almost have to be forced to this table, from which, if one were cast out, it would be as terrible as being cast out of paradise. Who are we? and what is the house of our fathers, that God acts so graciously and together with us and draws us to His table, but we, as a proud Vasthi, would rather not come to it than taste His love and kindness, would rather eat all the porters than be satisfied by the angel bread?

20 But let us proceed to the third part. There remains, then, what we need not pass over, which Christ may well have seen when he instituted the sacrament. For although the things of which I have spoken are great, namely, to treat the sacred signs with godliness and devotion, and not to leave out of memory the benefits of Christ and of Christ himself, still not enough has been done with such a high mystery. For this is still necessary, which is to be observed especially according to the times, namely the care for the secret body of Christ. Let no one reject this teaching as something new, which is nevertheless as Christian as anything else. For this is what bread and wine teach

with their images, and the body of Christ itself. For Paul says: "So we are all one bread and one body, who are partakers of one bread and one cup. Cup." (1 Cor. 10:17.) For as One Bread is made of many grains, and the true Body of Christ is made up of many members, so out of many believers there is One secret (spiritual) Bread, and One spiritual Body of Christ, of which He Himself is the Head. We do not deny (as someone might object) that Mary chooses the best part, and that the life that consists in looking is better than that which consists in doing. Which Paul also gives to understand, since he desires "to be dissolved and to be with Christ, which (as he says) would be much better. (Phil. 1, 23.) Nevertheless, he preferred to remain in the flesh for our good. Paul would rather miss the heavenly glory for a while and be satisfied with it, and we want to be annoyed about it, if we suffer a little misfortune in our Christian idleness (if I may speak like that) for the sake of our brothers? Christ is not deprived of his service, as he would rather have mercy than sacrifice. We never sit so close to Christ at table, and never serve Christ so sacredly, as when we lose something in Christian leisure (or rest) for the purpose of serving His spiritual body and brethren in Christ's name: As we deal with one of the least of His own, whether mercifully or cruelly, Christ will accept and judge it as well as if we had done it to Himself. Therefore we must not complain that Christ is not seen. We often meet a hungry man, and Christ himself meets us; why then do we not feed Christ? We meet a naked man, and Christ is before us; why then do we not clothe Christ? There is a sick man lying down, a prisoner in jail is all taken away. One of the brethren is mistaken; why do we despise Christ Himself? Christ so often appears to us, and is not respected. Then see if our whole life is not all hypocrisy and pretense of godliness. For true godliness and holiness must show itself in love and mercy. But what kind of love is this if we do not know and do not want to know the one for whom Christ did not refuse to die, in whose soul the image of the Godhead is expressed? He had his most holy flesh, which he took from the Virgin, beaten with rods and scourges and crucified, so that he might save and preserve the spiritual body. When the soldiers attacked him and wanted to capture him, he said: "When

If you seek me, let these go. (John 18:8) Think not, therefore, that Christ will be angry with us if we prefer to do godly business than to sit still, to think rather than to be silent, and to eat more holy food than to fast. Of this custom he says, "Do it in remembrance of me." But he does not give so lightly of our neighbor, for he wants us to love our enemies and to make them friends with good deeds. Therefore, one cannot deny anything to the fellow believers and right members of his body. He taught this when he washed the feet of all of them and preached the glorious sermon of love. This one commandment he gave, that we love one another as he loved us. But he loved us unto death: what shall we not do for brethren, for whom, according to Christ's commandment and example, we ought not to spare death itself? And as Cyprian says, "As often as we drink the cup of the Lord, we must always be ready to shed blood for the brethren."

This is the secret of the peace which the priest so often gives and receives in prayer; not the peace which the world seeks, but the peace which Christ bequeathed to His own, that neither by cunning nor by force, neither by fortune nor by misfortune, shall we allow ourselves to be turned away from the love of God or of our neighbor, nor shall we ever let go of such a principal commandment. The apostles and the first Christians, after they received the Holy Spirit and became citizens of the city of God, were always well aware of this, since they remained united in the temple, or broke bread in all the houses, and the multitude of believers was one heart and one soul. Where did such unanimity come from? Certainly, the hope of earthly gain did not bring them together, since they had abandoned everything and regarded their wealth as dung. Nor was it danger and its fear that brought them together, since they were glad to be considered worthy to endure danger for the name of Jesus. Nor were they bound together by any fleshly relationship, since for Christ's sake they knew neither father nor mother, brother nor sister, nor respected such things, but the founder of their friendship was Christ, who made all the members stick together among themselves. Therefore they knew of no deceit, trickery, mischievousness, arrogance, conceit, envy, strife, slander. They harmed no one and helped everyone. And this was no wonder, because honor and service were the same, everything was common with them; they did not seek to live tenderly and well; they did everything according to the law of love,

They sought only the common salvation. All their spirits burned with the same fervor, so that the number of believers increased. These taught, those prophesied, spoke with various tongues, healed the sick, or performed miraculous signs; the others served, and each contributed something to the common good; no one sought his own. For as we are so created by God's wise government that one needs another for help; one has wealth but no strength; the other has strength but no money; these are strong to serve, those wise to rule; and in a word, no one has enough in himself, no one is born for himself alone, so also no one is born again for himself alone, but each needs the other's help and support.

(22) This is the communion of saints, which is written in our creed; this is the most holy assembly, since those who live in the uttermost parts of India and Britain, whether they know Rome or not, whether they are pleasing to men or detestable to them, are nevertheless, if they only cling to Christ in faith and hold fast to the head, united also with us, if we are otherwise members of Christ. For Christ is common to all; he is the one head, and is of all One baptism, One faith, One sacrifice, One table, One inheritance, One city, toward which we are journeying: why then are not the lesser things equally and one to all? why have we not happiness and unhappiness, joy and sorrow, in common among ourselves? why do we not also put good and blood, fortune, counsel, and action, yea, all things together? If our love is without falsity, how should we begrudge earthly happiness to those whom we divine the heavenly? and how do we not want to help out those from our bodily goods to whom we heartily wish all good and well-being? Oh, it is all false and lying what many say: they wish all the salvation of souls to those whom they hate, but they would like to see them afflicted with some temporal misfortune. Such people, whoever they may be, either do not think enough about what great joy will be there one day, or they lie with a bold face. For envy cannot withhold or begrudge the lesser when it shares the greater. For it is far from true love to give the highest, and yet, if there is opportunity, to refuse the lesser. The apostle severely chastises the Corinthians that, since they should have shown the greatest equality, they were so unmerciful to the poor, and when others complained of hunger, they filled themselves with wine. When others complained of hunger, they filled themselves with wine and were heated by it.

would be. By what hardness they were not a little guilty of this so high mystery. True holiness is tested by love. This is a certain proof of a worthy communion, if after it one becomes more inclined to meekness, more willing and long-suffering to bear other people's vexations (or insults), and more ready to serve even one's enemies. On the other hand, it is safe to say that the meal will be unpleasant for those who still harbor resentment and suspicion, who carry bitterness and poison, who are slanderers, who love quarrels and strife, who cannot tolerate the weaknesses of others, and who are not willing to serve their brothers. Let it be, however, that at the renewed remembrance of the Passion of Jesus you felt a strange inward sweetness and shed the sweetest tears of joy, almost being enraptured like a Franciscan: it will be of no use to you if you do not extend yourself in love.

Now let those examine themselves who go down from the churches, as it were justified, and despise the humble with high eyes, harshly attack the miserable, and advance laziness and idleness to the beggars and the poor with defiant and threatening words. The preachers and teachers may be responsible for this, who much sooner and more forcefully persuade the people to build many altars, to come occasionally to supper in large crowds, to sacrifice often and much, to endow rich annual memorials of the dead and vigils, than to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to redeem the prisoners, and to give alms to others. O of avarice! O of the theft of the church! O of mischievousness and intrigue! Alas! to what does not the wretched and accursed avarice bring men! The fellow priests may hear this gladly or unwillingly, so it is all one. But I beg and beseech that they will gladly hear what is written there: "Mercy is better than sacrifice" (Matth. 9, 13.), even than the 1) fruits of the other kind, which the absent and the dead receive through our praising. And they do not have to make do with Iscariot's grumbling: the delicious ointment, which was poured out on Jesus by Mary, could have been sold for 300 pieces of silver (or pennies) and given to the poor, who nevertheless was punished because of it. For Judas would not only have been excused, but even praised, if he had been so minded in his heart as he was with his mouth.

1) So put by us instead of: "also to the fruits", which seems to us to give no sense. Our correction should say: mercy is also better than vigils and masses.

pretended. Our priests, however, take care of Christ just as Judas did of the poor, unless the latter had more faith. I do not like to say it in German; but what I conceal, their indulgence and laziness constantly speaks loudly enough, and almost the whole world sighs over it, and in such a way that it does almost nothing more about anything of the kind. But for now to be silent about the evil customs of this time, Christ does not speak against, but for the poor. "You always have the poor with you, but you do not always have me" (Matth. 26, 11.). For since this time he wanted to have something special because of his person, so that the memory of his death would be all the more famous and glorious, he only wanted to precede the poor in this and not always, and to be esteemed above them. But if he had said: "You will always have me" (as he said afterwards: "I will be with you until the end of the world" (Matth. 28, 20.)), then one might have thought that he was pleased with such an effort. But he says: "You do not always have me. Be now always content with the woman's doing, henceforth I will deal with you no more. Henceforth the poor shall not be deprived of the least thing by me. And they will not suffer any particular harm, since I have so far commended them to you with such diligence. Do them good afterwards, as much as you want. I will not only gladly let it happen, but also praise and accept it, just as if it had happened to me myself. But did Christ say to the rich, "Go, sell all that you have, and give to the priests and monks, and follow me? Will he ask at the last day: How much did you hire priests? because they are pressed. How much money did you spend on the altars? Oh, how good it would be for us then! But now he does not remember the priests with a syllable. But he gives everything to the poor, and in the day of his wrath he will reproach those who have not fed him in the hungry.

(24) But the money-minded have their little helpers and their little bundles, and though they cannot do it in their own name, yet they gather together in the name of the poor, and in the name of Christ.

(25) This, too, does not belong here at all, which is otherwise said quite truly: there is nothing more precious than the sacrifice of Christ, and no higher merit; which we gladly confess and admit, and are also glad about it. But it does not follow from this that one always earns more with divine prayers than alms. I do not want to say anything about the causes now. But it is not at all proper to see to it that the people are

More impels to heap up the masses than to give alms diligently. Those who feed the hungry out of love and remembrance of Christ are nothing less fortunate, and often equal in merit to those who serve the altar.

(26) Let them likewise examine themselves who judge life and morals! What kind of equity is it among them to consider it a monstrous crime if some priest, who is not so careful, misses something in the ceremonies, or spills a drop, or a layman touches the chalice with his hand? But this must be a small mistake, if he does his work in arrogance, lust, envy or unbelief, and defiles the name and altar of God.

(27) Let all hear it and shun it, who at every little occasion or cause separate and separate themselves from the faithful, as unfortunately happens to the irreparable harm of Christendom. The world is divided, and most countries are torn into different sects. Their disunity is either because of different customs, or for the sake of some doctrines, which are neither sufficiently confirmed nor rejected in holy scripture. This country needs leavened bread in the blessing, that unleavened; this 1) communicates under one, that 1) under another form. The former keeps Easter according to the time and custom of the Jews, but the latter wants to have nothing in common with them. Such things and the like are not of such importance that a partition should be made among us. Those who are burning in true love will not be the ones who-

If they cannot put it on a better foot, they will tolerate and overlook it rather than let themselves be separated and divorced from someone who adheres to Christ in faith and love.

(28) Let our defectors and apostates tremble and be terrified, who seek their part with the false and heretics, and drink the wine of error from the vine of Sodom, and eat the bread of mourning, and go over to the secret body of their chief, the prince of darkness, but clothed with the sheepskin approach also to the holy table, that they may rage the more and do harm in the simple host.

29. We, however, who are nourished by the evangelical truth, do not want to rely on our works, but place our hope and salvation in Christ alone, holding nothing more dear than love, by which we stand in good understanding and harmony with him and all his people, that if we serve him under this excellent sacrament, or otherwise in right and godly faith of the Spirit, we also have his love toward all, and thereby become worthy to come to the heavenly table with all the blessed and saints, and to be conformed to his glorious clarity; In such a state we may not only see the very brightest, truest, and most spiritual body manifestly and clearly, but also recognize more closely its most blessed soul and most blessed Godhead, which it has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit; to whom be glory and praise! Amen.

1) So put by us instead of: "these" and "those".

5. Joh. Oecolampad's letter to the Swabian preachers.*)

Before October 1525.

Translated from Latin.

To his brothers, beloved in Christ, who preach Christ in Swabia, John Oecolampadius wishes grace and peace from God.

You yourselves know, beloved brethren, how sacred and how precious love is entrusted to us by the Lord Jesus Christ, and with what great cunning.

and violence, persecution and temptation, the old and cunning enemy endeavors to invalidate and destroy them, especially among the ministers of the Word. For he sees well how much harm is done to the church when, instead of one shepherd, many rule over it, that is, when those who are the shepherds of the church are the shepherds of the church.

*) This letter of Oecolampad is attached to the writing which he published in 1525 under the following title: Os Muuiuu vsrdoruru Ooiuiui, lios 68t Corpus M6UM, fuxta V6tu8ti88iiu08 autorss 6xpo8itions livsr. This writing is reprinted in the ^otu st Kriptu puvlioaa soolssius ^irtsruUsrAious, rss. O. El. DkutNus, p. 41 sau., our letter ibid. p. 150. Hereafter we have improved the old translation. The letter is to be placed before the month of October 1525, because the preachers did not meet in Schwäbisch-Hall until the end of September. Compare the introduction.

If the shepherds are unanimous, they will be divided among themselves, so that the sheep will go astray without a shepherd and be exposed to the fury of the ferocious wolves. You yourselves know that nothing is so detrimental, nothing is so harmful, nothing is so distressing as this kind of trouble, you yourselves who, I do not doubt, will take all care with prayer, work, patience, gentleness and steadfastness so that the enemy does not have the upper hand, even if he has it in mind. He tries well, and in some cases he does something; but I hope that the Lord Jesus, who fights for us from above, will rebuke him and keep the victory. At least, as far as I am concerned, I would much rather die blessed than live in unchristian discord with one of my brethren, even if he were inferior to me; and for this very reason I will not refrain from anything that may serve to restore and maintain Christian friendship, although I do not see how it could be avoided that some minds should not be drawn away from me by false brethren who seek to confuse everything, if they have not already been drawn away, as I have long been told. For why should I not take care of absent ones what sometimes happens in a house, however much one tries to keep peace? Or how should a beloved brother not have to be careful not to cause offense to others? Offense to others? And it would certainly be lamentable if I should be separated from you, whose faith and godliness I have tested for a long time, and with whom I have lived in closer friendship, and as much as there is in me, and as long as the Lord Christ will be dear to both parts, I will not permit this sin.

2 There is a rumor, and the letters of certain people explain this sufficiently, that zealous people have been offended by it, who have heard that I have not joined in sermons here in the matter of the Lord's Supper to most of those who have a great reputation and are even considered pillars of the church. That it happened, I do not deny; nevertheless, love should rightly have remained unharmed, because I did not do anything untimely or other than out of love for the truth. But I will not suffer that honest hearts are angry with me for a long time, if they are otherwise angry, if Christ does not leave my groaning unheard. For why should "they be angry with a friend who loves them dearly, is innocent, and, like them, eagerly seeks Christ's honor without sparing any danger? If they are angry with me, they may also be angry with themselves, because they understand the truth, as they understand it, with the same, or with a different, attitude.

perhaps with even more burning zeal. Among Christians the saying of the comedy writer has no place: Truth makes hateful. For, as the apostle says, 1 Cor. 13:6: "Love rejoices in the truth"; and the very God who is love is also truth. Just as one does not act contrary to love through love of the truth, so also for the sake of love the truth remains unharmed. Now nothing must be done more diligently in the church than the investigation of the truth, through which one grows in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus. But we all can still grow. For the Father of lights leaves many things hidden from our eyes, which he reveals in due time and discovers to those who diligently investigate, if only envy and vain glory are far from us. For the apostle writes to the Philippians [Cap. 3, 15.], "And if ye hold anything else, let GOD reveal it unto you." And again [1 Cor. 14:30.], "If a revelation be made to another sitting there, let the first be silent." How can a peace-loving person be ill pleased with this, or a "truth-loving" person take it spitefully, if one is devoted not to strife but to truth? That would be to repay good with evil. For we can create no greater benefit than if, following Christ's example and through his grace, we do not hold back the truth, especially in necessary matters, but want to communicate it to others. But whether I have done this, I leave to your judgment. Truly, you will not be able to reject such my attitude (*animus*); you may also examine my words as sharply as you wish. For I do not arrogate to myself the mastery of arrogance, but I must be mindful of my office; and just as I am intent on truth with all diligence, so I also want to leave nothing to love.

3. Therefore, in order that no one may be offended by a malicious and unfounded rumor, I have written this document, which was forced from me by the insolent cries of some, in my defense, and I now hand it over to you, beloved brethren, so that you may see from it whether ours is more justified or what others say; whether I reject the church fathers as they accuse me; whether I seek that which serves the glory of God or the glory of my own name. But do not judge, as you are accustomed to do, by reputation. Perhaps some think it would have been better if I had not spoken of the matter itself, what the Lord's Supper is and how the bread is the body, but only of the use of the sacrament before God.

my people. But it was not possible for me to accept their good opinion, because the papists and others imagined such nonsensical things in people's minds that it would be the greatest impiety to keep silent about it. My listeners were waiting when I would finally present my opinion. Letters from my friends arrived daily, in which they earnestly demanded an account of faith on this point from me. Yes, I still do not see how one can have the holy and pure use of the Lord's Supper, as long as the ingrained highly dangerous superstition remains untouched. I had no desire to start a quarrel, but in order to make the seed good, I had to hoe the field, which otherwise would have become full of weeds. If only others had made use of such a composure in their speech, perhaps most things would have been settled in some places, although my modesty in words did not help me at all, so that my adversaries became even more furious and mocked me in a thousand ways. Therefore, I thought it worth the trouble that I dealt with the matter, which does not shy away from the light, in public writings, such as

The good people, whom I have tried to appease but not to provoke, may be angry with me and accuse me. It is therefore pleasing to the Father in heaven to put his children to the test, so that the truth may shine forth all the brighter. He uses the sins of men according to his wisdom for the glory of his name: but let us all, brethren, take care that we be not found among the vessels of wrath, and that if ever any offence arise, it be without our fault. Let us watch over the herd against the wolves; but let us also watch over ourselves, for whom a far greater danger hangs over our heads, especially if love is not to be found among us above all things. A fault can easily be overlooked if only faith in Christ is present; but we will not reconcile discord even with our blood. For God loves those who live peacefully together in one house, and is in their midst; who also keep us always in unity through His Holy Spirit, and grant that we may have one mind in Christ, and with one mouth praise His heavenly Father. Amen. Basel, Anno 1525.

End of the twentieth part.

The first part of the book is a list of some of the rare or obsolete words in Luther's writings.

The numbers indicate (unless otherwise noted) the volume and column of our edition. Many of these words have been replaced in the text by those now in use. In order not to make the directory too large, the uncommon expressions in the opposing writings have not been included, but where we have been able to give an explanation, they have been explained in the writings themselves.

but -- again. 18, 1002. 20, 197.	Bachant - unlearned man. 22, 1496.
buteins - once again. 19, 1084. 1092. 20, 243.	Banketen - Banketiren, holding banquets. 20, 2137.
abspannen - to deprive someone of something (Leipziger <i>Ooncordia</i> , p. 477, <i>e manidus auferre</i>). 10, 82. 84. 20, 1858. Erl. 47, 199.	bannig (bennig) - belonging to the bann, Witt. (1554) 7, 397.
wagon - wagon off. 22, 1033.	Barne - barbel, a fish. Old edition 8.1455. .
efern - repeat. 20, 593.	merciful - pitiful. 20, 1794.
Aglaster - Magpie. 22, 1588.	Bear Wolf Man Wolf. Erl. 47, 205. jen. (1562), 8, 241.
Ain, Amen - tips of the ears. 20, 235. 1000.	22, 848.
Alb - white chasuble. 18, 1361. 20, 185.	baurkündig - haughty, associated with a coarse nature. 19, 1349.
alfenzen, alfenzen - to juggle, to perform antics. 18, 962.	be mindful of - be mindful of. 19, 777.
19, 248.	Bechtlein - Spänlein. 13, 749.
Alfenzen, Alfanzeri - jugglery, jester antics. 18, 1461. 19, 246.	bedes both. 19, 1735.
alleding - quite. 18, 1331.	Begme - a kind of nuns. 19, 853. s. Pegine.
all-thirtieth-all-merciful. 19, 421.	certified - authenticated. 19, 1898.
Ammern (<i>emders</i>) - glowing ash. Jen. (1568) 6, 112b.	comfortable - pleasing, at will, pleasant. 19, 1116.
an (pronounced: ahn) - without; of:	take to heart - make hearty. 22, 664.
an - to get rid of. 18, 296.	Beißdrein - dirt. 19, 1402.
Devotion - attention. 20, 216.	beiten - wait. - distributed-missed. De Wette III, 47.
<i>The word concipere</i> (Luther). 13, 2668.	click--blank. 20, 768.
presume - measure, adjust. 12, 85.	announce - to make known. 18, 1300.
Armenia, a poison. 19, 1287.	Bellitschier - (<i>bona sciera</i>) - good standing (<i>donum. vultum</i>). 22, 298.
Arstultus (for Aristotle) - Archnarr. 18, 1328.	1677. .
Asperges (from <i>adspergo</i>)- Zuthat. 19, 1904.	repent - repent. 18, 305.
to make a fuss about, to make a burden of. 18, 1341.	Report - Communion rich. 19, 1289. 1392.
aufgehoben - held out, moved up. Old edition, vol. 7, 1160.	Reports - Communion (xxxxxxx) (Luther). 19, 1292.
unbutton - unbuttoning. 20, 222.	toast - to make someone warm. 20, 31.
to nail - to lace open. 20, 791.	make called - make famous. Old ed. 8, 675.
put on - make a fool of. 18, 1511.	to be called - to have the reputation. 19, 722.
Appearance - Anhalt, Zuflucht. Old edition, vol. 7, 674.	Professions - Occupation. 20, 166.
<i>Aureola</i> - gold florin. 19, 1946.	modestly assigned, communicated. Old edition 7, 1559. 1708. 2164.
Lust (Carlstadt) - rutting heat. 20, 204.	resolve - overcome by reasons. 19, 268.
to make a boast - to shout out boastfully. 12, 89; also: to make slander.	make burdensome. 18, 949.
outShear - to eliminate. 19, 613. 22, 1102.	beselben - to sully. 19, 1701.
Ausschnetten - to cut out, to cut away. 19, 853.	consist with - are based on. 18, 1518.
auswestern - auswersen. 22, 1487. Cf. entwestern.	bestricken - to take a vow from someone that he will not move away
Disassociation, separation. 18, 1015.	from the place. 22, 1033. It must be read there "bestricken"
outside--out. Old edition, vol. 7, 1291. let be outside. ibid. 1240.	instead of "beschicken". Compare the introduction to this
to take off - to take off, to reserve something for oneself. 18, 306. 1014.	volume, p. 57.
Excerpt - Exception. 22, 1504. 1506.	Betlin Prayer. 19, 1122.
	amount - tolerate. 20, 76.
	Bettrrß -a paralytic (paralyticus). 22, 1896.
	hives -to offer for exchange. 18, 308.

to prove - to test. 19, 1703. proven - it can be proven. 18, 942.	Credence - credentials. 22, 1398.
bewandt - related, friendly. Alte Ausg. 7, 2434. to let tame - to let rule and reign. Old ed. 7, 1735.	Curtisans - courtiers. 18, 1302.
bidmen - quake. 11, 2264.	Dale--Dohle. 20, 2267.
Bildung - Bild, Bildniß. Alte Ausg. 8, 88.	Giving thanks - thoughts. 19, 1734.
Bireth (Bareit, Banneth) - beret. 11, 487.	Jannen (dirmen, linen) - consecriren. 20, 993.
Biretlin - Barettlein. Old edition 8, 463. to - be. 18, 1341. 20, 42.	Darbloser - Darbender. 19, 1053.
Bißlin (from Büß) - Küsse. 19, 1931.	Jaumeln - to stagger. 20, 265.
blank - white. 20, 188.	stretchy - ductile, tough. Old ed. 7, 2263.
Blanketeu -- Blank; paper, with own signature and seal, but not inscribed. 19, 1900.	Dimung - Consecration. 19, 1204. conversion 20, 332. discipliniren - to chastise. 19, 1682.
Blaßtücker - cheater, deceive 19, 925.	Docke (Tocke) doll. 19, 1094. 22, 903.
Leaf - the disc. 20, 931.	Dockenwerk - Puppetry. 13, 1288.
scroll - chat. 18, 1306.	Dod -- Pathe.
blecken - to look at, to let see. 18, 1337.	Dohn - sound, vocals. Jen. (1562) 8, 140.
stay - let stay. 18, 1301.	dohnen - to sound, in the compound: to listen and to dohnen. Jen. (1585) 2, 236. - Auch- voll sein, old ed. 7, 763,--dunen. Cf. 19, 416.
Bleuel - a flat wood provided with a handle for beating. Witt. (1553) 3, 467.	Double-cross - fraudulent dice game. 20, 2093.
bleuen - to plague, to drive. 19, 1670. blinzlings - blindlings. 20, 1008.	Dreckel, Drecketal - Decret, Decretal. 22, 1516. 848.
Mere, one - lay - shamefully fall. 11, 1806. Erl. 47, 203.	Thirtieth s. Trigesimä.
Bombart - a dull, deep sound. 19, 1933. bören - to burn. 19, 522.1908.	Drue - chest, box. Jen. (1566) 4, 316.
Evil (bosses) -- post. 20, 279.	Druckpfenning - Pfennigdrücker, Geizwanst. Erl. 44, 205.
Boßleich - bowling alley. 22, 23. (Fürstemann, Neues Urkundenbuch, p. 354, is to read "Boßleich" instead of Bogleich").	Drums - drums. 18, 1292.
Bötel (Böttel) - beadle, henchman, war servant. 19, 1175. fire tail - a fire that still smokes a little. 19, 963.	dunen - to be drunk. 19,416.
Brazil - red dye oil. 20, 819. breakable - frail. Erl. 29, 83. break - to grind, to bite the teeth firmly together. 19, 1722	Dünkel - To think in favor of. 18, 943.
Fracture - pants. 19, 1027. 22, 734.1431.	Dunkelfeiner, Dünkelgut - a thin-skinned person. Jen. (1568) 6, 145b. Erl. 44, 269.
Bruntz shards (Bruntzschirbel) - chamber pot. 22, 1700.	meager - lamentable. Old ed. 7, 1313.
Book guide - bookseller. 19, 530. letters -- buchstabiren. 20, 782. buff -- puff, push. Jen. (1566) 4, 499 d. Busse - jack. 18, 1044.	Durst s. Thurst.
Bufferei - Büberei. 18, 1007.	thüftig (thürtig) - impudent, presumptuous. 19, 1668.
Frets, from the - (and from the -) = flush. 18, 963.1274. 20, 911.	Dutten teat. 20, 53.
Bundwerk - edging with fur work. 18, 935.	Adventure, on - on the unknown. 11, 1641.
Penance - Kiss. Jen. (1566) 5, 268b.	ebmsteuern - driving into the unknown. 20, 775.
atone - to punish. Erl. 47, 129.	ebenteuerlich - strange. Old edition 8, 1240.
Caballen - horses. Old issue 8, 901.1002.	before, else. 18, 1446.
Carnal (carnalis - carnal), mocking for Cardinal, 19, 716, and Carnalhut - Cardinal's hat 19, 716. These two words should not have been resolved in the text; the resolution has been accidentally taken over from the old edition.	marital - substantial. 18, 1354.
carnal - cardinal. 19, 774.	Ehehalt -- servant. 13, 162.
Carnöffel - the jack in the deck; Cardinal. 19, 774.	Eyern - Aehren. Jen. (1568) 6, 1341).
Casel a chasuble. 18, 1286.1361. 20, 185.	ehrgyttig - ambitious. 18, 1264.
Cavat - altan-like porch of a house, bay window. Old edition 8, 948.	Ehrnhold - Herold. Jen. (1564) 1, 441.
Cavillation - evasion, sophistry. 19, 1861. cavilliren - to engage in sophistry. Old edition 8, 470. collation conversations - table talk. 22, 296.	own - to give to one's own, to appropriate. 18, 1040. also: to be one's own. 19, 1143.
Comment - Fündlein, Erdichtung. 18, 973. 1047.	something - anything, anything at all. Old ed. 7, 1022.
Corporal - a white linen cloth for covering the hosts. 18, 1493. 19, 949.	Einrösser - the one who rides a horse. 22, 1271. also: Landreiter, Gendarm. (Fürstemann, N. Urkundenbuch, p.354b.)
	Einsiedel - Hermit. 19, 1169.
	retract - restrict. Old ed. 8, 774.
	Vain, a - a nothing. 20, 852.
	Eli singen - to sing a farewell song. 20, 282. 22, 1367 "Heli singen". Ant - Ant. Jen. (1562) 8, 21.
	emperen - to spare. Witt. (1553) 3, 465.
	sensitive - sensitive. 20, 240.
	endlich (Luc. 1, 39.) - hasty, hurried. 13, 2737.
	end - lead out. Old ed. 8, 1097.
	finally - definitively. 18, 1441. once and for all. Old ed. 8, 1253.
	Angel notes - English gold coins. 19, 412.
	enhandicap - back. 18, 881.
	Erne - fool (?) (Dietz). 19, 269. According to the context, it seems to mean a mad man possessed by the devil.
	de-completed - incomplete. 19, 1943.
	To make a eunuch out of a person. Erl. entheffen - to deprive of help. 20, 1858.

to bring in the right direction, to teach. 20, 256. 1051.
 to be seated - to be elevated. 11, 1645.
 escape - to escape, to escape. 11, 1809.
 to wash away the chrism and oil (Bucer). 20, 418.
 Epulo - Schlemmer. 19, 1892.
 He--Lord. 19, 658. 20, 272.
 acquire --eramen. 19, 1400. old ed. 8, 406.
 to behold, to -- to show oneself, to reveal oneself. Old edition.
 7, 2130. (With Walch: to occur.)
 Erbeis - pea. 20, 952.
 Deferral - reverence. 19, 1157.
 erbidmen - earthquake. Old ed. 7, 2464.
 to please -- to compensate for something. 13, 701.
 get - get. 12, 91.
 to make merry (erlöstern) -- to enjoy, to delight. 13, 2755. slay -- to
 smash (*afflictus*). 19, 1142.
 erseuchelt - hunted. (Cf. geseseuchelt.) Jen. (1568) 7, 224d. ersucht
 - sought. 20, 178.
 consider - trust. 19, 442.
 to consider - to be prepared for. 13, 701. bold - confident, defiant,
 audacious. 19, 1716.
 Archstultus - Aristotle. 18, 1338.
 about or sthan - earlier. 18, 1535.
 stho -- somewhere. 20, 949. 1009.
 Facilet - Sweat towel, handkerchief or handkerchief. 13, 2761.
 (Missing in Dietz.)
 Farch mother -- piglet mother, sow. 20, 1950.
 almost very. 18, 934.
 lazy, to let oneself be - to let oneself be morose. Alte Ausg. 8, 442. lul
 thun - to be peevish. ibid. 8, 1249.
 Purgatory soul - soul in purgatory. 18, 950.
 enemies - hate. 19, 778.
 feisten--farts. 20, 1994.
 fern (fert) - in the previous year, in the idiom: Heuer wiefern. 13, 660.
 Fire, the sacred -- the rose, the red run. 20, 2014. fiedern (fiddern) - to
 feather, to decorate.
 19, 1913. old ed. 8, 1166.
 Felting - clumsiness. 18, 1326.
 Finance -- intrigues. 18, 1537.
 Finance - intrigue, fraud. 10, 83. 19, 1762.
 fitzeln (shred) - to tear to shreds. 20, 778.
 Flegel -- *flagella*, Geißeln. Erl. 47, 190.
 fodder -- demand. 19, 1103.
 Claim - promotion. 20, 166.
 Frauenh't - Women's guardian, eunuch. Erl. 26, 62.
 free -- make free. 20, 153.
 alien - to alienate, to withdraw. 18, 1309.
 fretzen - to feed, to feed. 20, 2000.
 Frohnfasten - the fasts on the Quatember days. Alte Ausg. 7, 766.
 Frumen - that which is pious, useful. 11, 1649. lead - to guide. 20, 232.
 Advocate -- advocate, representative, advocate. 20, 44. gach --
 abrupt, hurried. 20, 889.
 Gack - Kaak, pillory, pillory. 20, 998. In De Wette I, 569 erroneously
 "sack". Seidemann in De Wette VI, 670 has improved this, but
 explains it as "gallows".
 Gauls -- the priests of Cybele. 19, 1483.
 Galrede -- Gallerte, 19, 422. 20, 2035. old ed. 7, 771. 2152.
 gan (Jen. (1568) 6, 1121.,) -- gönnne. 19, 413. 20, 1999.

Ganerbenhaus (Janerbenhaus) -- a house in which "every" man has
 a right and which is open to everyone. 19, 510.
 Garen - yarn, nets. 22, 1281.
 Garst -- Malice 19, 1854.
 Gauch (Gauff) - joke, foolishness. 18, 1356.
 Gauch (name of cuckoo) -- Narr. 19, 1842.
 Gäucherei (Gäuchelei) - foolishness. 18, 1358. 19, 1887.
 20, 793.
 gecken (geckzen) -- cry of the jackdaws. 19, 776. 1865.
 Geckism - mocking name Luther gives to Agricola's Catechism. 20,
 1654.
 geel, gel - yellow. 19, 630. 20, 883.
 dangerous (gefehr) - hostile, leprous. Old ed. 8, 457. 761.
 Countercaster - object (*objectum*). 18, 953.
 Geher - ridicule, mockery. Erl. 44, 318. Old edition.
 7, 2311.
 gehnemäulen -- to open the mouth yawning. 20, 837.
 Drool -- empty talk. 18, 1356.
 Horny - testicles. Witt. (1553) 3, 459.
 spiritual - at the bottom of the heart. Erl. 37, 359.
 rummaged - bought. 19, 1762.
 strived for - ardently strived for. Jen. (1568) 7, 224.
 gelterr - to give payment, to pay. Old ed. 8, 1234.
 kröchtzet krächzt. Jen. (1568) 7, 224.
 deliver -- coagulate. Old ed. 8, 978.
 Solved -- lot, lead, bullet. Jen. (1562) 8, 249.
 gem - against dem. 19, 627. Instead of: Dem Türken read: Gem.
 gemeiniglrich - like all people in general. 18, 1301.
 genemäulen s. gehnemäulen.
 Genetter (ital. *ginetto*) - light horse. 13, 1748.
 enjoyable - profitable. 18, 1523.
 discussed - put in place. 20, 13.
 Geplätz -- Patching. 20, 778.
 Blaring -- Dazzle. Alte Ausg. 7, 853. 1914.
 geramen -- to target, to take aim at.
 19, 1941. cf. De Wette VI, 222.
 gerathen - to deprive, to dispense with. 20, 189.
 gereden - to vow, to pledge. 19, 720. Old ed. 7, 1908.
 Geren - Rockschooß. (Hes. 16, 8.) Old ed. 8, 1404.
 Business - Creature. Old ed. 8, 1096. order. ibid.
 Geschicht, the - the thing that has happened, the factum. 20, 277.
 1007.
 accelerated (Hos. 12, 5.) - given the victory (?). 19, 866.
 Geschlepp--Gefolge. Erl. 44, 131.
 smoked - smoked, burned. Erl. 26, 69.
 pushed -- pushed, pushed. 19, 816.
 swiftly! - swings. 20, 52.
 schwoll (geschwal) - swollen. 13, 2393.
 Ulcer - a large swarm. 19, 831.
 Gesell, a good - hypocrite, godless man. Old edition.
 7, 2286. 2340. 2515.
 disgusted - strived after. Jen. (1568) 7, 224.
 Clamp - clasp. 22, 1686.
 tense -- imprisoned. Erl. 47, 171. 170.
 Rafters -- entablature, rafterwork. 19, 1881.
 Gespügniß -- spook, empty appearance. 18, 962.
 Geströde -- Spülicht. 19, 1389.
 Getas (*Getæ*) - Gothen. 10, 342.
 Getzen. 22, 1588. s. gecken.
 Getzung - tongue, language. Witt. (1553) 6, 481.
 Geuchelei (smokehouse) see Gäucherei. 20, 793.
 geudic - wasteful. Witt. (1553) 6, 591.
 Geuße - abundance (in our edition: "sufficiency").
 10, 402.

2394 Verzeichniß einiger seltenen oder veralteten Wörter in Luthers Schriften. 2395

Guarantee possession (Luther). Erl. 26, 93.	Hoffet - Planer. 18, 956.
Rifles - weir, dam. 19, 693.	to fetch, to close in the hollow - to make a conclusion from silence. 18, 1425.
wean - to wean off, wean off (from the breast). 20, 53.	holhippellen - mean scolding of a solder. 18, 1253.
desired (adj.) - for which I have a desire. Old ed. 8, 1484.	Holhipler - a meanly scolding lotterbube. 18, 955. Zwingli uses the form: "Holhüppen" (20, 1205. cf. 20, 1189), Emser: "Holhüppen" (18, 1253, note/5), people who fetch the Hüppen>, i.e. the Abhub. - Kawerau, Agricola, p. 112, explains (because he confuses "Hippe" [Abhub] with "Hippel" [Wäffel]) "Hippenbube": a boy who offers baked goods for sale. In Förstemann, N. Urkunden-., p. 294a, we find: "Hippenträger".
Tools. 19, 639.	Hell Oven Corner. 22, 777.
Tides, the seven - <i>horae canonicae</i> . 19, 860.	Holzschuher - Barfüßermönche, Franciscan. 22, 683. 18, 1418 f.
Producer - Witness. 18, 1329.	Horä - the seven Gobetz times. 18, 1552.
Gezeugniß - Testimony. 18, 954.	Hülfen - Gehülfin. 19, 1733.
gezwagen - pinched, head washed. 11, 1226.	hützelig - shriveled, like baked fruit. 22, 1984.
Equal purchase - lawful purchase. 20, 792.	Hutzelprediger, ein Scheltwort Carlstadts wider Luther" . 20, 258.
Equal - Gleichniß. 20, 1967.	ichtes, ichts - anything. 18, 893. 20, 959. 22, 8. always, evermore - ever. 18, 1493. 20, 797. fervor - rut. 19, 1155.
Equality. 20, 281.	Island - <i>infula</i> , bishop's cap. 18, 1490.
gleichzu - straight ahead, without beating about the bush. Alte Ausg. 8, 673. gließe - gleißete. 12, 1283.	irtzen (Jen. (1568) 6, 544b) - "your" name (like dutzen). 10, 1015.
milder - lenient. 11, 1842.	them, themselves - to speak of themselves in the majority. 20, 2223.
Göckelmännlein - little juggler, little fool. 20, 2195. göcken (köcken) - to spit, to vomit. 20, 866.	jach (gach) - swiftly, hurriedly. 20, 889.
Göckler Gaukler. 19, 413.	jachen/jagen. 20, 1915. Old ed. 8, 1229. 1304.
Goldfasten - Nothfastm, the fasts on the four days of Quatember. 19, 601.	Yacht baptism - emergency baptism. 19, 1227.
Gorre - bad horse. 20, 973.	Janerbernhaus s. Ganerbernhaus.
Idolater - idolater. 20, 776.	Jauf - Gauch, joke, foolishness. 18, 1356.
Grepelmarkt - a marketplace. Erl. 26, 19. gro -grob. 19, 629.634.	Jenitser - Janissaries. 22, 1604.
Grumpen - crumbs, Brockm. 18, 1287. 20, 1847. Gründe - foundations (<i>fundamenta</i>). 19, 1119. grunts, wrong reading Erl. 27, 238 instead of: Grumpen. Gugel (Kogel) - hood, cap. 18, 1552.	Jope - jacket. 20, 747.
Hence: Gugelfritz -a monk. 18, 1533.	Juche - Jauche. Witt. (1554) 7, 250b.
Guldenstück (gülden piece) - gold jewelry, gold embroidered robe. 10, 346. old issue 7, 851. 2120. 8, 1224. gumpen - jump. 13, 1097.	Jew, a red - the Turk. 22, 858.
Hair loss - to suffer a severe defeat. 20, 1016. 19, 417. Also: to prepare for defeat. 20,2072.	Jüdischheit - Judenschaft. 20, 1826.
Hadeln (Haddeln, Hoddeln) - rags, rags. 19, 1412. 1902.	Jungherren, Junghern-Junker. 13, 2662. 20, 875.
Handfan - Manipel. 20, 390.	Kanden (Kandel) - Kannen. 19, 823. old ed. 7, 2021. 2482.
Hamen - net. 22, 1442, also in the idiom: to fish before the Hamen - to chase away the fish that are before the net.	Kasel s. Casel.
Hanpotzen - Scarecrow in hemp. Alte Ausg. 8, 1307. Erl. 27, 321.	Kemnotes - chambers. 20, 955.
Hare (hair) - hair, fur. In the idiom: Are you of the hair, i.e. are you so constituted? 20, 165. 830.	heretic - to make a heretic. 18, 1299.
Harns - Harnisch. Erl. 27, 291.	Keutel - bag in the middle of the net. 22, 1656. kick - poke, hit. 20, 167. 223, 799.
Urinary sherd - chamber pot. 19, 1263.	Kielkropf (Kilkrob, Kilkropp) - changeling, an idiot. 19, 1296. 20, 258. 1982. 22, 757.
Harre, die - the Long Time. 22, 1489.	Kinckernel - Mandate (?). 19, 1927.
häubist - hauest. 18, 1341.	to grind - to grind one's teeth. 19, 1722. to make a piercing sound. Old ed. 8, 1475 f.
Haufe, der Verlorne - the troop of the army. 20, 2178. Seidemann, Münzer, page 84, explains it: "der erste Schlachthaufe".	Kläret - sugar water or another flavored potion. 13, 142. Old ed. 7, 2077.
Heie -- Schlligel, wooden hammer, ram block (Grimy). heisch heiser.	Click blob, blemish. Old issue 7, 1571.
Old ed. 7, 600.	click - blot, smear. 20, 768. be unclean. Old ed. 8, 889.
Heroes - leg irons. 19, 1682.	Cliff - a trap that collapses. Alte -Ausg. 8, 454.
Helekeplein - Hehlkäpplein. 20, 2112.	klitzschen -- clap. 20, 779.
Heli sing s. Eli.	jingle - ring. 20, 904.
Hempel - Dummkopf. 20, 956. 970. unpolished man. Erl. 44, 332.	Gag - unpolished man. Erl. 44, 332.
Autumn harvest. Alte Ausg. 8, 1247. herwieder - dagegen. 18, 1450.	Kobelbad - Teufelsbad (Kobel - Devil [Grimm]). 12, 1415.
Hofrecht (Hoffrecht) - Hoffe recht, Gutdünken, Dafürhalten. 20, 285. 1062.	KöMei, KöckereiSpeierei. 20, 800.
planing - höfeln. Old ed. 8, 358.	köcken disgust to vomit, vomit. 20, 800.

2396 Index of some rare or obsolete words in Luther's writings; 2397

Köcken - The Spied. Erl. 26, 21.	Solution. 19, 627, 999.
Kogel s. Gugel.	Lotter - Lotterbube. 22, 1650.
Kogei apple - tip of the hood (liripipium). 18, 988. 19, 1813.	Slut paners --- vagrants who go on the lottery. 13, 2736.
Kolde - head, also the plate. 18, 1553. 19, 1354. in the idiom: mit der Kolde lausen, Kolde means a beating. 20, 214.	Lungm, with - to throw out - to chase away with disgrace. 13, 1224. 20, 780.
headstrong - stiff-necked, obstinate. Old ed. 7, 2417.	lurtfch futsch, verloren. 20, 991.
Körestein - a selected stone. Old issue 7, 2194.	Magister noster, title of doctor at the university. 18, 1502.
Körkinder - adopted children. 20, 2081.	moravian - stirring around. 19, 278.
korre - kirre, zahm. 10, 382.	mal an, in the expression: pfui dein mal an, or: pfui dich mal an - Pfui dich doch! 20, 965. Old ed. 7, 302; also: Pfui dich Maul an. Old ed. 7, 1929 - Pfui dein Maul an. Old ed. 7, 2108. 2363.
körm - bold, audacious. 20, 1765.	Malstatt - place of gathering. Erl. 55, 122. malvasia - a delicious wine. 18, 1024. 1340.
Corso - Corsican wine (?). Erl. 26, 128.	mäkeln - to stain. 18, 1302.
Köten, der Koten spielen - to deal with someone as one pleases. 20, 2088. - Köhde - the ankle on the horse's foot.	Manipel - hand flag, a piece of ecclesiastical regalia. 18, 1490. 20, 390.
Vomit -Whore. 19, 1887.	Maran - a complete unbeliever. 22, 851. 1609.
Krank (Krenck) - weakness, lack of strength. Old ed. 7, 1291.	Martens - occupied by Marderpetz. 20, 226.
krauchen - to crawl. Erl. 24, 54.	Marderschaube - a delicious, marten-trimmed, loose outer garment. 13, 1298. Erl. 47, 212.
Krausen (Kroos in Low German) - Krug. Erl. 55, 67.	to moderate, to - to mast, to conform to. 12, 85, Maul - muzzle animal. Old ed. 7, 1262. (Erl. 45, 243 wrong: "Gaul".)
Herbs, (dealing) with herbs - sorcery. 22, 1781. crying - (ears) ringing. 19, 714.	mulen - to pull the mouth. 20, 786.
Kretschmer (Kretschmar, Kretzmer, Kretzmaier) - Krämer, Wirth. 18, 306. 19, 820. Wirthshaus. Erl. 47, 71.	Martyrdom == Martyr image. Old edition 8, 60.
Crown Prayers - Prayers of the Crown of the Blessed Virgin. 22, 1319.	mausen - to play a game in the dark. Erl. 26, 50. 87. 299.
Krötengerick - Toad breeding (Gerick - the young brood). 13, 1265.	mausen - to moult, to throw off the shell (from crab). Erl. 47, 38.
krump -krumm. 20, 30.	mehe - more. 19, 628.
Coolable - crib. 13, 1084.	Mehrde (Meerde, Merde [merda]-mash, Gemengsel. 10, 1944, Koth. 20, 2094.
kündig - apparently, universally known. 19, 241.	meijsche Butter - May butter. 19, 1264.
Kürñß (Kuruß) - Panzer, Harnisch. 22, 191. cf. old ed. 7, 2174. 2308. 2412.	menkeln - to find fault with, to find deficiency. 20, 775.
Kürisser - a soldier protected with a Küraß. 18, 1272. 1326.	noticeable - to be noticed, to be observed. Erl. 37, 364.
Kux share in mine. 22, 812. Kützel - ticklish. 20, 2225 ..	Metze - a maiden. 18, 1483.
Lactuke - lettuce, herbs. 19, 434.	mild - inept. 18, 892.
Ladüinkel (Tentzel I, 211 Laßdüinkel, <i>supercilium</i>) - who lets himself be a bit thin. 22, 689.	Minor penitentiary master - sub-penitentiary master. 19, 773.
Lamprete - Bricke, a delicious fish. 18, 958. long - long lasting, 19, 1166.	minders - in the least. 20, 490.
lappen - to put on lobe, to mend. 20, 234.	disrespectful - disreputable. 18, 948.
Latwerge - sauce. Old ed. 7, 763.	Mitzbietung - disrespect, blasphemy. 18, 968.
Lauer (Lawer) - a rogue. 22, 1316. (lons - after wine, spent grains, marc wine) bad wine 19, 539.	mißhallen, mißshellen - to contradict. 18, 964.
Arbor - Permit. 19, 258. 601.	Mithaller - who votes with someone. 18, 966:
honest - alone. Erl. 37, 358.	Newt, the colorful - [the poisonous animal], "since all poisonous worms fetch poison" (Luther). Old edition 7, 272. - 22, 1045. 1047.
lcken (lick) - to jump, to lash out behind. 20, 799. 2031.	Morche - morels, a fungus. 20, 578.
Leich, the -skittle alley. 22, 665. old ed. 5, 1182. leichtferfergen - light-weight. 20, 234.	Morff -Schwel". 22, 1713.
leit -lie. 19, 1119.	Moshei - shell. 20, 213.
lenden - steering, turning, guiding. 18, 1268. 20, 201.	Muhme - aunt; also sibling, sister's daughter. 22, 1142.
Reader - Lector (at the university). 18, 1053.	Mundbügel, Erl. 56, 120, is wrong reading instead of: "Winden und Bülgen". Cf. De Wette VI, 487, amn. 6.
Letze farewell. 20, 2015. 2149.	Mussen - leisure. Jen. (1566) 4, 304b.
leugen - deny, and lie. 20, 175. 183. 814.	indifferent - indifferent, without validity. 20, 678.
Libell - lampoon. 19, 1930.	sewing - nearly. 18, 1273.
licentiously easy. 19, 1850. ed. 46, 317.	nehrllich, nerlich - almost, hardly. 19, 1302. low. Old ed. 8, 197.
leftward - to wrong opinion. 18, 9M.	more honest - more to mow (talk). 11, 1642.
Liripipium - a cocktail tip, an appendage on the hood. 18, loddern - to plod, to lead out in a boyish manner. 20, 203. lörlen - to hear, to wail, to whine. 19, 1251. lören and dohnen. Jen. (1585) 2, 236.	Niclasvischöfe - Child's Play Bishops. 19, 675. 1358.
	Niederwad - Hosen (Bruch). Old ed. 8, 177.
	riveting, itself - itself suffering. 19, 1910.
	Niftel - Nephews. Erl. 56, 107. 111.

2398 Verzeichniß einiger seltenen oderveraltetWörterin Luthers Schriften. 2399

- nigern - curious. 20, 2228. Erl. 55, 119. nöthigen, sich - to force oneself. 18, 955.
- Odern - veins. 19, 725.
- Oeß - Aas(?). 20, 315.
- open - apparent, clear. 19, 827.
- ömen - to make assumptions. 20, 744.
- Ongeil - without testicles, eunuch (Luther). Witt. (1553) 3, 459.
- Order --- Order. 18, 307.
- Order - ordination. 19, 1146.
- Place of the clothes - the extreme ends. 18, 965.
- örtern - to interpret, explain. 18, 1272. determine. Old ed. 8, 618.
- örtern - to bind to a place. 18, 1350. 20, 1353.
- Ostiarus - doorkeeper (the lowest consecration). 19, 1284.
- Pacem (euphemistic for *podicem*) - the posterior. 20, 1968, also: its incense. Erl. 26, 127.
- Pallium - bishop's insignia (Bishop's Mantle 18, 1008, explains Witt. [1554] 7, 610b). 10, 289.
- pampeln - to fidget. 20, 851. Old ed. 8, 349.
- Panetb, Pänet - beret. Witt. (1554) 7, 263. panketeren - to hold a banquet. 20, 2138.
- Poppy flowers. 18, 296. Also: Hie im Herbst herumfliegenden wolligen Sämlein. 19, 1505. 18, 254.
- Parable (*bargello*) - the captain of the guard in
- Parteke a begging piece. 11, 1743.
- Parteken, go to Parteken --- go begging. 22, 47.
- Paten - host plate. 19, 1053.
- Puff - bulge, full, be thick. Jen. (1566) 4, 506.
- Pegme, Begine - Begins, a kind of nuns. 13, 2612.
- Pellitschir 22, 1677 s. Bellitschier.
- Pearl Island s. Island.
- peulen - to do dirty work (?). Old edition 7, 1817.
- Pen - shit. 19, 1406.
- Pfinnchen---Pinnchen, Nägelchen (Grimm). 20, 1904. pfindt--feels. 18, 1349.
- Care, a - exist - buy revenue from customs and pensions by annual levy. 13, 2300.
- Pirzel - Bürzel, Schwänz. 20, 1968.
- Pletting - plate carrier, monk. Witt. (1553) 3, 500b.
- pletzen---patch. 20, 847.
- plixen - flash. Im. (1556) 3, 176 b.
- Plöche - Blocks. 19, 1967.
- Ploderment - fictional chit-chat. 18, 1442.
- Pobel, Pofel, Pöfel- -pöbel. 20, 143.
- Pöckler - Schild' 22, 1044.
- Pomp - Bombart, Fart. 20, 1983.
- pomp - fart. 20, 1994.
- Penalties. 18, 1527.
- Pötzen - Scarecrow, Popanz. 18, 1289. Old ed. 8, 1275.
- Potzenhut - hat of the scarecrow. Im. (1568) 7, 428 b. prallen - bale, mtt full cheeks scream. 22, 896.
- Presence - monetary gift for saying mass, also for listening to it. 19, 1173. 1186. Erl. 44, 353.
- praten - fry. Jen. (1568) 6, 230b.
- Proceß ---- Procession. Old ed. 7, 897. 903.
- Psittacus - parrot. 18, 1338.
- probiren-beweisen. 20, 1660.
- Publican - Publican. 18, 936.
- Püsch -Bushes. 20, 224.
- Puseron - disgraceful boy, sodomite. Witt. (1554) 7, 633b.
- Pusille - infant, small child. Erl. 56, 122.
- Cleaning s. Potzen.
- quad -- evil, bad. De Wette VI, 689. V, 792.
- Squares - ashlars. 22, 657.
- Quästm (*quaestio*) - questions, disputes. 18, 1297.
- Quat---dirt. 18, 1287.
- Quatern --- Bogm of four leaves. 18, 1256.
- Rabe, Rabm, mocking for rabbi and rabbis. 20, 2093. 2103.
- wheel breaking - wheels. 20, 270.
- raffeln - to riffle. 20, 252.
- ragen Erl. 27, 207. wrong reading instead of: "erjagen". Cf. 20, 1258.
- Ram (Rham, Rhom) - overburden, excavation, soot, dirt; in the idiom: Rahm fahm - to tarnish. 19, 1875. 20, 1890. old ed. 7, 368. 8, 842. 1190.
- Rant - throat (?). 13, 1029.
- Rapus, Rappuse, to give into the Rappuse ---- to give something into the big pile (as a booty) for free. 11, 2284. Old ed. 8, 432.
- Rastrum (grid) --- Leipzig beer. 18, 1024. 1047. 1340. smokeless -- smokeless. Jen. (1556) 3, 343 b. 344. space -- spacious. 20, 2092.
- Reffenter - Refectarium, dining room. 19, 1683.
- Birds of prey -- decoys. Old issue 7, 1465.
- ricey -- mounted. 18" 1272. 19, 1092. brave. 18, 982. chivalrous. 20, 2255.
- Riebe--Rib. 20, 792.
- Riege --- Rerhe. 18, 876. 20, 1074. .
- Giant - Hero, Warrior (Luther). 13, 2625.
- Rimlin - Riemlein. 20, 167.
- ringers - reduce. 13, 1109.
- Robunten - Scouring. 19, 855.
- rochzen (rochsen) - to belch, to spit out. 19, 356.
- Snotty, for Cochläus. Witt. (1554) 7, 572. rüchtig - fam. 19, 1165.
- Dog -- male, hunting dog. Witt. (1553) 3, 479.
- rugen - to rest. 19, 699.
- rugiglich - ruhig. 19, 676.
- quiet-idle. 11, 1771.
- Rüplin - Räuplein. 20, 264.
- rüffeln - to pull the mouth (from astonishment). 20, 218.
- (out of disgust). 20, 179.
- rusty (?). 19, 276. Sooted. Old edition 7, 574.
- Rutte --- Ruthe. Witt. (1554) 7, 574 b.
- full - enough. Erl. 46, 311.
- Infantile potion - Pork potion. 20, 270.
- Scapular, Schepler --- shoulder dress. 13, 2427. 22, 908.
- Shabab -- the refuse, sweepings. 19, 6Ä0. 20, 341. shabab -- there, past. Old ed. 7, 2160.
- schüfen - sheep-like. 20, 842.
- scharrm - to defy, to throb, to speak hopefully. Old ed. 8, 1193. 1198.
- Schaube - a wide outer garment. 20, 226. 22, 1496.
- Schaubhüte - a type of large straw hat. 22, 1623. show-hats- lurking down. Witt. (1553) 3, 462.
- The "Scharnützlein" - a container for keeping valuable things. Old edition 8, 1338.
- Schaufalt -- Schauspiel. 20, 341.
- Schele - hanger in the wreath. Jen. (1566) 4, 408b. schellig --- impatient, angry. 20, 170. old ed. 7, 1932.
- Schemes - Schattm. 20, 854.
- Schepler, Scheppler-Scapulier, shoulder dress of the religious clergy. 19, 631. 22, 1406.
- Scherganten - Schergen. 13, 2601.
- Scherrn, Scherrm - butcher stands. 20, 841. 867. scheubet - pushes. 20, 2125.

2400 Verzeichniß einiger seltenen oder veralteten Wörter in Luthers Schriften. 2401

Scheuchter -Scheuche. 19, 855.	disturb - irritate. 18, 952.
Schilling - Ruthe, Strafe. Old edition 7, 1613.	Strape chords. 22, 1637. Strapechorde. 22, 1634 - a cruel torture,
Schimpfe Scherz. 18, 1005. 20, 780. schimpfen -scherz. 20, 37. 19, 941. 721.	Strauesgütlem - waster. 22, 228.
Umbrella strokes - fencing strokes. 22, 735. feints. 22, 1276.	Stremen - appearance, shine. 12, 252.
Schirr (on schirr go Jen. [1566] 5, 266b) - dishes, i.e. everything needed for living. 10, 739.	Ströde - Spülicht. 20, 270. 10, 1944.
Schlangengerick - young brood of snakes. 11, 1809.	Stocking - hull. 22, 7, 1086. 1508. 20, 2172.
bad - plain, simple, straightforward. 18, 950,953. all right. 22, 473.	Step year - every seventh year of life. 22, 1553.
badly --beats. Jen. (1566) 4, 503 b.	Chair Robber - Wealth Robber. Old issue 7, 1898.
schleffe - to sleep. 20, 133.	8, 257. chair - Capital, Vorrath (Kaltschmidt).
slip - to be slippery. 20, 848.	Stützet - support. 20, 846.
Schmitzen - Wischer, reprimand. Old issue 7, 2068.	support - stützen. 22, 913.
Snotty! - schnöbe Aussonderung, snot. 19, 1848.	to soil - to contaminate. Erl. 44, 320. old ed. 7, 1817. 2552. wühlen (im Unflath). Old ed. 8, 328.
Schock, one old - sixty groschen, worth one gold. 22, 1645.	Tägen - to hold days, to meet. 22, 1248.
schochter - shy. 19, 682.	Taig -Teig. 20, 754.
already - beautiful. 20, 175. 11, 20 should be read: It is beautiful evil - the shiny is evil. 20, 2186.	Pocket market - gossip society. 22, 642.
Writings --Writings. 18, 1288. 1292. 20, 793. 841. 1957.	Täuferichen - little Baptist (little John). 13, 2736. 2738.
schuchtern - to shoo. 19, 855.	temmen, demmen - to indulge. 20, 267.
Pupil - school teacher, scholastic. 18, 972.	Temmer - Schweiger. 13, 2765.
digging - digging for ore on the surface. 22, 1532.	Tendel, Treudel -Trödel (Förstemann, N. Urkundenbuch, p. 319, is the wrong reading: "Tendet") s. Treudelmarkt.
Sagittarius - beginner, ABC student. 22, 1496. weld - bleed. 13, 490.	tenniniren - the begging of the monks; of it.
schwensten. 20, 2243.	Terminirer - mendicant monks. 19, 677.
Schwerichen - Schwäre. 13, 2613.	Tham (Jen. [1568] 6, 91) -- Damm. 19, 1246.
seelzogen - are in their final throes. 13, 1878.	thar - dares. 18, 1256.
Soap - Drool. Witt. (1554) 7, 172.	tharn, thüren - may, dare. 18, 304. old ed. 8, 1444.
very - more. 11, 1807. .	Thesem - a fragrance. 20, 1772. Old ed. 7, 301.
Seiger - Sun pointer. 19, 1092.	Thesemapfek, a perfume. Erl. 26, 127.
shallow - shallow. Jen. (1556) 3, 381b.	Theriac - Medicine Against Poison. Old edition 8, 1315. 1384.
to be - to sow. Erl. 54, 345.	Tholen--Dohlen. 13, 2156.
Set - to set captive. Erl. 53, 377. 413.	thon -thun. 20, 55.
Sesto - printed sheet of six leaves. 18, 1268.	thüren - to be allowed, to dare, to dare. 18, 1507.
sider - meanwhile (<i>intedrim</i>). 19, 1158.	Thurm - Gefängniß. 22, 463.
sidermals - since. 19, 1706.	Thurst - presumption, insolence. 20, 183.
sink - to drive a shaft vertically. 22, 1532.	Thvmien - thyme (as incense). 12, 95.
Sod, Sotten - boiled, brew, impure mixture. 18, 298.	kills--sucks. 19, 417. 20, 787.
to let - to let deal with. 13, 1886. shall - become. 22, 445.	Tocke s. Docke.
Speck, a grove near Wittenberg. 22, 198.	Töcklein - little doll. Old issue 7, 2039.
spenstig - unruly. 19, 900.	Todeske (<i>tedeschi</i>) - German. Erl. 26, 207.
Spikenard water - fragrant water (spike - lavender). 13, 2762.	Toppeler (doubler) - cheating dice players. 20, 943.
spittelisch - belonging to the hospital, sickly. Old ed. 7, 600.	Tostblume - the dost, Wohlgermuth. 22, 847.
Spitzknecht - knave. 22, 1650.	Tracheit - Inertia. 18, 1342.
Spugniß - spook, ghost. 19, 855.	Tramyuder, a delicious wine. Erl. 29, 83.
flush - rob, plunder. 20, 1944.	Trau - faithfulness, faith, trust. 18, 1278.
Ständerling, Ständner - standing still to chat. 22, 642. 13, 2737.	Trebesand - driving sand. 20, 862.
starchless -- powerless. 18, 1278.	treit -trägt. 19, 629.
Stecklin - Splitterlein. 18, 1278.	TreudelMarkt - Flea Market. 22, 881.
Steft -- pen, spike. 20, 777.	Trigesimä - thirty masses for the dead. 19, 1136. 22, 773. 908. 1393.
control - support. 18, 1448.	Gannets--Gannets (?). 20, 261.
stumble, poke - tumble, swing. 20, 12.	Drip - the drop in the brain that causes disease and death. 19, 644. 22, 1476.
Sting, to give into - to plead guilty to. Erl. 26, 241. 243.	tropfen (Jen. [1556] 3, 512) - to make tropes. 20, 986, Trotzian - medicinal cake, cookies, incense. 22, 523. chug, chug - duck. 20, 160. 19, 1349.
Embroidery, for - on hair. 19, 1373.	tügten - were good. 20, 283.
vote - to determine, to separate out. 20, 1045.	tunkelt's (Jen. [1568] 7, 364b) - darkens it, hides it. 19, 1916.
Stiplin - Pünktlein. 19, 1412.	Tütel - Tüttel. 18, 1294.
Stole -- a piece of the clergy's regalia. 18, 1490. stönen -- to support. 22, 1245. 20, 72.250.	Ueberbund - Ausbündigkeit. 18, 1326.
	overbearing - exceedingly highborn, presumptuous, proud. 19, 689.

2402 Verzeichniß einiger seltenen oder veralteten Wörter in Luthers Schriften. 2403

Transfer - Addition, which exceeds the measure. 18, 901. 20, 2149.
super-evil - to be exceedingly evil, also: to surpass in wickedness.
20, 2156.

overcome - to defeat, to hold down. 22, 1308.

exceeded - surpassed. 18, 972.

Umschläger - usurer. 22, 1528.

careless - inconspicuous, difficult to notice. 11, 6. irreverent - disrespectful, insulting. 18, 938. uneß (vneß) - unappetizing, inedible. 20, 1788.2039.

13, 2766. Erl. 45, 176 Höck has read "dieß", for which the Erl. has put "Viehs".

ungeheiet - unmolested. 19, 1879. 1896. uncreated - unskilled, untalented. 13, 1218.

unequal - unjust, not according to faith. Erl. 55, 22.

Unlust - unpleasant thing, annoyance. 20, 157. unsöt - rude, harsh.

Erl. 55/100. old ed. 8, 1314. unstümig.- impetuous. 18, 1335.

incomprehensible - incomprehensible. 18, 953.

unwavering, unmanageable - without wavering, unshakable.

18, 954.978, 20, 74.

Urgicht - Confession, especially on torture. 19, 1905.

Old ed. 8, 917.

Urständ - Resurrection. 20, 491. 22, 993.

Veit, brother - the war servants. 20, 2204. spend - accomplish. 19, 1125. 1709. caked - covered. 19, 825.

We owe you our full gratitude. Old ed. 7, 2545. forgiven - poisoned. 19, 626.

poisoned - toxic. 18, 1010.

compare - equal respect. 18, 1581.

compared - made equal. 18, 1500. grudge - begrudge. Old edition 7, 1751.

behavior - reserved. 19, 1091.

to impose - to follow, to give space. 13, 1316. bewitch - represent [the place]. Erl. 44, 22.

lump - mutilate. 11, L.

degenerate - to forestall, to resist. Old ed. 7, 869. abandon (vorlafsen) - to refrain from. 18, 307.

misplace - refute. 18, 1041.

Publishers - Refusers. 18, 297.

Transfer - Refutation. 18, 296.

verlippen - to poison. 20, 891.

verlipt - poisoned. 18, 934. 1273.

The "Verlorne Haufe" - the army's supply train. 22, 1438. verlüstern s. erlüstern.

measured - agreed upon, stipulated. 18, 1445.

to be on good terms with someone. Old ed. 8, 644.

pitched - sealed. 19, 1065.

verposteiet - fortified. Erl. 26, 223.

verrohrt - stirred up, spilled. 10, 2187.

crazy, mad (by a woman) - weakened. 20, 1802.

assembled - total. 20, 172.

procure - to dispose of. 19, 700. wear out - worship, spoil. 13, 1300.

gobble up - devour. 19, 1173.

protected - provided with a shooter. 19, 693. provided - overlooked. Old ed. 7, 560. 8, 47.

Versisex - verse maker. 18, 1258.

promise - to deny. 19, 828. To speak disparagingly of something.

Old ed. 7, 1305. 1487.

Rejection - contradiction, rejection. 12, 85. Coiled - ethane, discarded. 20, 368. 369. demonized - deepened, sunk. 20, 1766. 1780.

Everything is geared to the best. Old edition 8, 674.

Orphan - an outcast. 18, 1032.

audacious - to consider it, to be prepared for it. Jen. (1566) 4, 488 d. to forgive, to abstain from a thing, (*repudiare*). Old ed. 8, 759. 764.

1125.

visirlich - possirlich. 19, 267. foolish. 22, 767. old ed. 7, 1968. 2140.

Full word - consent. 18, 941.

"before" as a prefix often for: "ver"; and conversely, "ver" for "before". Jen. (1566) 5, 3430.

(degenerate) occur (degenerate). 18, 1299.

former - before. 22, 495.

dare - to tackle. 20, 781.

wahen - to wobble, to waver. 20, 267.

Wahl (Wal) Welscher, Italian. 22, 1627.

Delusion - empty. 19, 928.

Währe duration. 22, 1089.

Forest brothers - hermits. In the St. Louis edition, vol. 10, 326, § 116 read: "Waldbrüder.

Forest rights - make forest right, slam. 18, 957.

Wallbrüder pilgrims. 10, 327, § 117.

wältigen - exercise violence. 19, 722.

transform - change. 19, 816.

changeable - changeable. 22, 132.

waver - doubt. 18, 1562.

when -denn. 18, 305.

tub, an exclamation of astonishment - Ei, seht doch nur.

18, 936.

Wapen, arms - weapons. 18, 1296. what -was. 20, 61. 22, 1295.

Laundry - orphans. Erl. 37, 385.

waserlei - any. 18, 950.

weger (also double comparative: wegerer) - a better way. 20, 455.457.

wegern - to refuse, to deny. 18, 1337.

Wegzeigen - Signposts. 10, 340.

Wehetage, the - pain. Old issue 7, 2125.

Weibling - female human. 18, 1301.

Weichmuth - female essence, incapacity. 18, 963.

weimeln - to teem. 20, 342.

Wenden - Vandals. Old edition 7, 2506. few - make less. 18, 1276.

10, 340. if then - an expression of astonishment and challenge: Ei was! 18, 1444.

work-related - according to the craft. 22, 1401.

werrig - confused. 19, 830.

Being - to be (*existere*). 20, 783. 2058.

Western shirt - baptismal shirt, symbol of purity. Erl. 47, 38.

countermeasured. 20, 202.

Widerspiel - Gegengentheil. 11, 2277.

resists - refuses. 11, 1779.

wingen - to wring. 20, 1837.

wöllen - dressed in wool. Old ed. 7, 2412. 8, 55. wuschen - to wipe.

Erl. 44, 262. 281. 47, 80.

Zang Zank. 20, 765.

sign - bezeichnm. 20, 1007. 1008.

to accuse - to blame. Erl. 44, 225. Old ed. 7, 715. 8, 1221.

to break - to smash, to frighten, to drive. 11, 2277.

crushed - crimped. Erl. 26, 237.

zerloddert - torn, corrupted, ruined. Witt. (1554) 7, 149. Old ed. 8, 1263.

zermerkeln - crush. 20, 1970.

Pulverize - turn into dust. 19, 1871.
 Zisra (Ziphra, digit) - zero. 10, 289. Also: number sign. 20, 1978.
 2045.
 Zippeln (Zwippel) - onions. Jen. (1562) 8, 39. Old ed. 7, 1249.
 Zoten, in the idiom: to go to Zoten - to adhere, to take root. Old ed.
 7, 2278.
 to as a prefix - zer.
 Breeding - Reproduction. 20, 1797.
 Coincidence - incidence. 18, 1347. consent. 22, 468.
 Trains, zun - to die. Old edition - 7, 2364.

Listening - accessories. 18, 1361.
 zwagen - zwacken. 18, 898.
 Zwarg dwarf. 20, 246.
 Zwecken - Nagel, Centrum der Scheibe. Erl. 44, 175.
 two half - one and a half. 20, 969.
 zwiesen - in two columns. 20, 2082.
 twelve articles [of the Christian faith] - the apostolic symbolum. 19,
 797.
 Twelve messenger - apostle. 18, 1495. 19, 776.
 Twelve messengers' evening - the evening before a feast of the
 apostles. 18, 1516.

Supplements and corrections.

To Volume 18.

Introduction, p. 10, Z. 20 v. o., read: 2 Thess.
 Introduction, p. 20 d, line 4 v. o., read: Pabstes.
 Introduction, p. 4d, line 5 v. o., delete the quotation marks.
 Introduction, p. 47b: Other authorities state that Erasmus had been
 Lector of Greek at Cambridge and had already left England
 permanently in 1513.
 Introduction, p. 48, line 7 v. o. "read: July 12.
 Col. 613, line 4 b. u., read: Palestine.
 Col. 928, note 2, read: lib. VI.
 Col. 929, Z. 4 v. u., erase the punctum.
 Col. 934, last line of text, read: torture through.

To Volume 19.

Introduction, p. 27, to note 4: The same error, only in somewhat milder
 words than in Köstlin, is also found in Kolde, Martin Luther, vol.
 II, p. 26.
 Introduction, p. 51 d, line 15 v. o., read: Ine. instead of: v.
 Introduction, p. 51a, line 4 v. u. in the text, read: 9901 Masses. Col.
 115, at the end of the first paragraph, can, according to the
 interpunction of the Latin Wittenberg edition, also be translated as:
 "like the Gauls (Galli), the priests of the goddess Cybele, cut
 themselves and with one", etc.
 Introduction, p. 36, we have taken the references where "Christi
 Ablaßbrief" is to be found in the editions, unfortunately! from the
 Erlangen edition. These are all wrong. It should read:
 "Eislebensche Ausgabe, Vol. I, p. 147; Altenburger, Vol. II, p.
 344; Leipziger, Vol. XVIII, p. 456." - The words "in den Hallischen
 Theil, p. 135" are to be deleted.
 Col. 124, line 2 v. u., read: *diapason*.
 Col. 346, last line, read: *Papum*.
 Col. 627, line 21 v. u., instead of: "Dem" read: "Gem", which is: against
 which.
 Col. 1418, Thesis 2, "in the fourth way" is a scholastic expression,
 which denotes that the statement (*praedicatum*) refers only to the
 One object, and only to this. The note, which is set to it, is to
 be deleted.

Re Volume 22.

Eii'eituna, p. 51, para. 5 v. u., penultimate line, read: "[d. i, take^" and
 erase the square bracket at the end of the paragraph.
 Introduction, p. 51 d, para. 3 v. u., line 1, read: para. 6.
 Introduction, p. 53d, line 3 v. o., read: which.
 Col. 29, lines 2 and 3 v. u., erase the brackets.
 Col. 429, § 44, line 1, read: 1537 instead of: 1541, which the old table
 speeches offer, because the theses in No. 31 of this volume are
 mentioned.
 Col. 830, § 71, line 1, read: an instead of: von.
 Col. 924, line 2 v. u., read: "Naumburg" instead of: "Neubruck" in
 Cordatus. On April 8, 1532, Naumburg burned down so quickly.
G; Langii Chron. Numburgensia at *Menchen* S. S. II, 78.
 Col. 925, §150, Z. 1, read: 1533, which is missing in the old table
 speeches. See the introduction to the 19th volume, p. 23 d.
 Col. 1010 has Cordatus erroneously 1521 instead of 1522, because
 the meeting of Marcus with Luther took place only (after Luther's
 return from the Wartburg) in early April 1522.
 Col. 1026, § 29, in the note, read: Cap. 45, § 58.
 Col. 1032, last line, delete parenthesis.
 Col. 1033, § 37, line 2 from the end, read: "bestricken" instead of:
 "beschicken". It follows that this speech belongs to the beginning
 of May 1540. Cf. the introduction to this volume, p. 57.
 Col. 1036, §41. The last paragraph is not spoken with reference to D.
 Jakob Schenk, but it refers to Agricola. It is contained in Col.
 1720, No. 160.
 Col. 1042, line 12 v. o., read: "auf dem Convent" instead of: "auf der
 Synode", because after the Schmalkaldic Convention the
 princes met in Zeitz, March 11-17, 1537, concerning the
 hereditary union of Saxony, Brandenburg and Hesse. Kawerau,
 Agricola, p. 173.
 Col. 1044, line 6 v. u., read: "Cyrсило" instead: Christo. The words
 objected to there belong in the text. Cyrsilus was stoned by the
 Athenians. Kawerau, Agricola, p. 200.
 Col. 1047, § 60, line 2 of text, delete: 1) .
 Col. 1081, § 124, line 10 of the text, read: "Hyperaspistes".
 In the first line of the annotation there, read: "the ablative"
 instead of: "erroneous".

Col. 1091, §148, line 2 of text, read: "that the" 2c.

Col. 1148, line 6 v. o., read: Eustochia.

Col. 1294 at the end is inadvertently omitted the following: On this day, the feast of Nicolaus [Dec. 6, 1538], he divided a nut according to the rule of Pliny [Hist. nat. XVII, 10, sect. 11, § 64] that the nuts turn (*se vertant*) on the shortest day and at the solstice. Thus also the plague tends to cease. Christ was born at the solstice, but he suffered at the time of the equinox.

Col. 1301, § 5, line 1, read: "Anno 38, den 21. December." For this exhortation occurred after the 37th sermon on the first four chapters of John, which was preached on "Saturday before the birth of Christ." Cf. Erl. Ausg., vol. 47, p. 77 ff. The plague did not appear until the end of November. Table Talks, Cap. 9, § 15.

Col. 1362, Z. 7 v. o., read: "1535" instead of: "1533" in the old table speeches. For on Nov. 7, 1535, Luther went to Vergerio. Cf. Walch, old edition, vol. XVI, 2292 ff. Seckendorf, *Hist. Luth. lib. III*, p. 95 (1). In 1533 in June the papal nuncio was.

Hugo Rango in Wittenberg, but did not get to see Luther. Walch, old edition, vol. XVI, 2280 and (duplicate) vol. XXI, 1406. According to this letter of Luther to Hausmann of June 16, 1533, also the date in Cap. 54, § 1: "am 21. Tage Martii" is wrong, because Rango was in Wittenberg about June 12, 13 or 14. Cf. Köstlin, Martin Luther, vol. II, p. 292.

Col. 1367, line 19 v. o., read: "sing" instead of "sink. On the idiom "Heli singen" compare No. 5 in this 20th volume, Col. 282, § 204.

Col. 1713, line 1, instead of: [Was Herz, was Hand] read: [Was Hirsche, was Hindinnen]. We owe this improvement to the kindness of Dr. theol. A. Zahn in Stuttgart.

Col. 1875, No. 466, read: Cap. 14, 27.

Col. 1880, no. 548, line 1, read: [Jan. 22].

Col. 1910, No. 857, read: Cap. 66, 62.

Col. 1918, No. 951, read: Cap. 51, 3.

Col. 1962, No. 1481, line 5, read: "Da" instead of: That.

Col. 1973, No. 1575, read: Cap. 74, 1.

Col. 1991, note 1, line 1, read: *sic*, or *sicut* and delete the comma after *sicut*.